AN ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE ON *"JUMANJI: WELCOME TO THE JUNGLE"* FILM

Saniatang, Surya Sili, Ririn Setyowati

English Literature Department, Faculty of Cultural Sciences
Mulawarman University
Email: saniatangarbn@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In this research, the researcher used the film as the object of the research entitled *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* film and focused on understanding character utterances. The data were taken from the film script and scene in the form of utterances. Through the utterances, the participants tell their idea and opinion about something, but sometimes they do not say their goals directly; this is called implicature. Based on that, the researcher tries to understand the meaning of implicature utterances occurred in the film based on the implicature theory. This research was aimed at classifying the types of conversational implicature, which have been done by the five main characters in the film and then explaining the implied meaning. The researcher used Levinson's implicature theory and context by DeVito. The data were explained by showing the maxim flouted by the main characters, the context of the situation, the types of conversational implicature, and the implied meaning of the utterances. Dealing with the purposes of the research, it was found that the five main characters used implicature. Thirty-seven utterances contained conversational implicatures, which comprise thirty-four particularized conversational implicature, and three generalized conversational implicature. The five main characters used particularized conversational implicature more frequently than generalized conversational implicature. In addition, it was also found that the implied meaning behind main characters' utterances mostly depend on the context of the conversation. The implied meaning found were informing, complaining, refusing, reminding, criticizing, assuring, affirming, apologizing, and entreating.

Keywords: implicature, implied meaning, generalized conversational implicature, particularized conversational implicature

ABSTRAK

Dalam penelitian ini, peneliti menggunakan film ini sebagai objek penelitian berjudul Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle film dan berfokus pada memahami ucapan karakter. Data diambil dari naskah dan adegan film dalam bentuk ujaran. Melalui ucapan, para peserta menceritakan ide dan pendapat mereka tentang suatu hal, tetapi kadang-kadang mereka tidak mengatakan tujuan mereka secara langsung; ini disebut implikatur. Berdasarkan hal tersebut, peneliti mencoba memahami makna ucapan implikatur yang terjadi dalam film berdasarkan teori implikatur. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengklasifikasikan jenis implikatur percakapan, yang telah dilakukan oleh lima karakter utama dalam film dan kemudian menjelaskan makna yang tersirat. Peneliti menggunakan teori implikatur oleh Levinson dan konteks oleh DeVito. Data dijelaskan dengan menunjukkan maksim yang dilanggar oleh karakter utama, konteks situasi, jenis implikatur percakapan, dan makna tersirat dari ucapan. Berhubungan dengan tujuan penelitian, ditemukan bahwa lima karakter utama menggunakan implikatur. Tiga puluh tujuh ucapan mengandung implikatur percakapan, yang terdiri dari tiga puluh empat implikatur percakapan partikular, dan tiga implikatur percakapan umum. Lima karakter utama menggunakan implikatur percakapan particular lebih sering daripada implikatur percakapan umum. Selain itu, juga ditemukan bahwa makna tersirat di balik ucapan karakter utama sebagian besar tergantung pada konteks percakapan. Makna tersirat yang ditemukan adalah untuk menginformasikan, mengeluh, menolak, mengingatkan, mengkritik, meyakinkan, menegaskan, meminta maaf, dan memohon.

Kata kunci: *implikatur, makna tersirat, implikatur percakapan umum, implikatur percakapan particular*

A. INTRODUCTION

In this society, human is a social creature who needs each other in daily life. As social being, human needs to communicate with one another. However, when someone communicates and has a conversation, there is often another meaning to be communicated. Therefore, when having a conversation, it needs an understanding. Because, in a conversation, not all the messages are conveyed clearly and explicitly. Sometimes, there are also additional meanings which are not openly presented.

Accordingly, the discussion about meaning exists in pragmatics. From several aspects learned in pragmatics, one of the aspects is implicature. Implicature is the meaning that the speaker wants to convey but is not part of what is said. What is said has another meaning than what is revealed (Horn and Ward, 2004). Implicature does not only happen in real life conversation but sometimes it can happen in a conversation of a film. To enjoy and understand the story in the film, we also have to understand what the characters are talking about. Sometimes the conversation

put in the film is not always expressed clearly. This is why studying implicature in a film is also important. Related to this, the researcher intends to conduct a research with film as an object entitled *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* by Jake Kasdan.

Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle film tells about four students who get the punishment to clean a room. This is where the story begins when the four of them were drowned in a mysterious game world called Jumanji. To exit the game, they must work together to complete the mission. Because the four of them have different characteristic and not close to each other, sometimes when they communicate, they did not convey their intentions clearly. From here, there comes the conversational implicature that will be examined by the researcher

The analysis is done in order to find out the kinds of conversational implicature that occur in *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* film and what meanings are implied in the conversational implicature found on *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* film. The purposes of this study conducted by the researcher are to identify what types of conversational implicature are found on *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* film and reveal out what meanings are implied in the conversational implicature found on *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* film. Theoretically, the results of this study "An analysis of Conversational Implicature on *"Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle"* Film" are expected to be a reference or input for the development of linguistics research especially for researchers who want to analyze literary work that concerns implicature depicted in a film. Practically, the result of this study is expected to give information about how to be cooperative in conversation. This study also shows that delivering meaning in communication not only deliver directly but also can be said not explicitly.

B.   RELATED LITERATURE
1.   Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is usually also called implicature as shorthand. Implicature "provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually said" (Levinson, 1983, p.97). According to Yule, there is a situation the speaker may not follow the expectation of the cooperative principle in order to convey an additional meaning more than what is said (1996, p. 39-40). In conclusion, conversational implicature is something that is implicated in a conversation. It is a study that learned about what is an utterance means that is not explained in detail, which has other meanings but is not a part of what is said. Grice also distinguished between kinds of conversational implicature, "generalized conversational implicatures are those arising without any particular context or special scenario being necessary, in contrast to particularized implicatures which do require such specific contexts" (Levinson, 1983, p. 126).

a.   Generalized Conversational Implicatures

Generalized conversational implicature is implicature in which its presence in a conversation does not require a specific context and concluded without special knowledge. Levinson (1983, p. 126) stated that generalized conversational

implicature is an implicature utterance which does not require the specific context or the same background knowledge to be understood is needed for the understanding.

b.   Particularized Conversational Implicatures

In contrast, particularized conversational implicature is implicature in which its presence requires a special context and special background knowledge in order to be used for the understanding. Levinson (1983, p. 126) explained that particularized conversational implicatures are when an implicature utterance is uttered and a special context is needed to understand the additional meaning.

Furthermore, in analyzing the implied meaning, speech act theory can be used to find out the intent of the speaker. Searle & Vanderveken (1985, p.1) stated, "the minimal unit of humans communication are speech act of a type called illocutionary acts". Illocutionary act can be used to observe the intent of the speaker because someone might utter something to make a statement, an offer, an explanation, or for some other communicative purpose. This was generally known as the illocutionary force of the utterance (Yule, 1996, p.48). There were five types of general function performed by speech acts: declarative, assertive, expressive, directive, and commissive (Yule, 1996, p.53). In each type, contains kinds of actions that can be carried out by the speaker, and the researcher classified the implied meaning in this research related to the speaker's intention and context of the conversation.

2.   Context

Finegan (2008, p. 6) says "Context refers to the social situation in which expression is uttered and includes whatever has been expressed earlier in that situation. It also relies on generally shared knowledge between speaker and hearer". Additionally, the definition of context based on Widdowson (2007, p. 27), "The context that texts, whether spoken or written, are designed to be key to the construct of reality by particular groups of people, representation of what they know of the world and how they think about it". Based on Sperber and Wilson (1986) they said that context is anything that plays a role in interpretation, which is not limited to the immediate physical environment or the immediate preceding utterances, but also expectations about the future, scientific hypotheses or religious beliefs, anecdotal memories, general cultural assumptions, beliefs about the mental state of the speaker play a role in interpretation. In summary, context provides related information that connects one and another. A situation where the utterances take place to relate to its meaning indicated by an utterance.

There are four dimensions of context: physical, social-psychological, temporal, and cultural (DeVito, 2012, p .8-9). They are expressed as follows:

1. The physical context is the tangible or concrete environment in which communication takes place—the room or hallway or park, for example.

2. The social–psychological context includes, for example, the status relationships among the participants, the roles and the games that people play, and the cultural rules of the society in which people are communicating. It also includes the

friendliness or unfriendliness, formality or informality, and seriousness or humorousness of the situation.

3. The temporal (or time) context includes (1) the time of day (2) the time in history in which the communication takes place and (3) how a message fits into the sequence of communication events.

4. The cultural context has to do with your (and others') culture: the beliefs, values, and ways of behaving that are shared by a group of people and passed down from one generation to the next. Cultural factors affect every interaction and influence what you say, how you say it, and how you respond to what others say.

In communication, understanding the context of the conversation will help to understand the information and help the hearer from a wrong perception of information. When it connected to context, it makes it easier for the hearers to understand the speaker's intended message.

C.   RESEARCH METHOD

This research belongs to the qualitative research. Qualitative research is characterized by its aims which relate to the understanding of some aspects of life, and its methods which (in general) generate words, rather than numbers, as data for analysis (Patton and Cohcran, 2002).   The approach used in this research is content analysis. Content analysis based on Webster's Dictionary (as cited in Krippendorff, 2004, p. xiii) is defined as " analysis of the manifest and latent content of a body of communicated material (as a book or film) through classification, tabulation, and evaluation of its key symbols and themes in order to ascertain its meaning and probable effect". In this research, content analysis will be used to an examination of research materials to identify data needed in this study. Data or significant information collected and examined in this research are in in the form of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences that are included in the utterances of the characters in dialogues in the movie which show conversations that have implicatures. The data source for this study will be obtained from a film script entitled *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* by Jake Kasdan.

There are three main phases in analyzing the data in this research based on Elo and Kyngas (2008), as follows:

1)   Preparation (selecting the unit of analysis and making sense of the data and whole)

First, after collecting data, the researcher selected the unit of analysis that carried out. Based on the research question, unit analysis focused on conversational implicature and its types. After determining the unit analysis the next thing is to understand the whole data that have been collected from a film that is used as the object of this research.

2)   Organizing (developing analysis matrices, data gathering by content, grouping, categorization, and abstraction)

Next, the researcher created a matrix to distinguish the types of data that have been collected, the data were categorized into two types of conversational implicature. After the matrix is formed, the researcher identified the data, and distinguished it based on the type of conversational. After that, a brief description of

the data is given, in terms of the research that will be conducted, the researcher provides an overview of the characteristics of why the data include conversational implicature.

3) Reporting the analyzing process and the results (Model, conceptual system, conceptual map or categorization)

The last step is reporting the analyzing process; the researcher reports how the analysis is processed, how to categorize the data and, write down the results obtained after analyzing the data. Regardingly, that is about what utterances are found as conversational implicature and the utterance belongs to the type of generalized conversational implicature or particularized conversational implicature by using Levinson's theory about conversational implicature, and DeVito's four dimensions of context to know the context behind the utterances occur that make clear the implicature utterance in this film.

D. FINDING AND DISCUSSION
1. Conversational Implicature and Its Implied Meaning

a. Generalized Conversational Implicatures
Fridge: You proofread everything?
Spencer: Yeah, I proofed it.
        And I gave it a beginning... and an ending and s-some in the middle.
Fridge: I would've done it myself, *if I had the time or whatever,* but...
Spencer: Yeah, it's no big deal.

(D1/05.45-05.56)

This conversation between Spencer and Fridge occurred when Spencer gave Fridge the essay that he had done and the conversation took place on their way to school. After Fridge received his essay, Fridge asked if Spencer had checked his essay properly, which was then replied by Spencer that he had done it well. Then, Fridge told Spencer a sentence, "I would've done it myself, *if I had the time or whatever,* but..." even though Spencer did not ask anything. In that conversation, Fridge suddenly changed the topic, so he flouted the maxim of relevance and that utterance contained implicature because Fridge wanted to convey other meaning.

The utterance "*if I had the time or whatever*" is used to indicate the speaker's wish, which is contradictory to the current situation and can be analyzed using I-principle that is "What is simply described is stereotypically exemplified", because it has minimal information which means what the speaker said is implicated to an interpretation from what the hearer know about the world. The context of the situation that has followed the utterance does not really influence the utterance. Because, in general, when someone has an opinion which in contrast with the fact and the response that happens for the situation like that is generally the same as the utterance "he is busy", then Spencer can make an assumption that Fridge meant to tell Spencer that he is busy so he did not have time to be able to work on his essay and asked Spencer for help. To know the meaning of Fridge's implicature utterance, we can find out what it means from the words that was used by Fridge. If so, then Fridge utterance is included in the generalized conversational implicature.

b. Particularized Conversational Implicatures

Spencer: Guys, I think she's right. At camp, they used to tell us if you see a rattlesnake, don't move. I think someone has to make direct eye contact and not blink.

Bethany: And then Spencer will reach in and grab whatever else is in there.

Spencer: What? Why me again?

Martha: *Because you're Bravestone.*

<div align="right">(D19/52.08-52.26)</div>

This conversation also took in the same place at their second mission site when they tried to find the missing piece and were directed to retrieve it in a basket while there is a black mamba snake inside. Spencer and the others did not know how they could retrieve the missing pieces from the basket that filled with a snake. Spencer confirmed Martha's idea that it could be a gazing contest with a snake in the basket. Then Bethany suggested that the one who will take the pieces in the basket was Spencer and she was willing to do the gazing contest. Spencer did not believe what he was hearing and tried to clarify it which was then responded by Martha with the phrase, "*Because you're Bravestone*". She provides unclear information by saying that utterance, thus she failed to observe the maxim of manner, and from that short sentence, it contained an implicature.

If we look at the social-psychological context included, that was, the roles that people play that refer to their characters in the game. Martha wanted to convey another meaning, which means by saying that, it is clear that only Bravestone (Spencer's character in the game) can do it. The only one who can overcome this obstacle was him, because he is Bravestone, a character who has no weakness in the game. To find out the meaning of Martha's words, we must know the characters they played in the game and the same knowledge of the speaker and listener is needed for interpretation. By that, the utterance was included in the particularized conversational implicature.

2. Discussion

Based on the data finding, the researcher found that the five main characters; Spencer (Dr. Bravestone), Fridge (Moose Finbar), Martha (Ruby Roundhouse), Bethany (Professor Seldom), and one the other character that is Alex (Seaplane) flouted all types of Gricean maxims which rise implicatures in their utterances. Thirty-seven utterances contained conversational implicatures, which comprises thirty-four particularized conversational implicature, and three generalized conversational implicature. Particularized conversational implicature was the most frequently used in *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* film. Fridge used implicature more than the others. He did implicature when he wanted to show his feelings and to say what he meant indirectly, as an example, to boast himself, to defend himself, explain his situation, reject, criticize, ask for something, show his support, and also when he blame his character in the game. And the character with the least implicature found in their utterances was Alex; because, in the film, Alex did not met them from the beginning of the story. So, there was not much interaction between Alex and the

others. Meanwhile, the other characters used implicature to convey their intentions because they did not know and not very familiar yet with each other, so they used conversational implicature to express their feelings indirectly.

There are several meanings behind implicature utterances in *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* film like inform, complain, refuse, remind, criticize, assure, affirm, apologize, and entreat. In order to know the implied meaning, it was necessary to have the same background knowledge or prior knowledge between the participants. Also, a clear understanding of the context should be clearly derived, so that proper understanding of the implied meaning can be achieved. Although there are some implicature that were not bound by context to know the implied meaning, however, in this film, most of the implicature needed context and special knowledge for the interpretation.

E.   CONCLUSION

Two types of conversational implicatures are generalized and particularized conversational implicature found in this film. In the analysis, the researcher finds more particularized conversational implicature than generalized conversational implicature. It is because the five main characters convey their intent by using implicature in a specific context that is in the game world and the knowledge about them who transforms into a character from the game. So, sometimes to find out the implied meanings behind the characters' utterances depend on the context of a conversation and need special knowledge about the character. The five main characters in *Jumanji: Welcome to the Jungle* film uses conversational implicatures to convey what they exactly meant to the interlocutor. They did implicature to convey feelings, and to show their personality indirectly. The implied meanings are found in the form of inform, complain, refuse, remind, criticize, assure, affirm, apologize, and entreat.

REFERENCES

DeVito, J. A. (2012). *Human Communication: The Basic Course 12th Edition*. London: Pearson Education, Inc.

Elo, S. & Helvi, K. (2008). *The qualitative content analysis process*. Finland: Blackwell Publishing.

Finegan, E. (2008). *Language: Its Structure and Use 5th Edition*. Boston: Thomson Higher Education.

Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing Pragmatics 3rd Edition*. London: Routledge.

Horn, L. R. and Gregory, W. (2004). *The Handbook of Pragmatics.* USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Patton, M. Q. & Michael C. (2002). *A Guide to Using Qualitative Research Methodology*.

Searle, J & Vanderveken D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Sperber, D & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition 2nd Edition.* United Kingdom: Blackwell Publisher.

Widdowson. H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. *Pragmatics*. (1996). New York: Oxford University Press.