

IMPLICATURE IN *THE PROPOSAL* MOVIE

Aprillia Miftaqul Wijiningtias, M Bahri Arifin, Ririn Setyowati

English Department, Faculty of Cultural Sciences

Mulawarman University

Email: w.aprillia28@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this research were to find out all utterances by the main characters Margaret Tate and Andrew Paxton that contains implicature and its context in *The Proposal* movie. This research was categorized as qualitative research and used content analysis approach. The researcher used *The Proposal* (2006) movie as the source of data. The data were taken from the utterances between the main characters Margaret Tate and Andrew Paxton that contained implicature based on implicature theory by Grice and its context used context theory by Hymes. The findings reveal that the researcher got 23 data of conversational implicature and 14 data of conventional implicature. 15 data from 23 data of conversational implicature are done by Andrew. From the data that the researcher found, component of the context that prominent between Andrew and Margaret was participants. From 15 data of conversational implicature done by Andrew, the contexts of participant are vertical dimension. Vertical dimension is a component that relates to social factors such as age or social status. The seven data of this research were vertical dimension of social status between Margaret as a boss and Andrew as her assistant. Then, the other eight data were social status of both of Margaret and Andrew as a fake lover. The context of participant in this research became the benchmark for the researcher to find the implied meaning.

Keywords: implicature, conventional implicature, conversational implicature, maxim, *The Proposal*

ABSTRAK

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menemukan semua percakapan yang dilakukan Margaret Tate dan Andrew Paxton sebagai pemeran utama dalam film *The Proposal* yang mengandung implikatur dan konteksnya. Penelitian ini dikategorikan sebagai penelitian kualitatif dan menggunakan pendekatan analisa konten. Peneliti menggunakan film *The Proposal* (2006) sebagai sumber data. Data didapatkan dari percakapan yang berlangsung antara Margaret Tate dan Andrew Paxton sebagai pemeran utama yang mengandung implikatur berdasarkan teori implikatur Grice dan konteks berdasarkan teori konteks Hymes. Hasil penelitian yang didapatkan oleh peneliti yaitu 23 data dari implikatur percakapan dan 14

data dari implikatur biasa. 15 data dari 23 data implikatur percakapan dilakukan oleh Andrew. Komponen konteks yang paling menonjol dari data yang ditemukan peneliti dalam percakapan antara Margaret dan Andrew adalah peserta percakapan. Dimensi vertikal dalam peserta percakapan adalah konteks yang ada dalam 15 data dari implikatur percakapan yang dilakukan oleh Andrew. Dimensi vertikal dalam peserta percakapan adalah komponen yang berhubungan dengan unsur sosial seperti umur atau status sosial seseorang. 7 dari 15 data yang dilakukan Andrew mengandung dimensi vertikal dari sosial status antara Margaret sebagai atasan dan Andrew sebagai sekretaris Margaret. Lalu, 8 data yang lain mengandung dimensi vertikal dari sosial status antara Margaret dan Andrew sebagai pasangan kekasih palsu. Peserta percakapan dalam komponen konteks dalam penelitian ini menjadi tolak ukur peneliti dalam menentukan implikasi dari implikatur yang dilakukan.

Kata Kunci: implikatur, implikatur percakapan, implikatur biasa, maxim, *The Proposal*

A. INTRODUCTION

According to Anderson in Miller, communication is a process to understand each other (2001). People might use a simple word, sentence, paragraph and so on in communication that makes it easy to understand. Using a simple word to communicate the conversation that has no implied meaning is simple and usually easy to understand. However, there are some people who deliver their mind implicitly. They imply what they said not because they want to hide their mind to the listener but, they make the listener understand there are the implied meanings behind their utterance. In this case, they use implicature to express their mind. Following to Levinson, implicature is the aspect of meaning that a speaker conveys, implies, or suggests without directly expressing (1981).

Based on Grice implicature is divided into two, they are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Based on Yule (1996) conventional implicature is an implicature that the implied meaning based on the special context in interpreting an utterance. However, conversational implicature is implicature that the implied meaning of the utterance connected with certain general features of discourse.

When we used implicature in our conversation, we must aware of the circumstances when we imply our words. Different situation has different context in conversation, so we must use our words wisely. We cannot imply our words carelessly. Spontaneously or not, some people use implicature when they are conversing. In this case the speaker and hearer will be cooperating or not. If the hearer understands with the implied meanings, the conversation will go through, but if the hearer does not understand what the speaker means, it will be a war of the conversation or the misunderstanding will be occurred in communication. On a small scale, misunderstanding will make someone angry or even in the worst case, fight with each other.

Grundy states in the case of implicature, context helps us to determine what is conveyed implicitly but not explicitly stated by the speaker (2000). Context in this study has a big role to determine the implied meaning of implicature. The researcher used context theory by Hymes which explains component of speech that influences the result of speech. The acronym of the eight component is SPEAKING; Setting, Participants, Ends, Act sequences, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms and Genres.

The purposes of this research were to find the implicature done by the main characters of The Proposal movie Margaret Tate and Andrew Paxton and its context. It was expected that this research can inspire another researcher to analyze other movie through the same theories used by the researcher. Hopefully, this research can be a reference for future researchers.

B. REVIEW OF RELATED STUDY

1. Implicature

According to Grice (1991), "what a speaker means by an utterance can be divided into what the speaker "says" and what the speaker thereby "implicates" (p.106). Hence, what the speakers say will be different with what they mean. Levinson also explains, implicature is the aspect of meaning that the speaker conveys, implies, or suggest without directly expressing (1996). Then, according to Yule, implicature is something must be more than just the word means (1996). According to Gazdar (1978), "an implicature is a proposition that is implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context even though that proposition is neither a part of nor an entailment of what was actually said" (p. 38). So, implicature is a way to imply what we would to say such as, implying "b" by saying "a".

Based on Grice implicature is divided into two; conventional implicature and conversational implicature.

a. Conversational Implicature

According to Grice, conversational implicature is an implicature that the implied meaning of the utterance is connected with certain general features of discourse (1991). Thus, conversational implicature is implicature that happens while we are communicating each other. Mey (2001) also explained, "conversational implicature concerns the way we understands an utterance in conversation in accordance with what we expect to hear" (p. 46).

Yule said that generalized conversational implicature is an implicature that happen when no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning (1996). It means that the implicature will be recognized even though both the speaker and hearer are not in the same knowledge.

Based on Yule, "particularized conversational implicature happens when the conversations take place in very specific context in which locally recognized inferences are assumed" (1996).

b. Conventional Implicature

Based on Yule (1996) conventional implicature is an implicature that does not occur in conversation, it based on the special context in interpreting an utterance. This implicature brings the additional meaning of the words that

contain conventional meaning is not depend on the meaning that brings by the conversation itself.

2. Cooperative Principle

Related to Grice (1975), the cooperative principle makes your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. Based on Grice's theory there are four principle of conversation called maxim.

Based on Grice in Yule, there are four kinds of Maxim

a. Maxim of Quantity

- Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of exchange).
- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

b. Maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true.

- Do not say what you believe to be false
- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

c. Maxim of Relevance

Be relevant.

d. Maxim of Manner

- Avoid obscurity of expression
- Avoid ambiguity
- Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
- Be orderly

3. Speech Acts

Yule explained on speech acts theory, there are three related acts that will consist when the action is performing when produce an utterance (1996). Austin also defined the speech acts in Cutting, speech acts is the action to say something (2002). There are three related acts; locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary act.

4. Context

Context is a part of communication that happens to be important when speaker and hearer have to know the context. Context helps the hearer to understand what the speaker mean. Dell Hymes (1974) showed there are some components that influence in code choice in a speech. Hymes called it component of speech and categorized it into eight and constructed the acronym, S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G.

5. Non-Verbal Communication

Calero (2005) said "whenever we perceive information that is not written or spoken, we comprehend something that is nonverbal" (p. 01). So, verbal communication is means what is said or written then, non-verbal communication is the unspoken or unwritten communication.

C. RESEARCH METHOD

1. Research Design

This research used qualitative method and content analysis approach as the research design. Based on Stren quoted by Straus and Corbin (1990), “qualitative research can be used to explore substantive areas about which little is known or about much to gain novel understanding “(p. 4). Straus and Corbin said that there are three major components of quality research. First component is the data which come from various sources; such as interviews, observation, documents, records, and films. Then the second component is the procedure that researcher uses to interpret and organize the data. The last component is the written and verbal report (1990).

To describe the data, the researcher used descriptive form. Ethridge explained that descriptive research may be characterized as simple the attempt to determine, describe or identify the data (cited in Dr. Raghu Korrapati, 2016). It can be said that descriptive studies are used to describe or identify a situation that exists or happens. Based on Frankell and Wellen (2007), content analysis is “the analysis of the usually, but not necessarily, written contents of a communication” such as textbooks, essays, newspapers, novels, articles, film’s scripts and pictures (p. 472). Thus, the researcher decided to use content analysis approach because, the researcher analyzed the data in the form of utterances in *The Proposal* movie script and also used descriptive study to describe the data.

2. Data and Data Source

The data of this study were the utterances of the main characters Margaret Tate and Andrew Paxton as the main characters in *The Proposal* movie that contained implicature and the context of implicature. The data source of this research was *The Proposal* movie script.

3. Data Collection

In collecting the data, there were several steps that the researcher did. First, the researcher watched *The Proposal* movie and read *The Proposal* movie script several times. Second, the researcher classified the data from the script which contained implicature and its context.

4. Data Analysis

According to Miles and Huberman, there are three main components in data analysis; data reduction, data display and drawing conclusion in data analysis (1994). In this case, the analysis process is described below.

In data reduction, the objective is to reduce the data without significant loss of information. The researcher selected the data that contained implicature then eliminated the data that did not contain the criteria of implicature. In this part, the researcher used coding to help the researcher categorized the data.

Coding is the process of adjusting the data for categories and marking similar passages of text with a code label so, that they can easily be retrieved. Coding the data makes easier to search the data and to make comparison that require further investigation. Code can be based on themes, topics, ideas, concepts, terms, phrases, and keywords (cited in Taylor & Gibbs, 2010). The researcher made keywords as the code in order to make the readers easier find the data as listed below.

Table 3.1

The Coding of Types of Implicature

No	The Types of Implicature in <i>The Proposal</i> Movie	Code
1.	Generalized Conversational Implicature	GCI
2.	Particularized Conversational Implicature	PCI
3.	Conventional Implicature	CI

In data display the researcher organized the data for the analysis in the narration form for the types of implicature and the context of implicature. In drawing conclusion, the researcher gave a conclusion based on the data displayed and after analyzed the data discussion.

5. Triangulation

Triangulation is a process to verify the validity by combining more than one approach and method in a research. According to Denzin in Rugg, Denzin divided triangulation into four types; data triangulation, investigator or researcher triangulation, theoretical triangulation and methodological triangulation. The first is data triangulation or a method that uses more than one data sources, including time, space and persons, in a study. Second is investigator triangulation or a method that use more than one investigator in a study. The third is theoretical triangulation or the using of more than one theory or hypothesis when examining a situation or phenomenon. Fourth is methodological triangulation or the use of more than one method to study a situation or phenomenon (2010).

In this research, the researcher used theoretical triangulation to interpret the data using Grice's implicature theory as the basic theory that later would be supported by Yule and Levinson.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Conversational Implicature

a. Generalized Conversational Implicature

00:17:02,488 - 00:17:52,904

Mr. Gilbertson : So, Andrew. You wanna... you want to talk to me?

Andrew : *(shake his head)*

Mr. Gilbertson : *(frowning his eyebrows)*No?

Andrew : *(nod his head)*

Mr. Gilbertson : *(frowning his eyebrows)*Yes?

Andrew : The truth is... Mr. Gilbertson, the truth is... Margaret and I... are just two people who weren't supposed to fall in love. But did. We couldn't tell anyone we work with because of my big promotion that I had coming up.

Mr. Gilbertson : Promotion?

Andrew : Yeah.

Mr. Gilbertson was Margaret's immigration lawyer. This conversation happened after Mr. Gilbertson talked about the punishment if Andrew commits fraud to avoid Margaret's deportation so, Mr. Gilbertson made sure the relationship between Andrew and Margaret. In this case, Andrew made Mr. Gilbertson confused with his silent and just shakes and nods his head. According to Cutting, to fulfill maxim of manner, the speaker should put information briefly and orderly therefore the speaker must avoid the obscure (2002). Andrew flouts maxim of manner because he wanted to make Mr. Gilbertson believed about what he said after his hesitant act. Then based on Calero, gestures are either used for purposes of emphasizing spoken words or to express feelings and emotions (2005). In general, answering a question with shaking our head has meaning of saying no or rejection of the question. Then, nodding our heads has the meaning as saying yes, accepting, or agreeing with the question. In this conversation, Andrew's gestures are shaking and nodding his head. Mr. Gilbertson interprets Andrew's gesture as *there is something Andrew wants to say but he is worry to say it out loud*. In this case after Mr. Gilbertson explained about the punishment, he thought that he got the explanation what actually happened between them. When Mr. Gilbertson frowns his eyebrows, it means that he is questioning the truth behind Andrew's speech.

The contexts that support the implied meaning of the implicature are the participant and the act sequences. As a partner of Margaret's fake fiancé, Andrew must be careful to speak with Mr. Gilbertson. So, Andrew acted intentionally to persuade Mr. Gilbertson. It makes Mr. Gilbertson interprets Andrew's gestures in general way. Then, the act sequences of this conversation are there is someone who tells to Mr. Gilbertson that Margaret and Andrew are lying about their relationship before he meets Andrew and Margaret. It makes Andrew takes time to think about another lies to strengthen their lies. This implicature is categorized as a generalized conversational implicature because Andrew's gesture is a common gesture when someone is having uncertain feeling.

In this research, researcher found two data that contain generalized conversational implicature. One data flouts the maxim of manner and the other

data flouts maxim of quantity. Both of the data are done by Andrew. In the first data, it shows that Andrew uses implicature to hide the truth from Mr. Gilbertson. Then from the second data, Andrew uses implicature to make the humor scene about a reverse situation of how a boss follows her assistant's instruction.

b. Particularized Conversational Implicature

00:02:57,343 - 00:02:59,277

Andrew : I need the shirt off your back. Literally.

Jordan : You're kidding, right?

Andrew : *Yankees, Boston, this Tuesday, two company seats for your shirt.* You have five seconds to decide. Five, four, three, two, one.

In this conversation, Andrew had accidentally spilled the coffee to his shirt. Then, he came to his friend's desk Jordan to change his shirt with Jordan. Jordan is Andrew's friend whose working in his office. Andrew tried to get Jordan's shirt immediately. Then, Jordan thought that Andrew was telling a joke. After that, Andrew's answer was "*Yankees, Boston, this Tuesday, two company seats for your shirt.* You have five seconds to decide. Five, four, three, two, one." In fact that Jordan only asked him about his seriousness to exchange their shirt. Andrew should have answered Jordan's question briefly with "Yes" or "No". So, Andrew's answer is not relevant with Jordan's question. Cutting stated, to fulfill the maxim of relevant, the speakers are expected to say something relevant to what is said before (2002). Meanwhile, Andrew's reply offers a deal to Jordan by saying "*Yankees, Boston, this Tuesday, two company seats for your shirt*". Andrew implies that he really needs his shirt at that moment and he is serious as he offers that such a big deal just for a shirt.

The context of the utterance that supports the implied meaning is the act sequence. In this conversation Andrew persuades Jordan to lend his shirt with giving Jordan a deal. Andrew gives a deal as his answer to Jordan. The deal's worth for Jordan just for lending his shirt is he gets two tickets of baseball match. Andrew's dictions of Yankees and Boston are understandable by American. Yankees is the nickname of the New York Yankees which is an American professional baseball team based in New York City. Meanwhile Boston is known as Boston Red Sox that is also an American professional baseball team based in Boston. The New York Yankees and Boston Red Sox are in rivalry in Major League Baseball's America League for over 100 seasons therefore it is a really interesting match to watch. To conclude, this implicature can be categorized as particularized conversational implicature because both the speaker must have same background knowledge about the match of the baseball club Yankees and Boston and, both Andrew and Jordan are American.

In this research, the researcher found twenty one data that contain particularized conversational implicature. The using of particularized conversational implicature is more often than the other kinds of implicature because both of the main characters are cooperating to make the story goes by conducting their lies.

2. Conventional Implicature

00:28:59,571 - 00:29:02,404

Andrew : I never said I was poor.

Margaret : But you never told me you were rich.

Information p : Andrew never says he is poor

Information q : Andrew never tells Margaret that he is rich.

The conversation happened when Andrew and Margaret arrived in Andrew's house. Margaret thought the word house was not appropriate to describe Andrew's house but that was a mansion. The contrast in this conversation was between poor and rich words. It made the conversation has gap with adding conjunction 'but' in it. The implied meaning of that utterance is Andrew is rich and Andrew never tells Margaret about it.

The context of the utterance that supports the implied meaning is the act sequence of the conversation. The implied meaning of those utterances is Andrew is rich and Andrew never tells Margaret about it. The using of conjunction "but" in this conversation gives the statement that Andrew never tells her about his financial condition.

In this research, the researcher found fifteen data that contain conventional implicature. The context of the conventional implicature is on the specific words, in this case they are some conjunction such as *but*, *even*, *yet*, and *and*.

E. CONCLUSIONS

According to analysis of the type of the implicature found in *The Proposal* movie, the main characters used particularized conversational implicature more often than the generalized conversational implicature and conventional implicature. It happened because some of the scenes in the movie contained the lies that the main characters agree have done to make story go on. Then, their lies continue to cover the previous lies.

There are twenty three data of conversational implicature and fourteen data of conventional implicature. From twenty three data of conversational implicature, fifteen data are done by Andrew and eight data are done by Margaret. From the data, Andrew did the implicature more than Margaret. From the data that the researcher found, component of the context that prominent between Andrew and Margaret was participants. From fifteen data done by Andrew, the contexts of participant were vertical dimension. Vertical dimension is a component that relates to social factors such as age or social status. The seven data of this research were vertical dimension of social status between Margaret as a boss and Andrew as her assistant. Then, the other eight data were social status of both of Margaret and Andrew as a fake lover.

The flouted maxim on implicature did not make the conversation breakdown but, to give the sign that they did the implicature. The implicature done by the main characters give the chance to throw jokes. It makes the movie's humor in *The Proposal* movie is feeling lively.

WORKS CITED

Calero, Henry H. (2005), *The Power of Nonverbal Communication*. USA: Silver Lake Publishing

- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for student*. USA: Routledge.
- Farooq, U. (2015). *Language Definition Characteristic and Importance in Communication*.
- Fletcher, A. (Director). (2009). *The Proposal* [Motion Picture].
- Fraenkel, Jack R., and Norman E. Wallen. (2007), *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. 7th ed. New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Gazdar, G. (1978). *Pragmatics : Implicature, Presupposition, and Logical Form*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gibbs, G. R., & Taylor, C. (2010, February 19). *LEarning Qualitative Data Analysis on the Web*. Retrieved October 12, 2017, from Online QDA : onlineqda.hud.ac.uk
- Grice, H. P. (1991). *Studies in the Way of Words*. United States: Harvard University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hornby, A. S. (2006). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press
- Huda, M. (2013). *Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue Euro Trip*. Malang: Unpublished Writer.
- Hymes, D. H. (1974). *Foundation of Sociolinguistics : An Ethnography Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania press.
- IMDb. (2009, June 9). Retrieved April 17, 2018, from The Proposal: http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1041829/?ref_=nv_sr_1
- Khusnita, A. S. (2013). *The Implicature of Humor Utterances in Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur*. Semarang: Unpublished Writer.
- Korrapati, D. R. (2016). *Five Chapter Model for Research Thesis Writing: 108 Practical Lessons*. India: Diamond Pocket Books Pvt Ltd.
- Latta, R. L. (1999). *The Basic Humor Process " A Cognitive- Shift Theory and The Case Against Incongruity"*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles in Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Macmillan Dictionary* (2009). Retrieved February 1, 2020 from on your knees: <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/on-your-knees>
- Mayer, C. F. (2009). *Introducing English Linguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (1983). *Pragmatics An Introduction*. United States: Blackwell.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Miller, K. (2002). *Communication Theories: persperctive, process, and context*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Pogoni, A. (2013, May 24-25). Illocutionary Force Indicating Defice (IFID) Mood in Albanian Language. *The 1st International Conference on Research and Education*, 1-10.
- Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ilmu Budaya

Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya

e-ISSN 2549-7715 | Volume 5 | Nomor 2 | April 2021 | Hal: 421—431
Terakreditasi Sinta 4

- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. New York: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Thao, V. T. (2011). *A Study of Conversational Implicatures in TITANIC Film*. Danang: Unpublished Writer.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.