

## The Types of Conversational Implicature in “Gifted” Movie

Nurhidayah<sup>1\*</sup>, Abdul Hakim Yassi<sup>1</sup>, Sukmawaty<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

\*Correspondence: [Nayahnurhidayah4@gmail.com](mailto:Nayahnurhidayah4@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*This study is a pragmatic context of conversational implicature. It aimed to identify the types of conversational implicature and the non-observance maxim of cooperative principles expressed by the characters in a movie entitled Gifted. The objectives of the research are to identify the types of conversational implicature by the characters in the movie. This research applied a mixed method (descriptive qualitative method and quantitative method) to analyze the data. The data were in the form of utterances in the movie which were organized and analyzed based on Grice’s theory of conversational implicature. The findings of this research are explained as follows: particularized conversational implicature is found as the most dominant type of conversational implicature performed by the characters in the movie since most of the implied meanings needed background knowledge.*

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Published December 10<sup>th</sup> 2021



### KEYWORDS

Conversation, Implicature, Movie, Pragmatics, Communication, Meaning

### ARTICLE LICENCE

© 2021 Universitas Hasanuddin  
Under the license CC BY-SA  
4.0



## 1. Introduction

Language is a means of communication. It is a medium for everyone to exchange information, to express idea, and thought. Goldstein (2008:294) stated that the way people communicate using sounds or symbols that makes them able to express their feelings, thoughts, ideas, and experiences is called language. Communication is the main component to build a relationship. People use communication in a conversation to generate various meaning (Suherman, 2018). When people are engaging in talk, they should consider the meaning employed by the speakers. Since communication using language has many various meanings in different contexts, it may lead to multiple interpretations. Thus, a listener or hearer should consider the implied meaning in a context which employed by the speaker. In other words, understanding the implied meaning is very important to make the conversation going well (Weda, et al., 2021; Bachriani, et al., 2018).

Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that focuses on the aspects of meaning and language uses which depend on the speaker, the addressee, and the context of utterance. Implicature is the intention of speaker which is far richer than what he or she directly said (Horn, 2006:3). Pragmatics is the study about the speaker meaning. In pragmatics, students learn how to understand the speaker’s meaning by the utterance. According to Fromkin, et al. (2003) pragmatics is concerned with the interpretation of linguistic meaning in context”. Pragmatics also overwhelms the implicit meaning called implicature.

The implied meaning in a conversation is also called conversational implicature. The conversational implicature is an implicative statement, when a speaker means differently from what the speaker says in a conversation. Davis (2007: 9) stated that conversational implicatures occur when the speaker’s meaning isn’t part of the literal content of the utterances. It might just add something else in the conversation. Conversational implicature comes in two ways: generalized conversational implicature (GCI) which occurs without reference or there is no special background knowledge is required in the context to determine the additional conveyed meaning (Yule, 1996:41), and particularized conversational implicature (PCI) which requires inferences or special background knowledge to understand the context (Yule, 1996:42).

The researcher makes use the conversation from the movie because the writer finds some implicit meaning in utterances that are used by the characters. This movie tells about a very cute young girl enrolling in first grade, much against her will, because as it happens she’s an utter math whiz who prefers being home-schooled by her uncle Frank.

Ensuing complications include a grandmother who feels the prodigy will be better off somewhere outside of Frank's grungy Florida shack. The characters use many implicit utterances which can be analyzed by using Conversational Implicature.

There are some previous studies done by applying this theory as a tool for analyzing the data. They are Zahrul Fauzi Makin (2015), Muhammad Vikry (2014), Tuy Eni Wijayanti (2013), Asrorul Nur Muvinda (2015). Meanwhile the difference of those researches above with this research is movie genre (Astiantih, et al., 2017). So, the target analysis is different. This analysis focuses on each conversation in the characters. Then, this research has some research question to get result of implicature that it also different with them. Among of them, first, types of conversational implicature.

## **2. About 'Gifted' Movie**

Gifted is a 2017 American film directed by March Webb and written by Tom Flynn. This film is supported by several famous stars such as Chris Evans, Mckenna Grace, Lindsay Duncan, Jenny Slate, and Octavia Spencer. This film tells the story of a girl named Mary who is known to be 'intellectually 'gifted' at the age of 7 years. Mary in this film becomes a guardianship struggle between her uncle Frank and her grandmother named Evelyn.

After its completion, for approximately two years, the film was then released on April 12, 2017 by Fox Searchlight Pictures and proved to have grossed \$42 million after being screened worldwide. Production on the film began in October 2015 in Savannah and Tybee Island, both in the city of Georgia.

This film stars as many as eight people each Chris Evans as Frank Adler, Mckenna Grace as Mary Adler, Lindsay Duncan as Evelyn Adler, Jenny Slate as Bonnie Stevenson, Octavia Spencer as Roberta Taylor, Julie Ann Emery as Pat Golding, Jona Xiao as Lijuan, and Keir O'Donnell as Bradley Pollard. The film ends with Mary back in Frank's custody, returning to public school and socializing with kids her age while taking college-level courses.

## **3. Objectives of Study**

The objectives of this study are formulated as follows; 1) to identify the types of conversational implicature and the non-observance maxim of cooperative principles expressed by the characters in the movie entitled 'Gifted', and 2) to identify the types of conversational implicature used by the characters in the movie.

## **4. Method**

This research applied the descriptive qualitative method to analyze the data. The descriptive qualitative method is emphasized on the phenomenon of the language use in its context by interpreting the data. Additionally, Neuman (2014) argued that qualitative approach looks at interpretation or the creation of meaning in specific setting. Therefore, this approach presented rich and in-depth understanding in conversational implicature 'Gifted' movie. The instrument of the research was the researcher herself including the theoretical knowledge. The researcher plays as the designer, the collector, the analyst, the interpreter, and the reporter of the data finding (Moleong, 2010; Rahman, 2019).

This research made use of spoken data in the form of sentences performed by the characters in the movie which contains types of conversational implicature. The context is the dialogues of the characters in the movie. The source of the data was a movie entitled Gifted.

'Gifted' is an American drama film written by Tom Flynn. This Movie was officially out in 2017. Gifted is about the plot follows an intellectually gifted seven-year-old who becomes the subject of a custody battle between her maternal uncle and maternal grandmother. The researcher analyses the conversations in the script by using pragmatics tool of Grice conversational implicature.

After classifying the utterances as the research data, writer interpreted the data in the form of conversational implicature employed by the characters found in the movie. The selected data were analyzed based on Miles and Huberman's theory (1994) in three major phases which are data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing and verification. Reducing the data, the researcher organized the conversation in the movie and the script based on Grice's theory about implicatures. The researchers selected, simplified and transformed the data appearing in the movie script to address the issue. The selected data were assembled to be analyzed one by one in the discussion of conversational implicatures from the characters' utterances. The researchers then concluded which types of conversational implicatures mostly found in the characters in 'Gifted' Movie. At the verification stage, the data were revisited and cross-checked before generating the conclusion.

## 5. Result and Discussion

According to the data, the most dominant conversational implicature was particularized conversational implicature. Besides, the second rank was generalized conversational implicature which the occuracy. In reference to the data analysis, particularized conversational implicature becomes the dominant that means background knowledge of the movie had important role regarding to the characters' conversation. The situation makes the characters employed particularized conversational implicature which reflected their condition. The example of particularized conversational implicature is shown below;

### 5.1 Particularized Implicature Gifted (PIG)

#### ➤ Datum PIG 1

Bonnie	:	And what about his father?
Frank:	:	Diane is very socially awkward. He doesn't date enough to tell the difference between a good guy and a bad guy.

The utterance "Diane is very socially awkward" is the particularized conversational implicature because the utterance works out of the context. When Bonnie said that and what about his father? But Frank gave the respond about has implicit with what was conveyed in the messages. Moreover, the utterance "He doesn't date enough to tell the difference between a good guy and a bad guy" means Mary's father was irresponsible and left Diane.

#### ➤ Datum PIG 2

Evelyn	:	This Mosquito Farm is your conscious choice?
Frank:	:	I can take you to the airport

Frank's response his mother that he flouts maxim of relation since his information is less information and unclearly. The meaning Frank meant was categorized as conversation implicature because the implied meaning requires background knowledge about where frank lives are unfit for habitation, so frank doesn't want his mother to talk about where he lives

#### ➤ Datum PIG 3

Evelyn	:	Mary, you know it's not true why don't you say something?
Mary	:	I can take you to the airport

The utterance "Frank said I shouldn't criticize parents" is the particularized conversational implicature because the utterance works out of the context. When Evelyn said that you know it's not true why don't you say something? But Mary gave the respond about has implicit with what was conveyed in the messages. Moreover, the utterance "Mary doesn't want her grandmother's friend to be offended because a mathematician has made the wrong math question"

#### ➤ Datum PIG 4

Mary	:	I think if you know Frank, you don't bother us. He can be really annoying, but he's a good person.
Pat Golding	:	Why do you say that?
Mary	:	He wanted me before I was smart.

The dialogue above exemplifies that Mary's response is flouting maxim of relation as it does not relate with pat Golding request. This context needs some background knowledge since Mary knows Mary knows that her grandmother wants to take care of her and take advantage of her genius. Therefore, his response is considered as particularized conversational implicature.

### 5.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature (PCI)

#### ➤ Datum PCI 1

Frank	:	Want to come to my house first?
Evelyn	:	Cat.

From the conversation above, the utterance of Evelyn "cat" was an evidence of a particularized implicature. He was clearly being stubborn by flouting the maxim of quantity. She meant that Evelyn is allergic to Mary's cat so she doesn't come into Fred's house. Evelyn bluntly did not give the information as it is required. It is a particularized implicature because

the addressee needs to generate the context and what Evelyn actually talked about. This is in line with Pop (2010) argument that flouting a maxim is often counting on contextual assumptions of the listener.

➤ **Datum PCI 2**

Pat Golding	:	Roberta is an adult?
Mary	:	People my age are boring. Roberta is cool.

From the conversation above, the utterance of the Mary was demonstrating a conversational implicature. She did not perceive the cooperative principle as he flouted the maxim of relation by not giving relevant information. To understand what he meant, it needs to be identified the context and it must be particularized implicature. She meant that she doesn't have any friends at all. This example exemplified the use of pragmatic reasoning to draw listeners' attention in flouting maxim of relation, as explained by Westera (2013).

➤ **Datum PCI 3**

Mary	:	What are we doing here?
Frank	:	Waiting
Roberta	:	We can see that! Why?
Frank	:	Because I said so.

From Frank's utterance of "Because I said so", It is rising the Particularized implicature as needed to generate the context that he flouted the maxim of quantity. He meant that I wanted to show Mary the moment people were waiting for a baby to be born. So that Mary understands that's how she was born and her presence is so precious. In this case, Alduais (2012) believed that in conversational implication, flouting the maxims clearly pointed to the fact that what was said was not what was meant.

➤ **Datum PCI 4**

Frank	:	Diane told me very clearly that I publish it only after death
Evelyn	:	She died 6 years ago.
Frank	:	It's not her death that she's talking about.

From the conversation above, the utterance of Frank "It's not her death that she's talking about" was an evidence of a particularized implicature. He was clearly being stubborn by flouting the maxim of quantity. He meant that the theory will be published when Evelyn passed away. Frank bluntly did not give the information as it is required. It is a particularized implicature because having needed to generate the context and what Evelyn actually talked about. This is in line with Pop (2010) argument that flouting a maxim is often counting on contextual assumptions of the listener.

**5.3 Generalized Implicature the 'Gifted' Movie (GIGM)**

➤ **Datum GIGM 1**

Mary	:	Would my mother want me to go to school there?
Frank	:	I don't know, but I'm sure he would want you to have friends.

The conversation between Mary and Frank can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because it does not have special background knowledge about its context. Mary asked "Would my mother want me to go to school there?" Frank said that I don't know, but I'm sure he would want you to have friends. This has a flouted the maxim of quantity because Frank gives more information than it is required.

➤ **Datum GIGM 2**

Pat Golding	:	Do you know why you're here?, has anyone ever told you about what ?
Mary	:	My grandma wants me to live with her and I want to live with Frank.

The conversation between Pat Golding can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because it does not have special background knowledge about its context. Mary asked "Do you know why you're here?" Mary said "My grandma wants me to live with her and I want to live with Frank". This has a flouted the maxim of quantity because Mary gives more information than it is required.

➤ **Datum GIGM 3**

Mary	:	Why don't we just call Evelyn and tell me I don't want to do this?
		Because like I said. It wasn't Evelyn who ordered this but the court. So
Frank	:	what you're saying is really exactly right. The sooner we answer this question the sooner we can go home.

Frank's response can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because he disobeyed the maxim of quantity. Frank bluntly gives a long response to Mary where he explained because like I said. It wasn't Evelyn who ordered this but the court. So what you're saying is really exactly right. The sooner answering this question the sooner getting go home. Therefore, his utterance has an implied meaning that does not need any background knowledge.

➤ **Datum GIGM 4**

Mary	:	Sorry what kind of school is this?
Bonnie	:	This is a school where students don't talk before being allowed.

Bonnie's response can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because he disobeyed the maxim of manner—his response is unclearly and unreasonably. She implied this is a formal school where students must obey the teacher's rules. Therefore, his utterance has an implied meaning that does not need any background knowledge.

**5.4 Generalized Implicature Gifted (GIG)**

➤ **Datum GIG 1**

Mary	:	Who will throw the ping pong ball?
Frank	:	Fred will be fine don't argue anymore okay

Frank's response can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because less information. He flouted the maxim of quantity as he did not answer since Mary would answer directly to the point. Therefore, his utterance has an implied meaning that does not need any background knowledge because frank gives more information than it is required.

➤ **Datum GIG 2**

Mary	:	Diane doesn't always imagine things carefully
Frank	:	One of the smartest people in the world. good luck with that reason.

The implicature occurred when Evelyn statement about Diane doesn't always imagine things carefully, and then frank replied "One of the smartest people in the world". Good luck with that reason which means that even though Diane is a reckless person, it's undeniable that she's a genius, so Fred is sure Diane won't mind if Fred takes care of Mary. To calculate the additional meaning of the implicature, frank does not require any special knowledge to understand its implicature. Thus, it is classified into Generalized Conversational Implicature.

**5.6 Generalized Conversational Implicature (GCI)**

➤ **Datum GCI 1**

Greg	:	Mrs. Adler, who is Paul Riva?
Evelyn	:	He is a boy in our neighborhood.

Evelyn's utterance of "He is a boy in our neighborhood" was clearly uncooperative. She flouted the maxim of quantity as she did not answer Greg as she would answer directly to the point. Without having to generate the context of the conversation above, the researcher understands the actual meaning of Evelyn's utterance that Paul Riva is just a neighbor trying to get Diane away. So, it is definitely a generalized implicature.

**Datum GCI 1**

Greg	:	What color did Diane's dress wear to the high school dance?
Evelyn	:	Diane doesn't go to the dance because she doesn't go to high school there's no dance.

Frank's response can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because less information. She flouted the maxim of quantity because Evelyn gives more information than it is required. She meant that Diane didn't go

to school and never went to dances. Diane prefers to spend her time studying math. Therefore, his utterance has an implied meaning that does not need any background knowledge.

➤ **Datum GCI 2**

Frank	:	What are you doing here?
Evelyn	:	You think I have no right to meet my granddaughter.

Evelyn's response can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because less information. She flouted the maxim of quantity because Evelyn gives more information than it is required. Evelyn meant she is a grandmother of Mary and she deserves to visit her granddaughter. Therefore, his utterance has an implied meaning that does not need any background knowledge.

➤ **Datum GCI 3**

Evelyn	:	I sthink Diane don't want me to have it.
Frank	:	Diane doesn't always see things carefully.

From the conversation above, Frank's utterance is an implicature. He was uncooperative by flouting a maxim of relation. As Evelyn said that I think Diane don't want me to have it, Frank gave a statement which did not explicitly relate to what Evelyn talked about. But she knew that from his utterance, Frank could assume what she meant. He meant that frank means Diane's choice is not right. Alduais (2012) suggested that this type of generalized implicature was flouting the maxim of relation by deliberately adjust the main topic of conversation.

➤ **Datum GCI 4**

Mary	:	You drive like an old woman!
Frank	:	This is Florida. I blend in.

Frank's statement "This is Florida. I blend in" represented a generalized implicature that does not need any specific context to generate the meaning. Yet, he clearly violated the maxim of manner by giving an ambiguous statement. The finding typified the use of flouting maxim to avoid judgment and prompt personal understanding from the listener toward the statement (Kondowe et al., 2014).

➤ **Datum GCI 5**

Frank	:	The student you dislike the most? Why?
Bonnie	:	Oh! No! I love all my students.

From the conversation above, Bonnie utters, "Oh! No! I love all my students" was an evidence of a particularized implicature. It is a flouting the maxim of quantity. Bonnie bluntly did not give the information as it is required. It is a particularized implicature because it needs to be generated the context and what Balian actually talked about. This is in line with Pop (2010) argument that flouting a maxim is often counting on contextual assumptions of the listener.

## 5. Conclusion

There are two types of conversational implicature found in 'Gifted' movie script. They are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicature is the most dominant of conversational implicature employed by the characters in the movie. It indicates that the characters in the movie tend to use some background knowledge in conversations since the characters have known each other well. Furthermore, the findings revealed that most of maxim was flouting the maxim of quantity. It happened because many of the characters in the movie gave the information as not it was required but they knew the audience or the hearer understand what they meant, so most of them flouted the maxim of quantity. Based on the explanation above, the most noticeable finding was the mounting number of particularized implicature because the flouting maxim of quantity. It showed that the characters of the movie gave less or more information than it was required

## References

- Alduais, A.M.S. (2012). Conversational Implicature (flouting the Maxims): Applying Conversational Maxims on Examples Taken from Non-Standard Arabic Language, Yemeni Dialect, an Idiolect Spoken at Ibb City. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 3(2), 376–387.
- Astiantih, S., Rahman, F., & Makka, M. (2017). From Narrative Slave to Movie: Adaptation Theory. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR)*, 3(6), 659-663.
- Bachriani, B., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2018). A Comparative Study of Euphemism in English and Buginese: Pragmatic Stylistics Contexts. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 1(4), 429-440.
- Davis, Wayne. (2007). *Implicature: Intention, Convention, and the Principle of failure of Gricean theory*. Brown University
- Fauzi, Z.M. (2015). "The Analysis of Conversational Implicature and Its Violation Maxim in the Movie *Grownups 2 2013*". Yogyakarta: Universitas Islam Sunan Kalijaga
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2003). An Introduction to Language seventh edition. Boston: Michael Rosenberg. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119990413.ch1>
- Goldstein, E.B. (2008). *Cognitive Psychology: Connecting Mind, Research, and Everyday Experience*, 3rd edition. Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Horn, Laurence. (2006). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Lexy, J.M. (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Edisi Revisi)*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Muvida, A.N. (2015). "Conversational Implicature that is used by Three Main Characters in *Hotel Transylvania Movie*". Yogyakarta: Universitas Islam Sunan Kalijaga.
- Neuman, W. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches Seventh Edition*. Assex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Pop, A. (2010). Implicatures Derived through Maxim Flouting in Print Advertising. *A Contrastive Empirical Approach*. Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics, 33.
- Rahman, F., & Weda, S. (2019). Linguistic deviation and the rhetoric figures in Shakespeare's selected plays. *XLanguage" European Scientific Language Journal"*, 12(1), 37-52.
- Suherman, L. A. (2018). The Analysis of Metaphorical Domain on English "Stab Verb" in Corpora. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 1(1), 52-58.
- Tuy, E.W. (2013). "Conversational Implicature Found in Movie *Abraham Lincoln: Vampire Hunter*". Jawa Tengah: Universitas Muria Kudus.
- Vikry, Muhammad. (2014). "An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in *Iron Man 3*". Jakarta: Universitas Islam Negri.
- Weda, S., Atmowardoyo, H., Rahman, F., Said, M. M., & Sakti, A. E. F. (2021). Factors Affecting Students' Willingness to Communicate in EFL Classroom at Higher Institution in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 719-734
- Westera, M. (2013). *Attention, I'm violating a maxim! A unifying account of the final rise*. Institute for Logic, Language and Computation. University of Amsterdam
- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.