CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN "CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE" MOVIE

Julio Agsa[1]
Universitas Putera Batam (UPB), Batam, Indonesia
e-mail: pb181210086@puterabatam.ac.id

Ambalegin, Ambalegin[2]
Universitas Putera Batam (UPB), Batam, Indonesia
e-mail: Ambalegin@puterabatam.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This descriptive qualitative research investigated conversational implicature found in the movie entitled "Central Intelligence". The gricean theory was applied to examine the conversational implicature types uttered by characters of the "Central Intelligence" movie. The data were utterances of all characters involved in the movie. Conversational implicature was taken as the research object. Observational method and non-participatory were used to collect data. The pragmatic identity method and competence- in equalizing technique were adopted to analyze the collected data. Therefore, the researchers analyzed in a pragmatics way and equalized the data with theory. Relating to the findings, this research discovered the types of conversational implicature, namely particularized conversational implicature with 10 data, generalized conversational implicature with nine in which five data for scalar, and four data for indefinite. This research also discovered that particularized conversational implicature was the dominant type. The reason is that utterances in the movie needed a particular context to get the unstated meaning.

Keywords: conversational implicature, Gricean theory, implicature.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics phenomena can be found in any media, context, or condition. The pragmatics phenomenon can be discovered not just in the utterances of speakers and interlocutors in oral communication. Written communication also shows utterances. The phenomenon develops as a result of speakers' and interlocutors' failures to interpret implied meaning. As a result, misunderstanding between the speakers and interlocutors happens in communication.

The researchers of this present research found the phenomenon in

news entitled "Indonesia wages war against coronavirus misinformation as hoaxes spread online" published on May 8th, 2020. It was found in the utterance "**drinking boiled garlic water can cure the coronavirus** (Simanjuntak, T. 2020)". The newspaper's author confirmed that corona virus could be healed by drinking cooked garlic water. The expert established that this option was incorrect. As the remark coronavirus misinformation as hoaxes or untruthful, the sentence violates the quality maxim of being truthful about information. The sickness caused by the Corona virus, on the other hand, cannot be healed by garlic water.

Aside from newspaper, movie is one of the media that present utterances. American action and comedy movie entitled "Central Intelligence" also have the phenomena of conversational implicature.

Maggie : "Do you wanna move tables? I know this kind of sucks."
Calvin : "**No, no. It doesn't suck.**"

Maggie requested Calvin to move their table away from Calvin's pals. Calvin turned it down. Calvin's responses were illustrative ways of observing the relational maxim. He responded Maggie's question about whether or not the table sucked. "Do you want to shift tables?" was the maxim observed. Maggie's utterances prompted Calvin to change their table. Central Intelligence (movie) encountered this conversational implicature type. It was a generalized implicature. As said by Grice (as cited in Huang, 2015), an implicature that is inferable without referring to a specific context is a generalized implicature.

Research of conversational implicature theorized by Grice (1975) had been done by lots of researchers. Martini (2018)'s study discussed conversational implicature done in the utterances of Indonesian students of English Education Department in University of Kuningan. The discussion was in accordance with the problem that was not said informatively and it provided less or too much information as required.

Kurniasari (2018) investigated the use of conversational implicature in reference to humor in "How to Train Your Dragon" movie. The data were utterances in the movie which were examined by applying Grice's theory. The results are particularized conversational implicature was discovered as the most common type. In addition, aggressive humor became the most dominant type of humor produced by the characters.

The previous and present research used the theory of Grice (1975). The researchers used the theory to identify the types of conversational implicature in the data source. The differences were in the data source because this present research used the "Central Intelligence" movie. Therefore, this research aimed at finding out the conversation implicature types in "Central Intelligence" movie.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Conversational Implicature

The conversational implicature is pragmatics topic that relates to meaning revealed through context (Yule, 2017). It mentions that every utterance involves meaning that is intended by a speaker and it is the contradiction to the truth. Anything

implied implies that the implicature is utilized to describe what the speaker will understand, suggest, or intend that is distinct from is stated. (Bauer, 2012) clarified that conversational implicature is defined as the implication to representations of what is implicated that principally presents. A speaker suggests, and the person receiving the information summarizes. The recipient may or may not be successful in recovering the connotations of the dialogue desired as inference by the speaker.

2.1 Conversational Implicature Types

As claimed by Grice (1975), two types of conversational implicature are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. The generalized conversational implicature is specifically classified into two different types as follows.

A. **Generalized Conversational Implicature**

As emphasized by Grice (as cited in Huang, 2014), generalized conversational implicature refers to the implicature that presents without requiring any certain contextual conditions.

1. Scalar Implicature

This is the type that its inference is done by reference to a scale value that the speaker has chosen (Yule, 1996). The choice of the speaker implicates "values" or the amount of something (determiner) as the things to determine the generalized conversational implicature.

A : "How did yesterday's guest lecture go?"

B : "**Some of the faculty left before it ended.**" **(Not many/ most/ all of the faculty left before the lecture ended)** (Huang, 2014)"

2. Indefinite Implicature

This type is known as the use of indefinite article to show the relation that includes a thing and a subject. (Huang, 2014).

"A car runs over John's foot." **(Not John's car or the speaker's car)** (Huang, 2014).

B. **Particularized Conversational Implicature**

Particularized conversational implicature refers to conversational implicatures that develop as a result of specific contextual situations (Grice as cited in Huang, 2014).

A : "Ah! Nice of you to join the party. I thought you'd been carried off"

B : "Who me? Nah, come on! I'm way too muscular for their taste..."(Kurniasari, 2018).

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This present research is descriptive qualitative research. The data are in the form of words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs. Qualtative research does not involve symbols and numbers (Creswell, 2003). The researchers collected the data by taking observational and non- participatory method by Sudaryanto as cited in Agsa and Ambalegin (2020). There were some data collection steps. First, the movie's utterances were transcribed into ke script. The data is then obtained by matching the utterances that show the phenomena of conversational implicature. Lastly, the data were

highlighted for analysis based on theory.

Data analysis were done by the researchers through pragmatic identity method by Sudaryanto (2015). The method that the researchers used was competence in equalizing technique to equalize the data. The researchers took some steps to analyze data. First, the researchers discussed the theory that was employed in data collection, namely watching conversational implicature types. Second, the researchers started to quote utterances from the movie. The utterances were then evaluated using the theory from Grice. Finally, the researchers began to link the data based on the theory employed in this research.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION
4.1 Result

This research found out there were 19 data of conversational implicature in the data source. From all data, 10 data appeared in the particularized conversation implicature and nine were found in generalized conversational implicature. The total data is as follows.

Table 1. Conversational Implicature in "Central Intelligence" movie

No.	Types	Frequency
1.	Particularized conversational implicature	10
2.	Generalized conversational implicature	9
	otal data	19

4.2 Discussion
Data 1

Calvin : "Hey, if I wanted to get one of those ice teas but I want most of it to be bourbon...?"
Maggie : "Okay. How about we change the topic to something a **little** more fun?"
Calvin : "Anything else, please."

In 00:07:50-00:07:51, Maggie (the interlocutor) came up with the concept of implicature. It displayed the thing (from the inquiry "what"), but it also displayed the agreement (okay). They failed to recognize the true significance of Calvin's query (the speaker). The answer revealed the interlocutor's meaning. His utterance arose without the need for contextual circumstances. Therefore, it is a **generalized conversational implicature**.

Data 2

Robbie : "I mean, anybody can do it, right?"
Calvin : "Yeah. You know, I've gotten into hot yoga. I started doing **some** sessions."

During 00:15:27-00:15:31, a conversational implicature was formed by Calvin (the interlocutor). "Yeah" was the response of the interlocutor to the tag question (right?). However, the reason for the response implied the use of conversational implicature. The interlocutor's utterance did not include the context of the conversation. Therefore, it presents the use of **generalized conversational implicature**.

Data 3

Waiteress : "Aw. You're so sweet. I think unicorns are sexy, too. Is it true?"

Calvin : "That must happen to you all the time, right?"

Robbie : "I mean, **all** that meaningless sex is just there"

In 00:16:11-00:16:12, conversational implicature was formed by Robbie (the interlocutor). The response was expressing agreement or disagreement with the question, but it also expressed the interlocutor's point of view (I mean). The interlocutor's response did not correspond to the speaker's inquiry. The interlocutor's remark arose without the necessity for any specific contextual factors. As a result, it is a generalized conversational implicature.

Data 4

Robbie : "I've got the login info, if you wanna crack open your computer, can we do this?"

Calvin : "I mean, the logs are all crazy, too. You have China, Syria, Iran. This is **an** auction site…"

During 00:30:27-00:30:29, the conversational implicature was uttered by Calvin (the interlocutor). The interlocutor failed to recognize the true meaning of Robbie's query (the speaker). The interlocutor's response demonstrated the ability to do something (can), but the response also demonstrated the interlocutor's opinion (I mean). The meaning was implied by the speaker's reaction. The interlocutor's utterance was demonstrated without the need for

special contextual conditions. Accordingly, it implies that the interlocutor uttered **generalized conversational implicature**.

Data 5

Calvin : "It's my house. Is something going on? What are you doing, dude?"

Robbie : "…a chain reaction of geopolitical events that **most** of our predictive models place…"

In 00:34:01-00:34:05 of the movie, the conversational implicature was formed by Robbie (the interlocutor). The interlocutor failed to recognize the true significance of Calvin's inquiry (the speaker). The interlocutor's reaction demonstrated the activity being performed, but it also showed the interlocutor's unwillingness to answer. The interlocutor's speech originated without the need for any specific surrounding factors. Therefore, it is a **generalized conversational implicature.**

Data 6

Calvin : "Oh, my… Dr. Dan, I had nothing to do with this."

Robbie : "**He's fine. I'll get you some water in a little bit."**

In 01:01:22-01:01:23. Robbie (the interlocutor). started the conversational implicatureCalvin (the Speaker) expressed his uneasiness by remarking on his blank thought. In response, the interlocutor informed him about the therapist's situation (Dr. Dan). The conversational implicature varies greatly depending on the

context. According to the interlocutor, the guy (Dr. Dan) was also present in the conversation. Based on the explanation, it mentions that the interlocutor presented the phenomenon of **particularized conversational implicature**.

Data 7
Calvin : "Are they coming?"
Pamela : **"It's coming."**

In 01:04:06-01:04:07, the implicature was said by Pamela (the interlocutor). The interlocutor's response indicated agreement or disagreement, but it only revealed the positive statement and did not include the plural form of the subject or the query. The conversational implicature is very dependent on the context. The speaker was notified about her visit by the interlocutor. For this reason, it implies that the interlocutor did the phenomenon of **particularized conversational implicature**.

Data 8
Calvin : "Everything's good?"
Trevor : "Men, a **few** years ago…"

During 01:04:46-01:04:47, Trevor (the interlocutor) formed the conversational implicature. The interlocutor did not observe the real meaning of Calvin's question. Although the interlocutor's reaction was inquiring about the interlocutor's current status, the response revealed his past. The interlocutor's speech originated without the need for any specific surrounding factors. Therefore, it describes the use of **generalized conversational implicature.**

Data 9

Robbie : "I should've believed you, I should've trusted you, and why you called police?"
Calvin : **"I'm sorry for that."**

This conversation was found in 01:13:55-01:13:57. The conversational implicature was created by Calvin (the interlocutor). Robbie (the speaker) expressed his disappointment in being able to believe and trust the interlocutor. In response, the interlocutor apologized to the speaker. The conversational implicature is very dependent on the circumstance. The interlocutor knew what would be done before the police arrested the interlocutor. For this reason, it indicates that the speaker showed **particularized conversational implicature**.

Data 10
Calvin : "Bob, don't do that. Stop it. Stop it, you don't scare?"
Robbie : **"You're getting good at this, man."**

In 01:17:53-01:17:55, the conversational implicature was formed by Robbie (the interlocutor). Calvin (the speaker) demonstrated his concern by requesting the agreement of the interlocutor. The interlocutor answered by expressing how the speaker felt. The conversational implicature is very dependent on the circumstance. Before embarking on a military strategy, the interlocutor had been terrified of heights. Thus, this is the type of **particularized conversational implicature.**

Data 11

Robbie : "How many mistakes in your life?"

Calvin : "The one thing I wish I hadn't done is not get in **a** plane with a guy who didn't check the goddamned fuel!"

During 01:22:13-01:22:16, the utterance above has the inclusion of conversation implicature. It was done by Calvin (the interlocutor). The response actually offered a description of the interlocutor's failures, but it also highlighted the interlocutor's experience with a military plan that he would not accomplish. The meaning was hidden by the speaker's reaction. The interlocutor failed to recognize the true meaning of Robbie's query (the speaker). The interlocutor's utterance demonstrated without the need for special contextual conditions. Hence, it shows there has **generalized conversational implicature** in the interlocutor's utterance.

Data 12

Robbie : "I think we run out of gas. Can you use this gas?"

Calvin : "**Oh, my God! I think we're gonna die!**"

In 01:22:24-01:22:27, the conversational implicature was produced by Calvin (the interlocutor). Robbie (the speaker) inquired about the interlocutor's ability to do things (can). The interlocutor expressed his surprise. The conversational implicature is very dependent on the circumstance. They were on the military plan, according to the statement. Therefore, this shows the phenomenon of **particularized conversational implicature**.

Data 13

Phil : "You're early. Can I take my money?"

Robbie : "**So are you, you look this car.**"

During 01:26:05-01:26:06, Robbie (the interlocutor) said the conversational implicature. Phil (the speaker) gave a request, thus a particular action could be done. The interlocutor commented on the statement but not on the question. The conversational implicature is very dependent on the circumstance. Based on the context of the conversation, the interlocutor and speaker arrived 15 minutes early. Accordingly, this utterance appears to have a **particularized conversational implicature**.

Data 14

Calvin : "You don't seriously believe this guy, do you?"

Robbie : "**You wanna get behind me, Jet.**"

In 01:31:49-01:31:52, Robbie (the interlocutor) said an implicature during the conversation. The response was indicating agreement or disagreement with the tag question. However, it demonstrated the opposite side of the speaker's viewpoint. The conversational implicature is very dependent on the circumstance. Calvin as the speaker had reservations regarding the individual. As a result, this utterance has **particularized conversational implicature**.

Data 15

Robbie   : "Sorry, Jet. Come here, Jet, will we back after this?"

Calvin   : "That was **a** trachea."

In 01:35:42-01:35:43, the conversational implicature was created by Calvin (the interlocutor). The meaning was implied by the speaker's reaction. The interlocutor's response expressed agreement and disagreement, but it also conveyed a surprising comment. The interlocutor failed to recognize the true meaning of Robbie's question (the speaker). The interlocutor's utterance showed without the need for special contextual conditions. As a result, it implies the use **of generalized conversational implicature** was presented in the utterance.

5. CONCLUSION

Conversational implicature has two types. Many responses are implied in the utterance. There is conversational implicature that requires context which is generalized conversational implicature and does not need context which is particularized conversational implicature. In addition, the most used conversational implicature types are particularized conversational implicature. It proved that many utterances required specific context to understand the meaning of the speaker. Conversational implicature will not be successful if there has no response provided by an interlocutor.

REFERENCES

Agsa, J., & Ambalegin, A. (2020). The form of slang terms in the "Kingsman: the Golden Circle" movie. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 3(2), 400-413. DOI : https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v3i2.1260.

Anggun. (2012, December 12). Mishal Husain Meets Anggun - BBC World News. Retrieved from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DSDrRjlD14g

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, MA: Pearson

Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. New York: Academic Press

Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Kurniasari, W. (2018). A pragmatic analysis of conversational implicature of humor practices in How to Train Your Dragon. *English Language and Literature Journal, 7*(4), 389-397. http://journal.student.uny.ac.id/ojs/index.php/quill/article/view/14544/14117

LoCastro, V. (2012). *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Martini, A. (2018). Conversational implicature of Indonesian students in daily communication. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 4*(1), 93-100. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v4i1.889

Pebriantika, E. (2017). Conversational implicature and politeness principles in Sumbawanese daily conversations. *Jurnal Kependidikan,*

16(2), 129-134. https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v3i1.468

Rahayu, E. S., & Safnil. (2016). Types of implicature in informal conversations used by the English education study program students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature, 1*(1), 65-83. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v1i1.3942

Simanjuntak, D., S., R. (2017). Analisis implikatur wacana percakapan dalam novel "Masih ada hari esok karya Daniel Steel". *Jurnal Basis Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris, 4*(2), 1-10. http://ejournal.upbatam.ac.id/index.php/basis/article/view/437

Simanjuntak, T. 2020. (2020). Drinking boiled garlic water can cure the coronavirus. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from: https:// https://www.thejakartapost.com /life/2020/05/08/dringking-boiled-garlic-water-can-cure-the-coronavirus-.html

Sudaryanto (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Sanata Dharma University Press.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. (2017). *The study of language*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.