CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter presents the experts theories that are relevant to solve the problem regarding an analysis of deixis in "Turning Red" movie script. The expert theories to discuss are the definition of pragmatics, Non-Observance Maxim and Conversational Implicature, reference and I am going to compile and discuss the previous related studies that are used to compare the previous related studies in this research.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that deals with the study of language in use and how context influences the interpretation of meaning. It focuses on how speakers use language to convey meaning beyond the literal content of words. Pragmatics examines how language is used in different social, cultural, and situational contexts, and how meaning is negotiated between speakers.

Key aspects of pragmatics include:

1. Context: Pragmatics emphasizes the importance of context in understanding meaning. Context includes the physical environment, social setting, shared knowledge, and the background information that shapes communication.

2. Speaker Intentions: Pragmatics considers the intentions and goals of the speaker in using language. Speakers use various linguistic and non-linguistic cues to convey their intentions, such as tone of voice, facial expressions, and gestures.

3. Inference: Pragmatics involves making inferences to derive meaning beyond the explicit content of an utterance. Listeners rely on their knowledge, context, and the cooperative principles of conversation to infer intended meaning.

4. Implicature: As mentioned earlier, implicature is a pragmatic phenomenon where the speaker conveys meaning indirectly, relying on conversational implicatures. Implicatures involve understanding what is meant but not explicitly stated, based on contextual cues and violations of conversational maxims.

5. Speech Acts: Pragmatics examines how language is used to perform actions, known as speech acts. Speech acts include making requests, giving orders, apologizing, complimenting, or making promises. The meaning of an utterance is not solely based on its content but also on the illocutionary force, or the intended action behind the speech act.

6. Politeness: Pragmatics also considers politeness and how social norms and cultural factors influence communication. Politeness strategies, such as using indirect speech or employing certain politeness markers, vary across languages and cultures.

In summary, pragmatics explores the dynamic nature of language and how meaning is negotiated in real-world communication. It examines the interplay between language, context, speaker intentions, and the inferences made by listeners to interpret meaning accurately.

2.2 Cooperative Principle

The cooperative principle is a concept in pragmatics, proposed by philosopher H. Paul Grice, that outlines the underlying assumption of cooperation in conversation. It suggests that participants in a conversation are generally expected to communicate in a cooperative and mutually beneficial manner. The cooperative principle guides how speakers and listeners interact and understand each other's intentions.

The cooperative principle is based on four maxims that speakers are expected to follow when engaging in conversation:

1. Maxim of Quality: Speakers should provide information that is true and supported by evidence. They should not say things they believe to be false or lacking adequate evidence.

2. Maxim of Quantity: Speakers should provide an appropriate amount of information. They should provide enough information to be informative and relevant, but not more than necessary or excessively verbose.

3. Maxim of Relevance: Speakers should contribute information that is relevant to the ongoing conversation. They should avoid introducing irrelevant or unrelated topics.

4. Maxim of Manner: Speakers should communicate in a clear, orderly, and unambiguous manner. They should avoid using obscure or unnecessarily complex language and should be organized and coherent in their expression.

While the cooperative principle suggests these maxims as guidelines for effective communication, it also recognizes that there can be intentional violations or deviations from these maxims to convey additional meaning. Such violations can lead to conversational implicatures, where listeners infer implied meanings beyond the literal content of the words.

The cooperative principle and its associated maxims provide a framework for understanding how participants in a conversation strive to create an efficient and effective communication process by assuming cooperation and adherence to certain principles of conversation.

2.1.1 Maxim Of Quality

The maxim of quality is one of the maxims proposed by H. Paul Grice as part of the cooperative principle in pragmatics. The maxim of quality relates to the principle of truthfulness and requires speakers to provide information that is true and supported by evidence.

Here's a breakdown of the maxim of quality:

1. Truthfulness: Speakers should strive to convey information that is accurate and truthful. They are expected to make sincere statements that align with their knowledge and beliefs.

2. Supported by Evidence: Speakers should provide information that is backed by appropriate evidence or justification. They should avoid making claims without sufficient support or evidence.

3. Avoiding Falsehood: Speakers should refrain from stating things they believe to be false. Deliberate falsehoods, lies, or intentionally misleading statements violate the maxim of quality.

The maxim of quality encourages speakers to be honest and transparent in their communication, fostering a foundation of trust and credibility in conversation. By adhering to this maxim, speakers contribute to effective and meaningful communication.

However, it's important to note that there may be situations where the maxim of quality is intentionally violated for rhetorical purposes, such as the use of sarcasm, irony, or certain figures of speech. In such cases, the violation is typically meant to convey a meaning that goes beyond the literal interpretation of the words.

In summary, the maxim of quality emphasizes the importance of truthfulness and providing information that is supported by evidence or sincere belief. Adhering to this maxim promotes honest and reliable communication.

2.1.2 Maxim Of Quantity

The maxim of quantity is one of the four maxims proposed by H. Paul Grice as part of the cooperative principle in pragmatics. The maxim of quantity relates to the principle of providing an appropriate amount of information in a conversation.

The maxim of quantity can be understood in two parts:

1. Make Your Contribution as Informative as Required: Speakers are expected to provide the necessary information to make their contributions informative and meaningful. They should not withhold relevant information that is needed for the listener to understand the message.

2. Do Not Provide More Information than Required: Speakers should avoid giving excessive or unnecessary information that goes beyond what is needed or relevant for the conversation. They should not include irrelevant details or go off on tangents that do not contribute to the topic at hand.

By following the maxim of quantity, speakers strive to strike a balance between providing enough information for effective communication while avoiding overwhelming the listener with unnecessary or redundant details.

It's important to note that the application of the maxim of quantity may vary depending on the context, cultural norms, and the specific goals of the conversation. Different situations may require different levels of detail or brevity.

Sometimes speakers may intentionally violate the maxim of quantity for various pragmatic purposes. For example, they may choose to be vague or withhold information to create suspense, build anticipation, or engage the listener's curiosity.

In summary, the maxim of quantity encourages speakers to provide an appropriate amount of information that is relevant, informative, and necessary for effective communication, while avoiding excessive or irrelevant details.

2.1.3 Maxim Of Relation

While not explicitly mentioned by H. Paul Grice, some sources refer to the "maxim of relation" as an additional maxim that complements the four maxims proposed in the cooperative principle. The maxim of relation emphasizes that contributions in a conversation should be relevant to the ongoing discourse or the topic at hand.

Here's an overview of the maxim of relation:

1. Relevance: Speakers should make contributions that are directly related to the ongoing conversation or the subject being discussed. They should strive to provide information, comments, or questions that are pertinent and contribute to the overall coherence of the discourse.

By adhering to the maxim of relation, speakers ensure that their contributions align with the context and purpose of the conversation. This maxim helps maintain the focus of the discussion, promotes effective communication, and avoids introducing irrelevant or tangential information.

It's worth noting that the maxim of relation can be closely related to the maxim of relevance, as discussed earlier. Some sources may refer to the maxim of relation as a specific application or aspect of the maxim of relevance within the cooperative principle.

In summary, the maxim of relation emphasizes the importance of making contributions that are relevant to the ongoing conversation or topic. By adhering to this maxim, speakers enhance the coherence and effectiveness of the communication process.

2.1.4 Maxim Of Manner

The maxim of manner is one of the four maxims proposed by H. Paul Grice as part of the cooperative principle in pragmatics. The maxim of manner relates to the principle of clarity and effective communication, specifying how speakers should convey their messages in a clear and orderly manner.

Here's an explanation of the maxim of manner:

1. Clarity: Speakers should strive to be clear and unambiguous in their communication. They should use language that is easily understood by the listener and avoid using obscure or convoluted expressions.

2. Avoiding Ambiguity: Speakers should make an effort to avoid ambiguity in their utterances. They should express their thoughts and intentions in a way that reduces the chances of misinterpretation or confusion.

3. Be Brief and Organized: Speakers should be concise and avoid unnecessary verbosity. They should present their ideas in a well-organized and coherent manner, making their contributions more easily comprehensible.

4. Be Orderly: Speakers should follow the conventional rules and structure of the language being used. They should use appropriate syntax, grammar, and other linguistic conventions to maintain a smooth flow of conversation.

By adhering to the maxim of manner, speakers enhance the clarity, efficiency, and understanding of their communication. Clear and orderly communication reduces the likelihood of misunderstandings and promotes effective information exchange.

It's important to note that the maxim of manner is closely related to the maxim of quality, quantity, and relevance, as all the maxims work together to facilitate cooperative and effective communication.

In summary, the maxim of manner emphasizes the importance of clarity, conciseness, and organization in communication. By following this maxim, speakers contribute to a smoother flow of conversation and enhance understanding between participants.

2.3 The non-observance maxim

The non-observance maxim, also known as the flouting of a maxim, is a concept in pragmatics that refers to a deliberate violate,disregard,break of a conversational maxim. Conversational maxims are principles or guidelines that govern effective communication and were proposed by philosopher Paul Grice as part of his cooperative principle.

Grice identified four conversational maxims:

1. Maxim of Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as required, but not more or less informative than necessary.

2. Maxim of Quality: Be truthful and provide information that is supported by evidence.

3. Maxim of Relation: Be relevant and stay on topic.

4. Maxim of Manner: Be clear, avoid ambiguity, and be orderly in your communication.

The non-observance maxim occurs when a speaker intentionally flouts or violates one of these maxims to convey a particular meaning or achieve a specific communicative effect. By breaks a maxim, the speaker implies something beyond the literal meaning of their words, leading the listener to infer an intended meaning through implicature.

For example, consider the following conversation:

Person A: "How was the movie?" Person B: "Well, it was certainly...interesting."

In this example, Person B's response deliberately flouts the maxim of quality by providing a vague and non-committal response. The non-observance of the maxim suggests that Person B did not enjoy the movie or found it disappointing, even though they did not explicitly state it. The implicature is that the movie was not good.

The non-observance of a maxim can be used for various purposes, such as irony, sarcasm, humor, or to convey social or cultural nuances. It requires the listener to infer the intended meaning by considering the violation of the maxim and the context of the conversation.

2.3.1 Flouting a Maxim

Flouting a maxim refers to intentionally violating or deviating from a conversational maxim in order to convey a specific meaning or achieve a particular communicative effect. The concept of flouting maxims was proposed by philosopher Paul Grice as part of his cooperative principle in pragmatics.

Grice identified four conversational maxims that guide effective communication:

1. Maxim of Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as required, but not more or less informative than necessary.

2. Maxim of Quality: Be truthful and provide information that is supported by evidence.

3. Maxim of Relation: Be relevant and stay on topic.

4. Maxim of Manner: Be clear, avoid ambiguity, and be orderly in your communication.

Flouting a maxim involves deliberately violating one of these maxims for various purposes, such as irony, sarcasm, humor, or to convey hidden meanings. By flouting a maxim, the speaker communicates more than the literal meaning of their words and relies on implicature for the listener to understand the intended meaning.

For example, consider the following conversation:

Person A: "Do you have any plans for the weekend?"

Person B: "I have a ton of work to do. It's going to be so much fun!"

In this example, Person B flouts the maxim of quality by providing an exaggerated response that suggests the opposite of what is conventionally expected. By saying that having

a ton of work to do is going to be fun, Person B implies sarcasm or irony, conveying that they actually do not look forward to the work and may find it burdensome.

Flouting a maxim can require the listener to recognize the violation of the maxim, consider the context and shared knowledge, and draw inferences to understand the intended meaning. It adds layers of meaning and implicature to the conversation, often contributing to the nuances and richness of communication.

It is important to note that the non-observance of a maxim is a deliberate act, and understanding the implied meaning often relies on shared knowledge, context, and the ability to recognize the violation of the maxim.

2.3.2 Violating a Maxim

Violating a maxim, also known as flouting a maxim, refers to intentionally disregarding or breaking one of the conversational maxims proposed by Paul Grice. The maxims are guidelines that govern cooperative communication and include the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. When a maxim is violated, the speaker deliberate communicates in a way that deviates from the expected norms of conversation to convey a particular meaning or achieve a specific effect.

For example, consider the following conversation:

Person A: "Can you pass me the salt?"

Person B: "No, I cannot. My arms are broken."

In this exchange, Person B violates the maxim of quantity. Instead of providing the straightforward information about whether they can pass the salt, Person B offers a humorous response by stating that their arms are broken. By violating the maxim, Person B communicates a humorous and indirect refusal to pass the salt.

Flouting a maxim can also occur for other purposes, such as sarcasm, irony, or to create a sense of ambiguity. By intentionally breaking a maxim, the speaker aims to convey a deeper meaning that goes beyond the literal interpretation of their words. Understanding the

14

implicature or implied meaning often requires the listener to recognize the violation, consider the context, and make inferences based on their shared knowledge with the speaker.

It's important to note that violating a maxim is a deliberate act and is often dependent on the listener's ability to recognize the deviation and interpret the intended meaning. It adds complexity, nuance, and layers of communication to a conversation.

2.3.3 Infringing a Maxim

Infringing a maxim, also known as breaching a maxim, refers to unintentionally or inadvertently violating one of the conversational maxims proposed by Paul Grice. While flouting a maxim involves a deliberate deviation from the expected norms of conversation for a specific purpose, infringing a maxim occurs when a speaker unintentional fails to adhere to one of the maxims.

The maxims proposed by Grice include the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, which are guidelines for cooperative communication. When a maxim is infringed, it means that the speaker has not fulfilled the requirements of the maxim, either by providing insufficient information, making false statements, being irrelevant, or communicating unclearly.

For example, consider the following conversation:

Person A: "What time is the meeting?"

Person B: "Soon."

In this exchange, Person B infringes the maxim of quantity by providing insufficient information. Instead of providing a specific time for the meeting, Person B's response is vague and does not fulfill the informational requirement of the maxim.

Infringing a maxim can occur due to various reasons, such as forgetfulness, lack of knowledge, miscommunication, or linguistic limitations. Unlike flouting a maxim, which is a deliberate act, infringing a maxim is unintentional and may result in confusion or misinterpretation in the conversation.

It's important to note that conversations often involve some degree of flexibility and pragmatic interpretation. While infringing a maxim may lead to a breakdown in communication, cooperative participants in a conversation can often infer the intended meaning or seek clarification to overcome any misunderstandings that arise from the infringement.

2.3.4 Opting out of a Maxim

Opting out of a maxim, also known as opting out of a conversational maxim, refers to a speaker's deliberate choice to refrain from following or adhering to one of the maxims proposed by Paul Grice. Instead of violating or flouting a maxim, opting out involves consciously not engaging in the expected behavior associate with a particular maxim.

The maxims of conversation, including the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, are principles that guide cooperative communication. By opting out of a maxim, a speaker intentionally avoids providing the expected information, being truthful, staying on topic, or communicating in a clear and orderly manner.

For example, consider the following conversation:

Person A: "Can you tell me what happened?"

Person B: "I don't want to talk about it."

In this exchange, Person B opts out of the maxim of relation by choosing not to provide any information or discuss the topic at hand. By stating that they don't want to talk about it, Person B signals their unwillingness to engage in conversation and breaches the expectation to be relevant and provide information.

Opting out of a maxim can serve various purposes, such as maintaining privacy, avoiding sensitive topics, or expressing a desire to withhold information. It can be a deliberate communication strategy used to redirect the conversation or signal boundaries.

Understanding the meaning conveyed by opting out of a maxim often relies on the context, relationship between the participants, and shared knowledge. It may require the

listener to respect the speaker's choice and refrain from pressing further on the topic or to seek alternative ways of communication.

It's important to note that opting out of a maxim is a conscious decision made by the speaker and should be respected within the conversational context.

2.3.5 Suspending a Maxim

Suspending a maxim, also known as suspending a conversational maxim, refers to a temporary deviation from the usual application of a maxim in a conversation. It involves a speaker conscious setting aside or temporarily disregarding a specific maxim for a particular communicative purpose or in a specific context.

The maxims of conversation proposed by Paul Grice include the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, which are guidelines for effective and cooperative communication. Suspending a maxim occurs when a speaker intentionally departs from the expected behavior associated with a particular maxim but does so in a temporary manner.

For example, consider the following conversation:

Person A: "How was your day?"

Person B: "I don't want to talk about it right now."

In this exchange, Person B suspends the maxim of relation by choosing not to provide information about their day. Rather than giving a direct answer, Person B indicates that they are not currently willing to discuss the topic, thereby suspending the expectation of providing relevant information.

Suspending a maxim can be used for various reasons, such as needing time to process information, not having enough information to provide a satisfactory response, or wanting to delay a discussion to a more appropriate time. It allows the speaker to temporarily deviate from the normal application of the maxim without completely violating or opting out of it.

Understanding the meaning behind suspending a maxim requires considering the context, the relationship between the participants, and the reasons for the suspension. It is important for the listener to respect the speaker's choice to suspend a maxim and be mindful of the temporary nature of the deviation.

It's worth noting that suspending a maxim is a conscious decision made by the speaker and should not be confused with unintentional violations or infringements of the maxims. It is a communicative strategy employed to manage the flow of conversation and meet specific communicative goals.

2.4 Implicature

Implicature refers to the meaning that is conveyed indirectly or implied in a conversation, beyond the literal or explicit content of the words used. It involves the listener's ability to infer or derive additional meaning based on contextual cues, shared knowledge, and the cooperative principles of conversation.

Implicatures are a pragmatic phenomenon and play a crucial role in effective communication. They allow speakers to convey meaning beyond what is explicitly stated and enable listeners to understand the intended message in a more nuanced way.

Conversational implicatures can arise through various linguistic and contextual factors, including:

1. Violations of Grice's Maxims: When a speaker intentionally violates one of the maxims proposed by H. Paul Grice (quality, quantity, relevance, and manner), listeners often infer a meaning that goes beyond the literal interpretation of the words. These violations can signal sarcasm, irony, or an implied intention.

2. Context and Shared Knowledge: Listeners rely on the context of the conversation and their shared knowledge with the speaker to infer additional meaning. This includes cultural references, background information, and prior knowledge about the speaker or the topic being discussed.

3. Pragmatic Inference: Listeners engage in pragmatic inference, drawing conclusions based on the speaker's choice of words, tone of voice, facial expressions, gestures, and other non-verbal cues. These inferences contribute to understanding the implied meaning behind the speaker's words.

4. Conversational Patterns and Norms: Implicatures can also arise from established conversational patterns and norms within a particular speech community or culture.

These patterns may involve using indirect speech acts, politeness strategies, or specific idiomatic expressions that carry implied meanings.

It's important to note that implicatures are not necessarily straightforward or universally understood. Different individuals may interpret implicatures differently based on their own background, experiences, and cultural context. However, implicatures play a crucial role in efficient and nuanced communication, allowing for subtlety, implied intentions, and the expression of meaning beyond literal language.

2.4.1 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is a term used in pragmatics to describe a type of implicature that is derived from conventional meaning associated with certain words or phrases. It refers to the additional meaning that is conveyed by an utterance based on the conventional or standard use of specific linguistic expressions.

Unlike conversational implicature, which relies on inferences drawn from contextual and cooperative principles, conventional implicature is based on the conventional or conventionalized meaning of certain linguistic elements.

Here are some key characteristics of conventional implicature:

1. Linguistic Convention: Conventional implicatures arise from established linguistic conventions or norms associated with specific words, phrases, or expressions. These conventions determine the additional meaning conveyed by the use of those linguistic elements.

2. Conventional Meaning: The conventional implicature of an expression is separate from its literal meaning. The conventional meaning associated with the expression adds an implied layer of meaning that goes beyond what is explicitly stated.

3. Non-compositional: Conventional implicature is often non-compositional, meaning that the additional meaning is not derived directly from the individual words or grammatical structure of the utterance. Instead, it relies on the conventionalized interpretation of the expression as a whole.

4. Inference: Even though conventional implicatures are based on convention, the listener still needs to make an inference to understand the intended meaning. The additional meaning is not explicitly stated but is derived through knowledge of the conventional use of the expression.

5. Cancellation: Unlike conversational implicature, which can be canceled or overridden by explicit statements or context, conventional implicature is typically resistant to cancellation. Once an expression with a conventional implicature is used, the implied meaning is generally understood, and it is not easily negated or canceled.

Examples of conventional implicature include:

- The use of the word "but" to convey contrast or contradiction, as in "She is smart, but lazy." The word "but" conventionally implies a contradiction between the two qualities mentioned.

- The phrase "even though" to indicate a contrast, as in "Even though it was raining, we went for a walk." The use of "even though" conventionally implies that the action mentioned is unexpected or contrary to what might be expected in that situation.

- The expression "as a matter of fact" to emphasize the truth or validity of a statement, as in "As a matter of fact, I saw him yesterday." The use of this expression conventionally signals that the following statement is particularly true or important.

Overall, conventional implicature adds an implied layer of meaning to an utterance based on the conventional associations of specific words or phrases. It enriches communication by allowing speakers to convey subtle nuances and implications beyond the literal content of their words.

2.4.2 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature refers to the meaning that is implied or inferred by the speaker in a conversation, beyond the literal meaning of the words used. It is a concept from pragmatics, a branch of linguistics that deals with how context influences the interpretation of language.

Conversational implicatures are typically conveyed through indirect speech acts, implicature, and implicature-maximizing principles. Let me explain each of these:

1. Indirect speech acts: Sometimes, speakers use indirect language to convey their intended meaning. For example, if someone says, "Could you pass the salt?" during a meal, they are not merely asking about the person's ability to pass the salt. Instead, they are indirectly requesting the salt. The implied meaning is understood by the listener based on the context and shared knowledge.

2. Implicature: Implicature refers to the implied meaning that arises from an utterance but is not explicitly stated. It relies on the listener's ability to infer information based on the context and the speaker's intention. For instance, if someone says, "I have a lot of work to do," it might imply that they are busy and unable to engage in a social activity, even though the statement doesn't explicitly mention it.

3. Implicature-maximizing principles: These are general guidelines that help listeners infer the most relevant implicature in a given context. Grice's Cooperative Principle is one such principle, which suggests that speakers and listeners in a conversation strive to be cooperative and make their contributions informative, truthful, relevant, and clear. The maxims associated with this principle include the Maxim of Quantity (be as informative as required but not more), the Maxim of Quality (provide information that is true), the Maxim of Relation (stay on topic), and the Maxim of Manner (be clear and avoid ambiguity). Violations or flouting of these maxims can lead to implicatures.

Overall, conversational implicature involves understanding the implicit meaning that is conveyed through context, shared knowledge, and the speaker's intentions, going beyond the literal meaning of the words used in a conversation.

2.4.2.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized conversational implicature, also known as generalized implicature, is a term coined by the philosopher H.P. Grice to describe a type of implicature that arises from a maxim violation in communication. It occurs when a speaker deliberately flouts a maxim of conversation to convey a particular meaning to the listener.

Grice proposed a set of cooperative principles and maxims that guide communication in everyday conversations. These maxims include the Maxim of Quantity (be as informative as required but not more), the Maxim of Quality (provide information that is true), the Maxim of Relation (stay on topic), and the Maxim of Manner (be clear and avoid ambiguity).

When a speaker violates one of these maxims, it can lead the listener to infer a meaning that goes beyond the literal interpretation of the words used. This inferred meaning is the generalized conversational implicature. The implicature is derived from the assumption that the speaker is being cooperative and expects the listener to recognize the violation and interpret the intended meaning.

For example, consider a situation where a person asks their friend, "Do you have any plans for the weekend?" If the friend responds with, "I have a book to finish," they are violating the Maxim of Quantity by providing less information than expected. The implicature derived from this violation might be that the friend does not want to disclose their actual plans for the weekend or is intentionally avoiding making plans with the person asking.

It's important to note that generalized conversational implicatures rely heavily on the shared knowledge, context, and background assumptions between the speaker and the listener. The listener must actively engage in implicature processing to interpret the intended meaning beyond the literal words spoken.

Overall, generalized conversational implicature is a type of implicature that arises from the violation of conversational maxims and allows for additional meaning to be inferred in a cooperative communication setting.

2.4.2.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature, also known as particularized implicature, is a term used in pragmatics to describe an implicature that arises from a specific context or situation, rather than being a general or widely applicable implicature. It is contrasted with generalized conversational implicature, which is derived from violations of conversational maxims.

Unlike generalized implicatures, which are based on general principles of conversation, particularized implicatures rely on specific information and contextual cues that are unique to a given conversation. These implicatures are not necessarily derived from maxim violations but rather from the specific circumstances surrounding the utterance.

The particularized implicature is often drawn from the speaker's choice of words, the context in which the communication takes place, and the shared knowledge between the speaker and the listener. It requires the listener to actively engage in the inference process to derive the intended meaning beyond the literal interpretation of the words used.

For example, consider the following conversation:

Person A: "I heard that John went to the party last night."

Person B: "John didn't tell me he was going."

In this context, Person B's response implies a particularized conversational implicature that suggests surprise or disappointment because John didn't inform them about attending the party. The implicature arises from the specific situation and the background knowledge of Person B and is not a violation of any conversational maxim.

Particularized conversational implicatures highlight the importance of context, shared knowledge, and situational factors in understanding the intended meaning of a speaker. They demonstrate how the interpretation of utterances goes beyond the literal meaning of the words and requires the listener to make inferences based on the specific context of the conversation.

2.5 Conversation

A conversation is a verbal or written exchange between two or more individuals where ideas, information, opinions, or emotions are communicated and shared. It involves a back-and-forth interaction, with each participant contributing their thoughts, responding to others, and actively engaging in the communication process.

Conversations can take place in various settings, such as face-to-face discussions, phone calls, online chats, or written correspondence. They serve as a means of expressing and

understanding thoughts, building relationships, sharing knowledge, and fostering social interaction.

In a conversation, participants typically take turns speaking, listening, and responding to each other. This dynamic interaction allows for the exchange of information, the exploration of ideas, the expression of emotions, and the negotiation of meaning. Effective conversations involve active listening, empathy, respect for diverse perspectives, and the ability to communicate clearly and effectively.

Conversations can be casual and informal, such as chatting with friends or family members, or they can be more structured and formal, such as business meetings or academic discussions. The topics of conversation can vary widely, ranging from everyday experiences and personal interests to professional matters, current events, or philosophical discussions.

Overall, a conversation is a fundamental mode of human communication that enables the sharing of thoughts, feelings, and information among individuals, fostering connection, understanding, and the exchange of ideas.

2.6 Movie

A movie, also known as a film or motion picture, is a form of visual storytelling that combines moving images, sound, and often other elements like dialogue, music, and special effects to create a narrative or convey a message. It is a medium of art and entertainment that has become immensely popular worldwide.

Movies are typically produced by a team of professionals, including directors, producers, screenwriters, actors, cinematographers, editors, and others, who collaborate to bring a story to life on the screen. The process involves scriptwriting, casting, filming, editing, and post-production, which encompasses activities like adding sound effects, visual effects, and scoring the film with music.

Movies can span a wide range of genres, including drama, comedy, action, romance, science fiction, horror, documentary, and many more. They can also be categorized based on their intended audience, such as children's movies, family-friendly films, or those targeted at mature audiences.

The experience of watching a movie usually takes place in a theater, where a large audience gathers to view it on a big screen. However, movies are also enjoyed at home through television, DVD or Blu-ray, online streaming platforms, or downloaded media files.

Movies have the power to entertain, evoke emotions, transport viewers to different worlds, challenge perceptions, explore societal issues, and provide a means of escapism. They can serve as a form of artistic expression, cultural reflection, and storytelling, captivating audiences with their visual and auditory elements, performances, and narratives.

In summary, a movie is a visual and auditory medium of storytelling that combines moving images, sound, and other elements to create a narrative or convey a message. It is a popular form of entertainment that spans various genres and offers a diverse range of cinematic experiences.

2.7 Movie Script

A movie script, also known as a screenplay, is a written document that serves as the blueprint for a film. It outlines the story, characters, dialogue, and actions that will be depicted on screen. A movie script is the foundation upon which a movie is created, providing guidance for the director, actors, and other crew members involved in the production.

Movie scripts typically follow a standardized format that includes specific elements and formatting conventions. Here are some key components commonly found in a movie script:

1. Scene Heading: It provides details about the location and time of a scene, typically written in uppercase and centered on the page.

2. Action Lines: These describe the physical actions, movements, and events that occur within a scene, helping to visually convey the story to the reader.

3. Character Names: Characters are introduced with their names written in uppercase and centered above their dialogue.

4. Dialogue: It consists of the spoken lines and conversations between characters. Dialogue is usually centered on the page, with the character's name preceding the spoken lines.

5. Parentheticals: These are brief notes within parentheses that provide additional information or instructions for the actors, such as indicating a character's tone of voice or physical actions while speaking.

6. Transitions: These are used to indicate changes in time, location, or perspective, such as "CUT TO," "FADE IN," "DISSOLVE TO," etc.

7. Sluglines: Also known as scene headers, these indicate changes in location or time within a scene. They are used to break the script into distinct scenes.

Movie scripts can vary in length, depending on the complexity of the story and the style of the writer. They can range from a few dozen pages for short films to hundreds of pages for feature-length movies.

Writing a movie script requires careful attention to storytelling, character development, dialogue, pacing, and visual description. It is a specialized form of writing that aims to capture the essence of the story and translate it into a visual and auditory experience on screen.

Movie scripts serve as a guide for the filmmaking process, providing a roadmap for the director, actors, cinematographers, and other crew members to bring the story to life. They are an essential tool in the production of a movie, enabling the collaborative efforts of the entire filmmaking team.

2.8 Previous Related Studies

Conversational implications in the film Beauty and the Beast Directed by Bill Condon, The purpose of this study was to identify the types of conversational implications and maxims violated in the film Beauty and the Beast. Conversational implications are implications that occur as a result of a violation of maxims in a conversation. According to Grice, there are two types of conversation engagement, namely; General conversational implications and specific conversational engagement. General conversational implications are implications that occur without a specific context and do not contain specific knowledge to calculate additional meanings, whereas specific conversational implications are implications that occur in a specific context and need special knowledge to calculate additional meanings.

Conversational Implicature in the Green Book Movie,Based on the findings and discussion from the previous chapter, the researchers concluded that two types of conversational implications can be found in the 2018 film Green Book: general conversational implications and personalized conversation engagement. The researchers found 12 general conversation implication data and 7 specific conversation engagement data. The data concluded that general conversational engagement was the predominance found in films because this phrase was used in everyday conversation, in both formal and informal contexts.

Analysis of conversational implicature in Split movie. Investigation of flouting of maxims and exclusions presented with types of conversational implicatures and their significance in the film Split reveals that implicatures play an important role in conveying the speaker's communication goals. The data from this study, which were analyzed using Grice's (1975) and Yule's (1996) theory of conversational implicatures, show that the characters in the Split trick conversation through expressions of darkness are uncooperative in providing inappropriate information followed by expressions. lies, including their special knowledge of certain contexts, and that these unrevealed implicatures characterize the characters in the film. In order to become a person who primarily uses implicatures, a

character named Dr. Fletcher, Kevin Wendell Crumb, and Casey Cooke were credited as actors. Therefore, it can be concluded that, as has also been said in the previous chapter, the use of implicature in particular gives the possibility for people to be able to convey (identify?) a person's characteristics.

Analysis of conversational implicature in the screenplay of the film "Kingdom of Heaven" by William Monahan. This study aims to identify the types of conversational implicature and non-compliance with the maxims that often appear in the scenario of the film Kingdom of Heaven. Based on the research results, there are two types of conversational implicature based on Grice's theory, namely general implicature and special implicature, which are found in this film script. However, the number of types is very unequal, where particular implicatures are more common than general implicatures. In addition, the results reveal that most of the non-compliance maxims violate the quantity maxim. This happens because many characters in the film provide information because it is not needed, but they know the audience or listeners understand what they mean, so most of them violate the maxim of quantity. The results of this study are unique from the results of research by Sudarni (2011) who found a difference in that the characters in the film Salt use more varied maxims in conversational implicatures so that they have more colorful meanings. However, this finding is actually similar to that examined in Muvida's work (2015) that the three main characters in the film Hotel Transylvania use more specific implicatures because listeners do not need to ask for confirmation because they already understand the context very well. , mostly sacrificing his own feelings for someone's happiness.