

THE ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN *NEW MOON* MOVIE

Eka Prastyaningsih¹, Ratri Harida²

¹²STKIP PGRI Ponorogo

eka.prastyaningsih@gmail.com

Received: 12 August 2021, **Revised:** 5 October 2021, **Accepted:** 25 October 2021

Abstract

Cooperative principle must be considered to make successful understanding between the speaker and the listener that happen in the conversation. There are four maxims in cooperative principle should be considered; quantity maxim, quality maxim, relevance maxim, and manner maxim. The focuses of this study were to describe and explain the conversational implicature. The objectives of this study are; first is to identify what maxims are violated by the characters in *New Moon* movie directed by Melissa Rosenberg and second is to describe and explain the implied meaning of violated maxim. In this study the writer uses qualitative descriptive analysis. The conclusions of this study are; the first, the writer finds out thirty one (31) violation of cooperative principle. Second, the writer describes and explains that the characters in this movie violated cooperative principle and they have their own reason to violate these maxims. The real meaning is not only in the structure sentence but actually the speaker intended meaning depends on the context.

Keywords: Conversational Implicature; Violation; *New Moon* Movie

Abstrak

Prinsip kerjasama harus diperhatikan untuk membuat suksesnya pemahaman diantara pembicara dan pendengar yang terjadi dalam sebuah percakapan. Terdapat empat maksim dalam prinsip kerjasama yang seharusnya diperhatikan; maksim kuantitas, maksim kualitas, maksim relevansi, dan maksim cara. Akan tetapi, terkadang banyak orang melanggar prinsip kerjasama untuk beberapa tujuan. Fokus dalam kajian ini pertama, untuk mengidentifikasi hukum apa yang dilanggar oleh karakter-karakter dalam film *New Moon* yang disutradarai oleh Melissa Rosenberg dan kedua untuk mendiskripsikan dan menjelaskan makna tersembunyi dari pelanggaran hokum maksim. Kajian ini menggunakan analisis kualitatif diskriptif. Kesimpulan dari kajian ini pertama, terdapat tiga puluh satu (31) pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama. Kedua, karakter-karakter dalam film ini melanggar prinsip kerjasama dan mereka mempunyai alasan untuk melanggar maksim-maksim tersebut. Makna kalimat yang sesungguhnya tidak hanya terdapat pada struktur kalimat tapi sesungguhnya makna yang dimaksud oleh pembicara tergantung pada situasi.

Kata kunci: Implikatur Percakapan; Pelanggaran; Film 'New Moon'

INTRODUCTION

People live in society, because they are social beings. To fulfill their needs they should live together. They cannot be separated from daily interaction with others. This interaction will happen through communication. People interact with others to share information, ideas, feeling, opinion, knowledge, and intention. It uses a tool, gestures of body, symbol, and language. All of those tools are used to make understand what people intended. Because principally, language is a system that human beings use to share their feelings or ideas (Wulandari and Harida, 2021). The tool that most be used for communication is language. Language is a part of life that cannot be separated with living creatures. Even today, most of people communicate in more than one language freely (Kartika *et al*, 2020).

People as communicator use language to express their feeling and information through words. Then, words used in conversation for daily communication. The conversations happen between speaker and listener. Both speaker and listener must understand the conversation, so they will not misunderstood. Arifin and Suprayitno (2015:1) argued that people mutually engaged in conversation will share common principles of conversation that lead them to interpret each other's utterance as the contribution in conversation. In addition, Yule (1996: 35) concluded that speaker and listener involved in conversation are generally cooperating with each other.

On the other hand, the communication or conversation among people does not always run well. Sometimes there is any lie, ambiguity, irrelevant or uninformative conversation which creates confusion even misunderstanding among the participants. Banga in Lestari (2014:2) says "In everyday conversation, sentence meanings are not

always expressed explicitly, but can also be merely implied". In pragmatics, implicit meaning called conversational implicature. Yule says that "An addition conveyed meaning called an implicature" (1996:35). Implicatures are primarily examples of more being communicated than is said. Implicature is a concept of utterance meaning as opposed to sentence meaning.

As discussed previously, conversation may include two or more persons. Both speaker and listener should cooperate with each other to understand the implicit meaning or the implicature. Yule (1996: 128) states, "Implicature is an additional unstated meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain the cooperative principle".

People should obey the cooperative principle and cooperate with each others, so their intended meaning can well be interpreted. "Cooperative principle is a basic assumption in conversation that each participant will attempt to contribute appropriately, at the required time, to the current exchange of talk" (Yule, 1996:128). Generally when people involved in a communication, they are cooperating with each other. Grice (in Horn, 2006:7) distinguished four categories under one or another of which will fall certain some specific maxim and sub maxim. Maxim quantity; relates to the quantity of information to be provided, and under it fall the following maxim: (i) make your contribution as informative as required (ii) do not make your contribution more informative than is required. Maxim quality; Under the category of quality falls a supermaxim 'try to make your contribution one that is true' and two more specific maxim (i) do not say what you believe to be false (ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. Maxim relation; 'be relevant'. Maxim manner; it's include supermaxim 'be perspicuous' and

various maxim such as: (i) avoid obscurity of expression (ii) avoid ambiguity (iii) be brief (iv) be orderly. When a maxim is violated (flouted), a conversational implicature results, in other word the utterance receives an interpretation that goes beyond the words that are spoken (Meyer, 2009; Arifin and Suprayitno, 2015; Kasnadi *et al*, 2019).

The cooperative principle should be known and obeyed by the language user. When the speaker can't fulfill those maxims, the act is called violation, a speaker can be said to violate a maxim when they know that the hearer will not know the truth and will only generate a misleading implicature (Thomas, 1995:73). Therefore, they may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim. If speaker violates a maxim she/he will be "liable to mislead". Violate the maxim means the speaker intentionally mislead the hearer. (Grice, 2002:30). In addition, Tupan and Natalie (2008:1) state that, violation is the condition where the speakers do not purposefully fulfill certain maxim. When the speakers do maxim violation, the conversation between the speakers and the hearers can be unsuccessful since they will misunderstand each other. It means that when the speakers' is talking about something and the hearer does not know the truth and the hearer will only understand the surface meaning of the word. Hence Harida *et al* (2015), emphasized that the violation of the maxims usually generates humor.

Many people like watching movie, because it can entertain them. The movie can represent the reality of life, and can be a lesson. Movie is a sequence of picture projected on a screen from a developed and prepared film especially with an accompanying sound track (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2004: 654). It is one of the human product literature terms. As we know that most of people in the world love movie

whether in humor, scary, action, love drama, or others. It can express someone thought and meaning sense.

Generally, the conversation of movie has specific aim. By focusing on conversational implicatures, the writer want to find violating maxims in "New Moon" movie. This is the Romantic movie directed by Melissa Rosenberg. This movie is entertaining; it has good theme and moral value. Afterwards, while watching "New Moon" movie, the writer want to understand the implied meaning in that movie. For that reason, the writer interested in finding out the conversational implicatures happened in "New Moon" movie and conducts the research with a title The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in "New Moon" Movie Directed by Melissa Rosenberg.

Therefore, the objectives in this study are (a) to identify the violating maxims found in "New Moon" movie, and (b) to describe and explain the implied meaning that violated in "New Moon" movie.

METHOD

In this study, the writer used a qualitative descriptive study. Descriptive method is a method of research which intends to create a "collection" of systematic, factual, and accurate information based on certain facts (Masyhuri and Zainuddin, 2008: 34). While according to Moleong "description qualitative method is the suitable method used in analyzing the data, which are words and images" (2009:38). The result of this study is in form of description explanation. The object in this study is romantic movie entitled "New Moon" directed by Melissa Rosenberg. This movie has 2 hours 4 minutes and 36 seconds of duration.

The technique of collecting data that is used in this study is documentation. Documentation in this case is “New Moon” movie script. Moreover, taking note technique is also used in this study. In this technique the writer watching the movie directly and catching also taking-notes the utterances, then classifies the movie’s conversations that are related to the violation of conversational implicature while checking at the printed subtitles. In this technique, the writer directly takes a part to create the data itself.

The writer uses these steps for collecting the data are as follow: (a) watching “New Moon” movie while taking-notes, (b) reading and observing dialog from “New Moon” movie script, (c) selecting the conversational implicatures which are found in “New Moon” movie, and (d) collecting the conversational implicatures which are found in “New Moon” movie.

In this descriptive qualitative study, the writer has three steps for analyzing the data; they are data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. In the process of data reduction, the writer looks for, collects, and taking note on the important data that is related to the conversational implicature while watching the “New Moon” movie. The next process is data display. In data display process, the writer analyzes the data that implies to the violation of conversational implicature clearly using theory of cooperative principle by Grice.

Then describing the reason why the characters in the movie violate these maxims. The process of data reduction and data display is applied in exchange to the end. In the conclusion/verification process, the writer checking the entire data finding and the process of verification again in order to get truth result. And the last is making the conclusion based on data analysis.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After getting the data, the writer analyzed the data. The data analyses were presented below:

Violation of Maxim of Quantity

There are some data related to the violation of Maxim of Quantity as follows:

Datum 1

Edward : So, how come Jacob Black gets to give you a gift but I don’t?

Bella : Because I have nothing to give back to you.

Edward : Bella, you give me everything just by breathing.

Bella : See? Thank you. That’s all I want.

At the time, when Edward and Bella were walking to the class, Edward said that he did not give Bella a gift in her birthday. Bella answered, the reason was that she had nothing to give back to Edward. Then Edward said again, “Bella, you give me everything just by breathing”. The statement had implied meaning. Edward should explain clearly how Bella could give him everything just by her being alive. The conversation had a deal with maxim of quantity which Edward did not give complete information.

Datum 2

Bella : I thought I said no present.

Alice : I’ve already seen you open it and guess what? You love it. You’re gonna wear it tonight. Our place.

The conversation happened in the school when Bella and Edward were talking, suddenly Alice appeared. Alice gave Bella a gift. Alice said Bella would love her gift without told what her gift was. The conversation violated cooperative principle based on maxim of quantity, because Alice gave less information about her gift for Bella.

Datum 3

Alice : Open Esme and Charles.

Dr. Cullen : Just a little something to brighten your day.

The conversation was happened in Edward's house. Bella and Edward's family had a birthday party for Bella. Alice gave Esme and Charles's gift. Suddenly Dr. Cullen said, "Just a little something to brighten your day".

Dr. Cullen did not explain clearly what his gift for Bella was. The conversation violated maxim of quantity which did not have complete information.

Datum 4

Jacob : If I told you I could not have fixed those bikes, what would you have said?

Bella : Are you doubting your mad skills?

Jacob asked Bella if he could not have fixed her bikes, what would have Bella said. Actually, Jacob could fix her bikes, but he did not tell it to Bella. Jacob said that because he hid the real condition. Actually, Bella's bikes were repaired yet. The conversation happened in the truck when they went to try these bikes. In that case, the conversation included conversational implicature based on maxim of quantity, because of incomplete information from Jacob.

Datum 5

Charlie : Hey, Look, I don't have to go fishing today.

Harry : Yes, you do.

Bella : Yeah you do. Go, what are you talking about? Just be careful.

In that situation, Charlie said to Bella that he did not go fishing that day. Charlie would go hunting, but he did not tell to Bella that actually he wanted to go hunting for some bears. The conversation happened in the living room of Bella's house. In that case, the conversation

included conversational implicature based on maxim of quantity, because Bella needed more information why Charlie did not go fishing.

Violation of Maxim of Quality

This research also found the violation of maxim of quality within the movie dialogues as follow:

Datum 3

Charlie : Is that a gray hair?

Bella : No. No way.

It happened in Bella's bedroom when she had already waked up. In that conversation, Charlie totally lied to Bella. He said that Bella had a gray hair.

Actually Bella did not believe it, but she saw herself in the mirror soon. She realized that she had no gray hair. It contained conversational implicature based on cooperative principle which violated maxim of quality where the speaker did not tell the truth in the situation.

Datum 2

Bella : Edward, what happened with Jasper - that was nothing.

Edward : You're right. It was nothing. Nothing but what I always expected. And nothing compared to what could have happened. You just don't belong in my world Bella.

Bella and Edward had conversation in the woods. Bella said that what happened in her was nothing. Then Edward said that Bella was right, and he added, "You just don't belong in my world Bella". Actually he was belonging to her. But, he said like that to save Bella from Jasper. It showed Edward disobeyed the maxim of quality, which he did not tell the truth.

Datum 3

Bella : I'm gonna go shopping tomorrow with Jessica.

Charlie : You hate shopping.

Bella : I... I need a girls' nigh out.

The conversation occurred when Charlie gave speech to Bella in front of his house. Bella told her father that she needed a girls' night out, actually she did not want it. The conversation violated maxim of quality because Bella lied to her father.

Datum 4

Laurent : Do the Cullens visit often?

Edward : Lie. (Edward's apparition)

Bella : Yeah, Absolutely. All the time.

Edward : Lie better. (Edward's apparition)

The situation happened at the meadow in the woods, vampire Laurent stood just 5 meters away. Laurent asked to Bella, "Do the Cullens visit often?" suddenly, Edward's apparition appeared between them, he asked Bella to lie. So, Bella lied that Edward was very protective to her to answered Laurent's question.

So, the conversation included conversational implicature accorded to maxim of quality because Bella stated something that hid the reality.

Datum 5

Billy : Bella.

Bella : I need to see him.

Billy : He's not in.

Bella : Okay, I'm sorry. I really need to see him.

It happened when Bella came to Jacob's house to see him. When Bella was knocking the door, Billy opened and he lied that Jacob was not in. Billy said untrue because he knew that Jacob did not want Bella to come. It means Billy disobeyed the maxim of quality that he should tell the truth.

Violation of Maxim of Relevance

The violation of maxim of relevance also occurred in the movie, as in:

Datum 1

Bella : I hate being... celebrated.

Edward : There are worse tragedies. I mean look at Romeo. Killed his true love out of sheer stupidly.

The conversation happened when Bella and Edward had a lecture in the classroom about Romeo and Juliet movie. Bella said that she hated being celebrated. But Edward did not response what's Bella said, he just talked about the story in that movie. In that case, the conversation violated maxim of relevance. Because Edward's statement was not related to Bella's statement.

Datum 2

Edward : Bella, do you not understand my feelings for you at all?

Bella : Carlisle told me how you feel about your soul. I don't believe that. So don't worry about mine.

Edward : You should go inside.

In that situation, Edward asked Bella, did she understand about his feeling. But, Bella did not answer that she understands or not. She just explained about what Carlisle's told about Edward's soul. It violated the maxim of relevance, because the speaker gave no relevant answer. The conversation happened when Bella was going down from his car in front of her house.

Datum 3

Bella : Hey.

Edward : Just come take a walk with me.

In the conversation, Edward's statement did not relate to what Bella's said. Bella just said hello to him, but he did not respect of it. It happened at the Bella's garden, when Edward

wanted to say something to Bella in the woods. In that case, the conversation violated maxim of relevance.

Datum 4

Bella : You're really hot. Like you feel like you have a fever. Are you okay?

Jacob : I don't know what's happening. I gotta go.

Mike : That dude is weird

In the conversation, Jacob did not answer Bella's question who asked his condition. But, he said that he did not know what was happening, and he got to go. That conversation broke the maxim of relevance, because Jacob gave irrelevant answer. The conversations occurred when they had already seen a movie.

Datum 5

Bella : Jake! Hey! You cut your hair off? And got a tattoo?

Jacob : Bella.

Bella : I thought you were too sick to come outside, or pick up the phone when I call.

Jacob : Go away.

The conversation happened when the day was raining, Bella came to Jacob's place. Jacob disobeyed what Bella's asked. The conversation destroyed maxim of relevance where Jacob did not give suitable response from what Bella's said before. Jacob just asked Bella to go away.

Violation of Maxim of Manner

The example maxim of manner violation in the movie are shown in the following data:

Datum 1

Bella : Hallo, biceps! You know, anabolic steroids are really bad for you.

Jacob : Well, I'm just filling out, Bella.

The conversations happened in the school's parking lot when Bella and Edward had a talked and Jacob suddenly came. Their conversation destroyed maxim of manner. Bella called Jacob as a biceps. It was just an expression that had an implied meaning. Bella should call him with his name.

Datum 2

Bella : Jasper, no fair with the mood control thing.

Jasper : Sorry Bella. Happy... Never mind.

Edward : You can't trust vampires. Trust me.

In the conversation, Edward's statement showed unclarity because he expressed that Bella could not trust vampires, although he was a vampire. He said something ambiguous. It means the conversation violated maxim of manner. Moreover, it happened when they were would go to the classroom.

Datum 3

Jacob : Bella!

Jacob : Where the hell have you been loca?

Bella : I brought you something.

Jacob : Okay

When Bella came to Jacob's house, she brought two motorcycles in her truck. Bella said to Jacob it was something, to make Jacob confused. Her information was not brief. It included conversational implicature in line with the maxim of manner.

Datum 4

Bella : Oh hey, be careful. Those things are actually really so heavy, so... Jake you're like... Buff. How did that happen? You're like 16. I don't get it.

Jacob : Mmm..Mmmm age is just a number, baby. What are you, like 40 now?

It occurred when Jacob was lifting the motorcycle from Bella's truck. It contained conversational implicature which violated maxim of manner. Bella described Jacob like a buff. It raised an ambiguity for the hearer how human could be said as a buff. It was just an expression of a hyperbole. Bella had an implied meaning that Jacob was very strong.

Datum 5

Bella : You're not the first monster I've met.

Sam : Jake's right. You are good with the weird.

That conversation happened in Emily's house. Bella said that Jared not the first monster that she had met. Implicitly it showed that Jared like a monster. The conversation included conversational implicature in the case maxim of manner that made the hearer felt ambiguous.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion in the previous chapter, the writer concludes that the characters of "New Moon" movie violate cooperative principles of all maxims. The writer also describes and explains the implied meaning of each utterance contains conversational implicature in "New Moon" movie. It describes that the characters in this movie violate cooperative principle and they have their own reason to violate these maxims.

In the real life, people often use so many informal words, less or more information, irrelevant statements, ambiguous sentences, uninformative information and untruthful answers as speaker meaning in the case of conversational implicature though it does not appropriate with cooperative principles. People should understand the meaning

intended by the speaker, because the real meaning is not only in the structure sentence or surface meaning but actually the speaker intended meaning depends on the context, although it is unsaid but it communicated. Therefore, to make good communication people should obey the cooperative principle in their conversation. It is mainly due to the function of language that enables people to share information, knowledge, ideas, and lots of thing to each other (Fransiska and Arifin, 2021).

REFERENCE

- Arifin, A. and Suprayitno, E. (2015). *Flouting the Grice's maxims found in Mr. Poppers' Penguin movie*. National Seminar of Prasasti. UNS Surakarta.
- Fransiska, A. W. and Arifin, A. (2021). Analysis of Translation Techniques on the English Teachers' Translation of English Articles. *Salience Journal*, vol. 1(1), pp. 9-17. Retrieved online from <https://jurnal.lppmstkipponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Salience/article/view/10/16>
- Grice, H. P. (2002). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Harida, R., Hurustyanti, H., and Wulandari, R. S. (2015). *Humorous Effect of Barbie: Life in the Dreamhouse Series' through Grice's Implicature*. 2nd National Seminar of Prasasti. UNS Surakarta.
- Horn, L., and Ward, G. (2006). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kartika, S. N., Arifin, A., and Harida, R. (2020). Code Mixing and Code Switching Found in Video Instagram. *Deiksis*, 12(3), pp. 296-306. Retrieved online from <https://journal.lppmunindra.ac.id/index.php/Deiksis/article/view/5583/3374>

- Kasnadi, Sutejo, and Arifin, A. (2019). Integrating Humanitarian Values in Teaching Translation of Indonesian Aphorisms into English. *Asian EFL Journal*, vol. 23(3.4), pp. 182-198. Retrieved online from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/>
- Lestari, R. Y. P. (2014). *The Conversational Implicature in the Croods Movie Written and Directed by Kirk Demicco and Chris Sanders*. Undergraduate Thesis: STKIP PGRI Ponorogo.
- Masyhuri, M. Z. (2008). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendekatan Praktis dan Aplikatif*. Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama.
- Meyer, C. F. (2009). *Introducing English Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moleong, L. J. (2009) *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- The Merriam-Webster Dictionary. 11th ed.* (2004). Springfield, Mass. Merriam-Webster.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatic*. London: Longman.
- Tupan, A.H. and Natalia, H. (2008). The Multiple Violations of Conversational Maxims in Lying Done by the Characters in Some Episodes of Desperate Housewives. *Literary Journals*, Vol. 10(1), pp. 63-78. Retrieved online from <http://www.petra.ac.id/~puslit/journals/dir.php?DepartmentID=IN>
- Wulandari, R. S. and Harida, R. (2021). Grammatical Error Analysis in Essay Writing. *Deiksis*, vol. 13(1), pp. 73-81. Retrieved online from <https://journal.lppmunindra.ac.id/index.php/Deiksis/index>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.