

THE STUDY OF CONVERSATIONAL UTTERANCES IN A *STAR IS BORN* MOVIE

Siti Natasya Febri Rhamadani

English Literature, Faculty of Cultural Sciences

Mulawarman University

E-mail: tasyamaswan@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This thesis studies conversational implicature in *A Star is Born* Movie. *A Star is Born* is a 2018 American romantic musical drama film starred by Cooper, Lady Gaga, Dave Chappelle, Andrew Dice Clay, and Sam Elliott. It tells story about a hard-drinking musician (Cooper) who discovers and falls in love with a young singer (Gaga). The research focuses on the conversations between characters in the movie. The objectives of the study are 1) to identify the conversational implicatures utterances on *A Star Is Born* movie, and 2) to analyze the conversational implicatures which have additional meaning. This research is a qualitative research. To analyze the data, the study uses Grice's theory of conversational implicature; Generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. The result of the study shows that: First, there are 375 data containing conversational implicature. Those conversational implicature divided into two, generalized implicature and particularized implicature. From 375 conversational implicature, there are 220 utterance belong to generalized implicature and 155 utterances belong to particularized implicature. Second, all conversational implicature have additional meaning. It means, there are 375 data of conversational implicature have additional meaning.

Keywords: Implicature, Conversation, Movie

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini membahas implikatur percakapan dalam sebuah film berjudul *A Star is Born*. Film ini adalah sebuah film drama romantis dari Amerika yang dibintangi oleh Cooper, Lady Gaga, Dave Chappelle, Andrew Dice Clay, dan Sam Elliot. Film ini menceritakan seorang pemain music yang suka minum-minuman keras (Cooper) yang bertemu dan jatuh cinta pada seorang penyanyi muda (Lady Gaga). Penelitian berfokus pada percakapan antar karakter dalam film. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah 1) mengidentifikasi ujaran mana saja yang mengandung implikatur percakapan di film berjudul *A Star Is Born*, dan 2) menganalisa mana saja implikatur percakapan yang mempunyai makna tersirat. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian kualitatif. Untuk menganalisa data dipergunakan teori dari implikatur percakapan dari Grice, implikatur percakapan umum dan implikatur percakapan khusus. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: Pertama, ada 375 implikatur percakapan. Implikatur

percakapan tersebut terbagi dua yaitu implikatur percakapan umum dan implikatur percakapan khusus. Dari 375 implikatur percakapan, ada 220 ujaran yang dikategorikan sebagai implikatur percakapan umum dan 155 ujaran yang termasuk implikatur percakapan khusus. Kedua, semua implikatur percakapan mempunyai makna tersirat yang berarti bahwa ada 273 data implikatur percakapan yang mempunyai makna tersirat.

Kata Kunci: *Implikatur, Percakapan, Film*

A. INTRODUCTION

Implicature can be found in novel, song, advertisement and movie. The researcher chooses implicature in the movie because the movie contains conversation between characters. The movie is used as the object of the research as well as the source of the data. Josef states that “movie is a work of art when motion comes from to a perceptible rhyhm with pause and part and where all aspects at the continuous images related to whole” (5). As Josef states movie is a work of art motion to preceptible rhyhm and all aspects continuous images related to whole.

The movie which is used by the researcher is *A Star Is Born* which was released in 2018. The film is about Jackson “Jack” Maine who was famous singer and suffered from alcohol and drugs addiction. He met the waitress and singer-songwriter Ally in the gay drag bar which later led up to being married and the story continued about both of them living their life as Ally become a new succesful singer. The reason of the researcher chooses this movie is the dialogues in this movie are rich of humor and jokes content. Humor and jokes are closely related to the implicit message. Jokes violate maxims frequently in this movie. Attardo stated that “all jokes involve the violation of (at least) one maxim of the Cooperative Principle that is commonplace in humor research” (27). It is obvious that jokes may contain and convey information without noticeable noise. The audiences are triggered to digest not only what literally said but also what is implied in the dialogue. The characters in this movie did not just merely convey what they want to say by literal utterance. The researcher uses the movie: *A Star is Born (2018)* and analyze it by using conversational implicature theory by Grice.

There are two objectives of this research. The first is to identify the utterances in *A Star Is Born* movie that contain conversational implicatures and the second is to analyze the conversational implicatures in *A Star Is Born* movie that contain additional conveyed meaning.

B. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. Context

According to Dash in linguistics, context carries tremendous importance in disambiguation of meanings as well as in understanding the actual meaning of words. Therefore, understanding the context becomes an important task in the

area of applied linguistics, computational linguistics, lexical semantics, cognitive linguistics, as well as in other areas of linguistics as context triggers variation of meaning and supplies valuable information to understand why and how a particular word varies in meaning when used in a piece of text.

2. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one of many subfields of linguistics. It concerns with the study of meaning within particular context. Leech states that pragmatics concerns with meaning as a triadic relation (6). It means that meaning in pragmatics is relative to the language user. In addition, Kreidler states that the main focus of pragmatics is a person's ability to get meanings from specific situations, to recognize what a speaker is referring to, to relate new information to what has gone before, to interpret what is being said from background knowledge about the speaker and the topic, and to infer information that the speaker takes for granted and does not bother to say (19).

Moreover, Yule states that pragmatics clearly concerns with the analysis of what people mean by their utterance not only recognizing the meaning of words in an utterance, but recognizes the words or phrases in the utterance mean by themselves. It studies how meanings of utterances depend not only on general linguistic knowledge like grammar and lexicon but also depend on the context. Since pragmatics concerns with the study of language use, it covers several topics of discussions, few of them are, speech act, context, cooperative principles and implicature.

Grundy also states that pragmatics is the study of language used in contextualized communication and the usage principles associated with it. So Pragmatics concerns about the function of language in communication and the speakers' intention or meaning while stating utterance toward hearer.

3. Implicature

The notion of implicature was first introduced by Grice, who defined it essentially as what is communicated less what is said. Implicature used by Grice to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says (Brown and Yule 31). Implicature can be considered as an additional conveyed meaning (Yule 35). According to Gazdar, an implicature is a proposition that is implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context even though that proposition is not a part of nor an entailment of what was actually said (Gazdar 39). An implicature does not require correct conditions of the uttered sentence or in the other word; it can just be a thought (Davis 5). Grice was the first to systematically study the case where different speakers meaning of sentences in jerkin. He introduced the verb (Implicate) and nouns of implicature which is technically a term that indicates "the act of meaning or implying something by saying something else." Consider the following dialogue:

Ann : Where can I get gasoline?
Bob : There's a station around the corner

In the example above, it shows the existence of conversational implicatures where Bob shows where Ann can get gasoline. But the emphasis here is not the concept of implicature requires the correct conditions of sentences uttered. When Ann asked where she could get petrol then Bob replied no gas stations on the corner. Meaning contained in the speech of Bob is Ann can get gasoline at the pump but you have to remember that the statements are not guarantees Ann will be able to get gasoline there, because it could be gas station is closed or out of stock gasoline (Davis 5)

A mutual understanding is inevitably needed by a speaker and a hearer in order to construct a good communication. Understanding an utterance syntactically and semantically is not sufficient since the meaning of utterance is not only stated but it is also implied.

Implicature is attained when a speaker intends to communicate more than just what the words mean. It is the speaker who communicates something via implicature and the listener recognizes those communicated meanings via inference. Implicature are inferred based on assumption that the speaker observes or flouts some principles of cooperation.

Grundy states the contribution of notion of implicature is that it provide some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually said (more than what is literally expressed by the conventional sense of linguistic expression uttered). Levinson in Potts adds the notion of implicature promises to bring the gap between what is literally said and what is actually said. In the Gricean model, the bridge from what is said (the literal content of the uttered sentence determined by its grammatical structure with the reference of indexical resolved) to what is communicated is built through implicature.

Furthermore, Grice as quoted by Levinson explains that the term of implicature to be a general cover term to stand in contrast to what is said or expressed by the truth condition of expression, and to include all kinds of pragmatics. Grice distinguished two different sorts of implicature, they are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. They have in common the property that they both convey an additional level of meaning, beyond the semantic meaning of the words uttered. They differ in that in the case of conventional implicature the same implicature is always conveyed, regardless of context, whereas in the case of conversational implicature, what is implied varies according to the context of utterance (Thomas 57).

3.1. Conventional Implicature

According to Levinson in Potts conventional implicature is non-truth-conditional-meaning associated with a particular linguistic expression like- **but**, **even**, **therefore**, **yet**, and **for**.

Example:

- a) *She doesn't have her own house, **but** far from poor.*
- b) ***Even** Mbah Maridjan cannot predict what will happen.*
- c) *John is an Englishman **therefore** he is brave.*

An utterance which triggers entailment built on the argumentative of reaching a conclusion based on a set of premises:

Premise 1: All Englishmen are brave.

Premise 2: John is an Englishman,

Conclusion: John is brave

3.2. Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is inferred from the use of some utterances in context. It is one of the most important ideas in pragmatic. According to Levinson the salience of the concept in pragmatic is due to two important contributions of sources (qtd in Edy's Conversational Implicature)

1. Implicature stands as a paradigmatic example of the nature and power of pragmatic explanations of linguistic phenomena,
2. Implicature provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean more than what is actually 'said'.

Example:

A: Can you tell me the time?

B: Well the adzan of Ashar has come.

What is said: 'Well the adzan of Ashar has come'. What is implicated: 'The speaker believes that he knows the time the adzan of Ashar comes'.

A: Has Joko got a job?

B: Joko's been going to the market everyday.

What is said: *Joko's been going to the market everyday*. What is implicated: 'The speaker believes that John may have been working in the market.

4. Types of Conversational Implicature

To understand the meaning of conversational implicature, sometimes we must relate it with situation or context where it's happening (Brown & Yule 31). In Levinson's book titled *Pragmatics*, Grice distinguishes conversational implicature into two types, those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature (Levinson 126)

4.1 Generalized Implicature

A generalized implicature is a conversational implicature that is inferable without reference to a special context. It arises without any particular context or special scenario being necessary. Expressions with the form *an X* usually imply that *X* is not closely related to the speaker or subject, as in the following expression:

Example:

*Muslim walked into a **house** yesterday and saw a ghost.*

This expression implies that the house is not Muslim's house.

4.2 Particularized Implicature

Particularized implicature is always calculated the expression with special knowledge of any particularly context, however most of the time, the conversation take place in very specific context in which locally recognized inferences is assumed. Therefore, Peccei addresses that particularized implicature requires not only general knowledge which is particular or 'local' to the speaker and the hearer, and often to the physical context of the utterance as well (38).

A particularized implicature is a conversational implicature that is derivable only in a specific context. It requires such specific context.

Example:

A: *What has happened to the fried chicken?*

B: *Look! The cat looks very happy.*

In the above exchange, A will likely derive the implicature “the cat ate the fried chicken” from B’s statement. This is due to A’s belief that B is observing the conversational maxim of relation or relevance in the specific context of A’s question.

C. RESEARCH METHOD

The study uses qualitative approach and content analysis as the research design. In this case, the researcher collected the whole data related to utterances in dialogue of *A Star Is Born* movie. The research design is content analysis dealing with all characters utterances.

The data of this study are the utterances in *A Star Is Born* (2018) movie script. The data are limited only the utterances by Ally. The data source are obtained from English subtitle transcript of *A Star Is Born* movie. The researcher explains the data in the using qualitative approach in which the data are described in the form of words rather than numbers and statistics.

The primary instrument for collecting the data is the researcher herself. The process of collecting the data in this research used some techniques in order to get the data. The techniques were watching the film, reading and understanding the script, and read the related theory. In the last step, the researcher read the related theories, journals, and studies that similar to this research and isolated some information that may help to build the findings.

There are also some stages on how to analyze the data, Miles and Huberman reveal three current flows of data analysis, namely data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. This research uses the triangulation method in order to make the research more reliable. Triangulation method is used to find more dependable when they are confirmed from several independent sources. After that, their validity is enhanced when they are confirmed by more than one “instrument” measuring the same thing (O’Connor & Gibson 74).

D. DISCUSSION

1. Utterances with Conversational Implicature

Before the writer discusses the utterances with conversational implicature, she elaborates the data findings. The movie, *A New Star is Born*, has 2152 utterances by all characters in the movie. As said in chapter 3, the writer uses only Ally’s utterances as the data for the study. The complete data were attached in the appendix section.

From utterances in the movie, the writer found 375 conversational utterances by Ally. Among 375 conversational implicature, 220 utterances were classified as generalized implicature and 155 utterances were particularized implicature.

For the complete data presentation on these utterances, the writer summarized the data in the table below:

Table 1: Utterances Classifications

Total	Ally's Conversational Implicatures	
	Generalized	Particularized
	220	155
	375	

Since this study only deals with conversational implicature, the writer only uses all the 375 data of conversational implicature for the analysis to answer the research questions formulated in chapter 1. Based on the table 1 above, there are 375 data of conversational implicature. The data consists of 220 generalized conversational and 155 particularized conversational implicature. The analysis of each classification and its meaning is presented in the next section.

2. Conversational Implicature with Additional Conveyed Meaning

Conversational implicature is usually also called implicature as shorthand. The term of implicature was introduced by Grice which refers to implied meaning from what is said. Levinson adds that implicature "provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually said. Moreover, implicature means a hint which a speaker indicates intentionally by means of language. In this case the message that the speaker utters may be not understood by the hearer.

To understand the meaning of conversational implicature, sometimes we must relate it with situation or context where it's happening. In Levinson's book titled *Pragmatics*, Grice distinguishes conversational implicature into two types, those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

2.1. Generalized Implicature

Generalized conversational implicature is a conversational implicature which does not require special knowledge in the context to calculate additional information or meaning conveyed. In the same aim, Levinson said that generalized conversational implicature arise without any particular context and special scenario being necessary. The analysis of generalized implicatures are described below:

a) Data 1

(1) Datum 1 (00:03:03,884 → 00:03:26,941)

Speaker: Ally

Roger... You're a wonderful man, yes, and you're a great lawyer. *We're just not meant to be together.*

The datum above is classified as generalized implicature because the hearer can understand the additional message without knowing any particular context.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

The generalized implicature above implies that Ally would not marry Roger, the man she was talking to. In fact, Ally was probably hated him despite of his career as lawyer and his wealth. Ally showed her anger toward Roger that seems boastful about his occupation and looks.

b) Data 2

(1) Datum 4 (00:03:46,360 → 00:03:49,027)

Speaker: Ally

He cried. He laughed. He yelled at me. You know, *whatever*.

The above conversation is generalized implicature, which means the hearer does need special knowledge in order to catch the additional conveyed meaning that the speaker conveyed.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

The utterance above implied that Ally was angry toward someone on the phone. Her anger was shown in the word “whatever”. She was angry and she did not care anymore if the man she talked to was cried, laughed and yelled at the same time.

c) Data 3

(1) Datum 7 (00:04:00,507 → 00:04:02,573)

Speaker: Ally

(to Ramon)

Okay, *I'll see you upstairs*

The utterance above is surely generalized implicature in which the hearer was able to guest the additional conveyed meaning that the speaker conveys. There is no context needed in the utterance above

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

The additional conveyed meaning that the speaker wanted to convey was that she still wanted to talk to Ramon and she wanted him to wait her upstairs while she was doing something else.

d) Data 4

(1) Datum 8 (00:04:05,679 → 00:04:08,179)

Speaker: Ally

Here we go. *Taking out the trash.*

Like your mouth

This generalized implicature is uttered by Ally after she talked to Ramon. The literal meaning of the utterance above is that Ally was going to take a trash out. She said to Bryan that his mouth is like trash, dirty and disgusting.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

The utterance above is classified as generalized implicature. It means the utterance has an additional conveyed meaning that can be understood by the hearer without knowing any particular context. The additional conveyed meaning that a hearer can catch from Ally's utterance is that she considered Bryan as

unimportant person that always says bad things and swearing with dirty words. She considered whatever Bryan said as trash that does need to be paid attention.

e) Data 5

(1) Datum 9 (00:04:10,217 → 00:04:12,987)

Speaker: Ally

Well, *You gotta keep your mouth clean.* Okay?

The utterance above is generalized implicature in which one sentence brings additional message to the original one. The literal message of the utterance above is that the speaker warned Bryan to keep his mouth clean. However, as generalized implicature, the utterance above implies another meaning.

(2) Additional Conveyed Message

The additional conveyed meaning that the above utterance brings is that Ally stated her dislike toward Bryan who always says dirty words. The utterance implies that Bryan always rude by saying bad words, swearing, and saying nasty and dirty words, therefore, Ally offended him by saying that his mouth was as dirty as the trash.

f) Data 6

(1) Datum 29 (00:14:25,031 → 00:14:27,798)

Speaker : Ally

Okay. Sure. Yeah, if you wanna wait, I'll come have a drink with you. Sure.

The utterance above is generalized implicature because it has additional message or meaning that can be understood by the hearer without knowing any particular context. Literally, the speaker said that to Jack. She said that if Jack willing to wait, She would accompany Jack to drink. As generalized implicature, the utterance above has additional conveyed meaning as below.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

The additional conveyed meaning that can be drawn from Ally's utterance above is that Ally hopes the hearer (Jack) to be more patient and wait for her to have a drink together.

g) Data 7

(1) Datum 41 (00:18:56,702 → 00:19:01,138)

Speaker: Ally

Yeah, I do... I don't like it.

But I understand it.

This utterance was spoken by Ally while having conversation with jack. Literally, the utterance conveyed that Ally did understand what Jack said and she also said that she did not really like about what Jack said. However, as generalized implicature, the utterance above has an additional meaning conveyed.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

Ally's utterance above implies that Ally was disappointed to what jack has said. She was fully understood what Jack said and she disappointed about that.

h) Data 8

(1) Datum 44 (00:19:14,554 → 00:19:16,687)

Speaker: Ally

I mean, I don't know what is going on, honestly --

The utterance above was Ally answering to Jack. This utterance is classified as a generalized implicature which means there is an additional message in it.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

A hearer can simply understand that Ally was not fully aware what was happened between she and Jack. She told Jack honestly that she did not know that their meeting was meant something for them.

i) Data 9

(1) Datum 50 (00:19:36,275 → 00:19:40,377)

Speaker: Ally

You put that on. When did you even go to the jukebox?

The datum above is Ally's utterance. It is classified as generalized implicature which means the utterance has another additional conveyed meaning. The literal meaning of the utterance above is that Ally asked Jack when did he go to juke box and play the song she heard just then. While the additional conveyed meaning from the utterance is described below.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

The utterance above has an additional conveyed meaning that can be easily understood by a hearer without knowing any particular context. A hearer easily catches that the song Jack played from the Juke box was very familiar to Ally so that she got surprised when Jack played the song.

j) Data 10

(1) Datum 52 (00:20:13,012 → 00:20:14,344)

Speaker: Ally

You want someone to take your picture? Ally steps up to him.

The datum above is Ally's utterance. The literal meaning of the utterance above is she offered help to take the picture for Jack. While the additional conveyed meaning that can be understood is described below.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

The additional conveyed meaning that can be inferred from the utterance is that Ally is doing hospitality by offering help to Jack to take the picture.

2.2 Particularized Implicature

Particularized implicature is always calculated the expression with special knowledge of any particularly context, however most of the time, the conversation take place in very specific context in which locally recognized inferences is assumed. Therefore, Peccei (1999: 38) addresses that particularized implicature requires not only general knowledge which is particular or 'local' to the speaker and the hearer, and often to the physical context of the utterance as well.

a) Data 1

(1) Datum 47 (00:19:28,199 → 00:19:30,501)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : In a bar having conversation with Jack.

Well, what do you want me to --

The utterance above is particularized implicature. The hearer will not easily get the idea of the utterance nor understand what the speaker wants to say without knowing the specific context in the utterance. The literal meaning of the utterance above is Ally asked jack something to do. Without knowing the context, the hearer cannot understand what Ally need to do and why.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

To know what the utterance implies, we need to know the context of it. Based on the movie script, the context of the utterance above is in a bar where Ally and Jack had conversation. Ally mention Jack's full name and Jack was laughed at her. Ally asked what thing to call him and he said "just jack"

b) Data 2

(1) Datum 55 (00:20:29,495→00:20:33,062)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : Jack and Ally were walking on aisles looking for something and Ally's hands were swollen

I'm fine, honestly. I'm okay.

This is so stupid.

The above datum is categorized as conversational implicature because it implies other meaning than the literal meaning. The datum is also categorized as particularized implicature. The reason of this classification is that the hearer needs to understand a certain context to understand the implied meaning of the utterance. Without knowing the context, the hearer will not be able to guest what Ally meant by her utterance and why she was cursing.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

As conversational implicature, the above datum has additional conveyed meaning. To understand the meaning implied from the utterance above, the hearer need to know the context of the utterance first. The context of the above utterance is Jack and Ally were walking on aisles looking for something and Ally's hands were swollen. Therefore, the additional conveyed meaning in the utterance is that Ally stated her condition to Jack that she was fine although her hand was swollen.

c) Data 3

(1) Datum 64 (00:22:03,122 → 00:22:05,790)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : Jack is wrapping Ally's hand with cold peas and wrap it with a gauze and tape. Previously they talk about how people want to take picture with jack and adore him

How the hell do you deal with that all the time?

The utterance above is a particularized implicature in which hearers need to know a specific context to understand the message implied in the utterance. Without knowing the context, the utterance above has no clear meaning for any hearer. What the hearer understands is only the literal meaning of Ally's question. However, the utterance implies other meaning as below.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

To know what the meaning implied in the utterance above, the hearer need to know specific context in which the utterance takes place. The context of the utterance is that Jack was wrapping Ally's hand with cold peas and wrap it with a gauze and tape. The implied meaning was that Ally is surprised by the way Jack live his live as a famous singer and song writer. Ally asked him how he did it.

d) Data 4

(1) Datum 6 (00:03:54,902 → 00:03:56,466)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : Ally and Bryan had an argue about Ally's task to throw garbage

Bryan, *can you get somebody else to do it for me.*

The datum above is a particularized implicature in which the hearer needs to know a certain context in order to understand the message implied. If a hearer only hear the utterance above without knowing the context the message he understand is just the literal meaning that is not to clear. The hearer will not know what Ally asks Bryan to do.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

To know the implied message that the utterance above has, the hearer has to know the context of the utterance above. The context is that the conversation between Ally and Bryan, her catering manager. Bryan asks her to bring the garbage out of the café. Ally answers Bryan that he should have somebody else to bring the garbage out.

e) Data 5

(1) Datum 11 (00:05:09,543 → 00:05:10,808)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : Ally walked through the audiences toward the stage. She was ready to perform a song.

Would anybody like some French tips tonight?

Datum 11 above is a conversational implicature and also particularized implicature. Therefore a certain context is need to understand the implied meaning of the utterance.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

To understand the implied meaning of the utterance above, a hearer needs to understand the context of it. Based on the movie script, the context is Ally walked through the audiences toward the stage. She was ready to perform a song. So the utterance above implies that Ally offered the audience some French songs and she expected for a tip for the song.

f) Data 6

(1) Datum 26 (00:13:55,102 → 00:13:57,668)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : Jack returned to the bar and met Ally. Ally was surprised to see Jack and he held her arms

Why did you come back here?

The datum 26 above is a particularized implicature because it implies more meaning that can be understood by knowing a certain context.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

To know what the utterance in datum 26 implies, a hearer needs to know the context of the utterance. The context is that Jack returned to the bar and met Ally. Ally was surprised to see Jack and he held her arms. The utterance “*Why did you come back here?*” means that Ally was unexpectedly happy to see Jack again. She was also wonder what make jack return to her.

g) Data 7

(1) Datum 118 (00:32:39,157→ 00:32:41,560)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : Ally was at home and having conversation with her father about a lifetime opportunity to meet Jack and become a famous singer.

He's a drunk!

You know all about drunks.

If a hearer hears this utterance, he probably did not understand who was drunk. Unfortunately, this utterance is a particularized implicature, where the utterance bears an implied meaning that can be understood by knowing a certain context.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

In the utterance above, the particularized implicature datum 118 has other meaning beside its literal meaning. To know what the utterance implies, a hearer needs to understand the context of the conversation. The context is that Ally was at home and having conversation with her father about a lifetime opportunity to meet Jack and become a famous singer. Therefore, the implied meaning of the utterance above is that Ally hate Jack because she knew that jack is a drunk. He loved to drink alcoholic drink.

h) Data 8

(1) Datum 129 (00:35:08,606→ 00:35:09,838)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : Ally was invited to a venue where Jack was performing with his band. The place was crowded and the stage was so big.

This place is so big.

The utterance above is a particularized implicature in which the hearer needs to know a certain context to understand the implied meaning.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

Without knowing the context, the utterance above will have awkward meaning. However if the context is on a venue where Jack was performing on a stage then the additional meaning was that Ally impressed with the size of the venue and the stage.

i) Data 9

(1) Data 132 (00:38:04,14→ 00:38:04,14)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : Ally was in the left stage of the venue and Jack was trying to drag her to get on the stage

It's not funny.

Jack, don't fuck around.

The above utterance is a particularized implicature. A hearer needs to know a certain context before he can understand the what message the utterance implies.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

To know what the utterance implies, a hearer need to know that the context of the utterance. The context needed to understand the meaning implies is that the location. Ally was in the left stage of the venue and Jack was trying to drag her to get on the stage. So, the utterance means that Ally tried to refuse to get on the stage. She cursed Jack so that he released her hands.

j) Data 10

(1) Datum 141 (00:43:09,086 00:43:13,158)

Speaker: Ally

Setting : in a hotel at a night, Jack and Ally were drunk in one of the room.

I'll be right back, okay? Just give me one second.

The utterance above is a conversational implicature and also a particularized implicature. The message brings hidden meaning that can be understood only if the hearer knows a special context.

(2) Additional Conveyed Meaning

The context of the utterance above is in a hotel at a night, Jack and Ally were drunk in one of the room.. The message implies from the utterance above is that Ally was uncertain to what would happen in the room. Ally tried to get some time to make sure the decision that she would take.

D. CONCLUSION

After analyzing the utterances done by Ally from the movie, the researcher that all 375 data were Conversational Implicature. Therefore, the first conclusion that the researcher concludes is there are 375 conversational implicature.

Next, the researcher analyzed deeper the 375 data of conversational implicature and found that those 375 data of conversational implicature were divided into two, generalized implicature and particularized implicature. From 375 conversational implicature, there are 220 utterances belonged to generalized implicature and 155 utterances belong to particularized implicature. Therefore, the second conclusion that can be drawn is that all conversational implicature have additional conveyed meaning. It means, there are 375 data of conversational meaning have additional conveyed meaning because the speakers intend to communicate more than just what the words mean by using those utterances.

REFERENCES

Attardo, S. *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin; New York. 1994.

Austin, J. *How to do Things with Words*. London: Oxford University press. 1962.

- Bickerton, D. *Languagae and Human Behavior*. US: University Washington Press. 2000.
- Bottyan, G. *The Operationality of Grice's Tests for Implicature*. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2005. Web. June 18, 2020
- Chris, P. *Conversational Implicature: an overview*. Standford Press. 2012.
- Creswell, J. W. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions*. London: Sage Publications. 1998.
- Dash, N.S. *Context and Contextual Word Meaning*. Web. 2008.
- Edy, Tri. *Conversational Implicature*. 2015. Web. June 18, 2020
- Grice, H.P *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1975.
- Grundy, P. *Doing Pragmatic*. London-Arnold, a member of the Hodder Headline Group. 2000.
- Huda, M. *Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue of Euro Trip Movie*. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya . 2013.
- Josef. *Studying Contemporary American Film*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc. 2005.
- Kreider, W. C. *Introducing English Semantics*. New York: Routledge. 1998.
- Leech, G. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited. 1983.
- Levinson, C.S. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983.
- Mey, J.L. *An Introduction of Pragmatics*. United State of America: Blackwell. 1983.
- Mey, J.L. *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. New York: Elseiver. 1998.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. *Qualitative Data Analysis Second Edition*. USA: Sage Publication Inc. 1994.
- O'Connor, Helene and Nancy Gibson. "A Step By Step Guide To Qualitative Data Analysis". *Pimatiziwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health* (n.d):64-90. 2004.
- Peccei, J. S. *Pragmatics*. London: Routledge. 1999.

Ilmu Budaya

Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya

e-ISSN 2549-7715 | Volume 5 | Nomor 4 | Oktober 2021 | Hal: 885-900
Terakreditasi Sinta 4

Potts,W. *Into the Conventional-Implicature Dimension*. 2007. Web. June 18, 2020

Rugg, Deborah. "An Introduction To Triangulation". Geneva: Unaided Monitoring and Evaluation Fundamentals, n.d. Web. June 18, 2020.

Yamazaki, T. *Conversational Implicature in Stand-up Comedies*. Web. 2010. June 18, 2020.

Yule, George. *Pragmatics*. England: Oxford University Press. 1996.