THE CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE USED BY THE MAIN CHARACTER IN I CARE A LOT MOVIE : A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

Nur Azizah Fitrianti[1], Murni Mahmud[2*]
Universitas Negeri Makassar
*Corresponding Email: murnimahmud@unm.ac.id

Abstract

The aim of this research is to discover the maxims that the main characters in the film "I Care a Lot" break, as well as the many forms of conversational implicatures that occur in the film. This research focuses on film analysis using Grice's implicature theory and cooperative principle (1975). The information was then evaluated using a qualitative descriptive approach. The goal of this study was to improve readers' understanding of pragmatics, particularly those connected to conversational implicatures. In addition, this study might be used as a source of information for future research. The findings demonstrate that the researchers detected 33 conversational implicature utterances, 21 Generalized Conversational Implicature utterances, and 12 Particularized Conversational Implicature utterances among the 225 utterances of the main character in the film "I care a lot." The researchers discovered 34 statements that violated the maxims based on the sorts of maxims proposed by Grice (1975). As a result, the main character frequently violates the rule by using Generalized Conversational implicature.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Conversational Implicature, Flouting Maxim.

INTRODUCTION

Communication is one technique for a human to express or send information utilizing a certain language or environment. Currently communication is vital in social situations because people must interpret what someone's intents and intentions are in their communication speech. A conversation's meaning is sometimes communicated explicitly and sometimes indirectly. Explicitly, communication expresses direct conversation, yet implicitly, an expression or conversation expresses more than what the speaker really said. By implicature, the implicit proposition of utterances is called.

One of the pragmatics' principles is implicature. Pragmatics itself is a term that refers to both the study of context-dependent meaning and the study of the speaker's intended meaning. Yule (1996) defines pragmatics as "the study of hidden meanings" or "the study of linguistic and communicative behaviors and their appropriateness" (Bublitz,2009). Conversational implicatures are more context-dependent in pragmatic research, whereas traditional implicatures are form-dependent. According to Grice (1975), an ideal communication should adhere to the Cooperative Principle (in Cole et al., 2004). First and foremost, one should talk as informative as possible. People must also convey what they believe to be true. Third, people must avoid expressing themselves in an ambiguous manner. Conversational implicature can occur when communication fails to work with the cooperative principle between the interlocutor.

Conversational implicature is a conclusion that comes from having a conversation. A listener infers meaning from a conversational utterance's implied message. Some listeners get what the speaker is saying, but others don't. Some people get messages easily, while

others do not. As a result, using the idea of conversational implicature, it is required to study the speech in a discussion in order to fully comprehend the indirect message.

In linguistics research, film is one of the things that can have an impact on people of all ages, from young people to the elderly. Film is frequently utilized to deliver a message in addition to being a source of entertainment. As a result, the phenomena of conversational implicature is common in the entertainment sector, such as in movies. Most of a character's speech in a film makes the audience think about what the character is saying since the character's words sometimes have different meanings or intentions than what the audience thinks. To grasp the meaning and purpose of a conversation, one must first understand the meaning of the conversation to avoid misunderstandings. Because film is one of the most popular audio visual media, conversational implicature in film becomes crucial.

This study used Grice's theory of conversational implicature to help it figure out what people mean when they say things to each other (1975). This is a conversational implication or proposition that develops when the speaker's purpose is communicated differently in the actual speaker's statement (Grice, 1975:43). There are four primary maxims that define criteria for how communication should be carried out based on the concept in question. Grice identified the guidelines and merged them into a broad principle known as Grice's Cooperative Principle.

There are some studies out there that show that this study is important to look into (Nanda et al, 2012; Vikry Vah., 2014; Fauziyah, 2016; and Prihatni 2018). For instance, in Take Me Out Indonesia, Nanda et al. (2012) conducted the first study, which focused on the presenter's conversational implicature. The second study, conducted by Vikry Vah (2014), examines the significance of the lines found in the characters' talks in the film Iron Man 3. Fauziyah (2016) is the third author, and her research focused on the conversational implicature function in talk shows. The most recent previous study was by Prihatni (2018), she looked into every character's utterances and separated them into flouting maxim and conversational implicature.

The researchers discovered that the main character sometimes utters the implied meanings when he or she is communicating with the speaker or the audience. As a result, the speaker's words can be perplexing to the listener. According to Grice's theory, in order for communication to run well, the speaker should follow the cooperative principle known as maxim, which entails maxim quantity, quality, relation, and manner. As a result, the researchers wanted to know how the main character's utterances cope with conversational implicature and their reactions when they hear or read the speaker or listener breaking a rule. In line with the background of the study, the problem are formulated as follows:

1. What are the types of conversational implicature used by the main character in I care a lot movie?
2. What are the maxim violations of conversational used by the main character in I care a lot movie?

Related to the explained above, there are several reviews of related literature about this study as follows:

Pragmatics

"Pragmatics" is a term coined by Charles Morris to describe the study of actual language use in linguistics. Pragmatics investigates language from the point of view of language users in

their situational, behavioral, cultural, sociological, and political contexts, employing a wide range of methodologies and multidisciplinary approaches, depending on the research goals. Knowing what other individuals are saying in a given context and how that situation affects what they say is required for pragmatics.

Pragmatics is concerned with qualities of meaning that are not 'found' but 'done' in combination with a specific application, according to the author. It investigates features of meaning that are not covered by semantic theory in a pragmatic sense. Pragmatics is the study of the link between symbols and their meanings. A literary work is considered as a technique to communicate particular goals to the reader while employing a pragmatic approach. According to Levinson, pragmatics encompasses deixis, presuppositions, speech acts, and conversational implicatures.

Context Culture

The high and low context culture framework proposed by anthropologist Edward T Hall is one technique to achieve such an insight. Cultures are divided into two categories namely; high context and low context. A culture's high context or low context can determine many other features of a culture, while being a complicated characteristic.

People in high-context cultures, for example, look for things they have in common. In this case because in high context culture, most people have the same level of education, as well as a common race, religion, and history. Because of the context, it's possible to think about messages in a way that makes sense to people who read or listen to them. In cultures that don't have a lot of context in other words in the low context cultures, this isn't the case at all. Since there are so many variables within a low-context culture, communication must be simple enough to accommodate these differences for as many people to understand it as possible. Conversely, when high-context persons do not supply enough information, low-context people will be at a loss.

Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature refers to the pragmatic implications that can be found in a conversation when there is a breach in the rules of the conversation. According to Yule's pragmatic book, implicature is inextricably tied to the cooperative principle in dialogue. The meaning or information that can be inferred from a communication is known as conversational implication. As a result, conversational implicature might arise when someone refuses to cooperate throughout a conversation.

Conversational Implicature is a concept that is suggested in the way people speak. Implicature is also described as a notion or concept that pertains to what a speech implies but does not explicitly say. As a result, the implicature which is communicated The speaker can always dispute that he wanted to convey that meaning in a conversation without stating so, but the meaning here is the meaning of the dialogue itself, which cannot be denied. Conversational Implicature is divided into two categories proposed by Grice (1975) : Generalized Conversational Implicature, and Particularized Conversational Implicature.

Generalized Conversational Implicature

On Yule entitled pragmatics states that generalized conversational implicature is when we don't need any special knowledge or inference to figure out how much extra meaning is being conveyed. In other words, Generalized conversational implicature is implicature which shows that its existence in a conversation does not depend on context. The example can see below:

02:00 Mr.Quan: "So he won't drive you?"
02:03 Fan: "Limo's come with drivers. So, stop worrying"

The conversation above happens without referring to any specific context aspects. Because the context employed in this type is a general discourse, the hearer does not need particular understanding to understand the meaning of the dialogue.

Particularized Conversational Implicature

Grice (1975) states that particularized conversational implicature is when a conversation occurs in a specific context. Particularly conversational implicature happens when people talk they use the specific features of the situation. Thus, particularized conversational implicatures occur because some things that happen in the context of speech aren't usually caused by sentences that are used in a conversation. The example can be seen below:

Byun : "have you upgraded to the latest ios on your iPhone?"
Sehun : "My Iphone only 5s"

The conversation above indicates that in order to calculate the additional imparted meaning, the listener must have prior knowledge or conclusions. The particularized conversational implicature also necessitates the listener's assistance in comprehending the meaning of a discussion. Yes or no might be the response of that conversation.

Cooperative Principle

The Cooperative Principle is a theory that explains how we make assumptions when communicating effectively, and how we try to work together to make the conversation meaningful. Each speaker must follow the four maxims of conversation in order to carry out the "cooperation principle" of the conversation: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of Manner. This idea, on the other hand, is not always followed. As a result, there are many "violations" of the corporation's rules/principles in a dialogue. The violation of that principle does not imply a "breakdown" or "failure" in the discussion (communication), but rather a purposeful infringement on the part of the speaker in order to achieve an implicature impact in the speech he delivers.

Flouting Maxim

Flouting Maxim is a covert method of getting the interlocutor to make conclusions and therefore can make the implicature. Furthermore, If someone breaks the maxims, he has purposefully and obviously failed to fulfill and obey the maxims for communicative reasons, according to Grice. The terms "flouting maxim" and "violating maxim" are interchangeable. As a result, when a maxim is broken, the speaker's intended message to the listener is not transmitted appropriately. "Speakers plainly fail to observe a maxim at the level of what is being uttered, with the explicit intention of causing implicatures," according to Thomas. There are several flouting maxims proposed by Grice's Maxim: Flouting maxim of quantity, Flouting maxim of quality, Flouting maxim of relation, and Flouting maxim of manner.

RESEARCH METHOD

Qualitative research describes a word by looking at things like behavior, perceptions, motivation, and other actions of the people who do the research. Qualitative research uses scientific methodologies to explain an experience by research subjects by examining specific settings such as behaviours, perceptions, motivation, and other behaviors. The researchers wanted to identify and explain the conversation of the main character in I Care a lot movie; Therefore, the focus of this research is on the main character's utterances and sentences related to conversational implicatures and fluting maxims. The researchers used the film script data that had been obtained and then matched it while watching the film to be able to classify the main character utterances related to the conversational implicature and also the flouting maxim.

The first step was that the researchers watched the film first and then matches it with the film script that has been obtained to find out the context and background in the film, whether the main character violates the cooperative principle of Grice (1975) that is; flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of relation, and flouting maxim of manner. Second, the researchers took a note to make it "highlight" in the every utterances in dialogue that the movie included in the conversational implicature. In collecting data, researchers re-watched that movie to get accurate data.

The researchers then classified the main character utterance which includes conversational implicature and also the flouting maxim proposed by Grice (1975) and is also supported by several theories such as Levinson (1983) and also Yule.G (1996). The researchers also made a table to make it easier to make a summary of which utterances were included in the conversational implicature category and also violated Grice's (1975) cooperative principle. After interpreting the data obtained from the study as the research method described earlier, the researchers reported it. After going through several stages, namely identifying problems, collecting data, and analyzing data, the researchers finally made a report on the results of this study.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Findings

Deals with the two problem statements in this research, which is what are the types of conversational implicature and what are the maxim violations of conversational used by the

main character, the researchers uses the theory of Grice (1975) and also supporting theory from (Leech, 1983, 2014) and Levinson (1991). The result of the research can be seen below:

Types of Conversational Implicature

This research found that the main character used two types of conversational implicature, namely, Generalized Conversational Implicature and Particularized Conversational Implicature. The following is a more detailed explanation:

Generalized Conversational Implicature

The generalized conversational implicature happens in the absence of any specific context elements. Because the context employed in this type is a general discourse, the hearer does not need special context understanding to understand the meaning of the dialogue. Based on the researchers' the result is be presented as follows:

Extract 5

Figure 1 *Marla want to the medical records from the next client*

12.45   Marla: "Can I get a copy of this?"
12.46   dr. Amos: "**You bet, all except her test result that wouldn't be ethical**"
12.53   Marla: "of course"

In extract 5 above, we can conclude that Marla's utterance "*Can I get a copy of this?*" can be understood by the listener because the utterance doesn't require a specific context that must be understood by the listener. Marla's utterance is generalized conversational implicature because the utterance can be directly concluded by dr. Amos that Marla wants all of Jennifer's medical records.

Extract 10

Figure 2 *Marla meets Jennifer and trying explains the court order*

17.53   Marla: "In emergencies, the court can convene without the presence of the prospective ward."
17.56   Jennifer: "**That's crazy**"

In extract 10 above Marla's speech can be directly understood by listeners that " **In emergencies** , the court can convene without the presence of the prospective ward". Jennifer immediately understood without having to know a certain context because Marla already implied in her speech about the courts itself. Marla's utterance is generalized conversational implicature because Marla not only explained about "the court" but also implies that in an emergency the court can decide unilaterally even without the person present.

Extract 12

Figure 3 *Marla trying to explain to how she can bring Jennifer*

19.35   Sam : "Marla, how's it going? You have to drag her out by her ankles?"
19:37   Marla: "**No, she packed and walked**. Hardly any of them fight. They see the official paper, they see the cops, then go right along"

In extract 12 above, we can conclude that Marla understands what Sam's question means. Marla understands that Sam is questioning how Jennifer can come right away with Marla. Marla's statement "They see the official paper, the see the cops then go right along" is the generalized conversational implicature because it has an implied meaning that Jennifer was afraid and deceived by the documents that Marla brought and the police who came with Marla.

Extract 13 :

Figure 4 *Marla is driving a car while responding to a call from Sam*

19.51   Sam: "Hey, you ever heard about the Milgram experiment?"
19.54   Marla: "**Not now Sam, We're already in transit.**"

In extract 13 above, The conversation occurs when Marla is driving her car. Thus, we can conclude that Marla understands what Sam is about to discuss but Marla is on her way. Marla's utterance is the generalized conversational implicature because the utterance can be understood without having to have a certain context.

Extract 24 :

Figure 5 *Dean is assuming about Marla for eyeing Jennifer*

39.41   Marla: "Now, why the fuck would I do that?"
39.50   Dean: "**Well, I can think of two reasons.** One, it is the right thing to do but don't
that means anything to you. And two, because she has very powerful.. friends who
can make life uncomfortable for you"

In extract 24 above, The conversation occurs when Dean is a lawyer who is shown to take out Jennifer from a guardian company. We can conclude that Marla's utterance "Why the fuck would I do that" is generalized conversational implicature because the utterance can understood by the interlocutor and Dean can immediately answer what Marla meant.

Particularized Conversational Implicature

This conversational implicature occurs when a listener or speaker requires context knowledge in order to comprehend the meaning of a communication. Someone must also help the listener understand what is being said in order for it to make a conversation effective. According to the findings of the researcher's observations, the following particularized conversational implicature was discovered:

Extract 6 :

Figure 6 *Fran is showing all about the Jennifer records she got to Marla*

13.57   Fran: "Look at this, from her tax records, it says that she has three separate
saving accounts, all earning monster interest. She likes to go to the movies

during the day. She reads a lot and likes gardening. Just your regular old lady."

14.06   Marla: "**She is sitting on pile of cash.**"

In extract 6 above, Fran and Marla's conversation is included in Type Particularized Conversational implicature because Marla must see data and also evidence of tax records that Fran talked about. The conversation occurs when Fran had found some evidence in hard file form shown to Marla, Thus Marla's utterance **"She is sitting on a pile of cash"** indicates that she must know the specific context.

Extract 7 :

Figure 7 *Jennifer looks confused because she doesn't know anything about the court order that Marla brought*

16.53   Marla: "It's court order ma'am"
16.57   Jennifer: "**A court order?** But what's that got to do with me?"

In the extract above, Marla's utterance is Particularized Conversational implicature because the listener must have special knowledge, as you can see when Jennifer said "**A court order?** But what's that got to do with me?" That means, Jennifer must have a lot of knowledge of Court order in order to understand Marla's meaning.

Extract 55 :

Figure 8 *License plate number of Russian car in Marla's hand*

1.30.38 Fran: "What's that, Marla?"
1.30.42 Marla: "**It's the license plate of the car our Russian friend was driving**"

In extract 55 above, This conversation occurred when Fran accidentally saw letter combination numbers in Marla's hand. Thus, Marla's interlocutor had to know about the context Marla was talking about. Fran must understand the license plate of Russian cars. It's called Particularized Conversational Implicature.

Types of Flouting Maxim
After collecting the data, the researcher found that the main character used four kinds of flouting maxim, namely, Flouting maxim of quantity, quality, relation and manner. The detail explanation is be presented as follows:

Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Extract 1 :

Figure 8 *Sam is calling Marla and telling some news*

08.51   Sam: "I got some news"
08.56   Marla: "Good news or bad news?"
08.59   Sam: "**Sort of both. You ward, Alan Levitt, here at our Berkshire Oaks facility, he just ied.**"

In extract 1 above, As we can see Marla's remarks were responded to with Information overload. The response of Marla's interlocutor looks excessive and included in the Flouting maxim of quantity because Sam provides too much information. Marla just asks "Good news or bad news" but Sam explains about Alan Levitt's death. Marla got more information than Marla needed.

Extract 17

Figure 9 *Marla looks happy because she got something in Jennifer's private deposit*

32.17   Fran: "Do you think they're stolen?"
32.19   Marla: "**Probably**"

In extract 17 above, The conversation occurs when Marla is talk about what she got from his private deposit box from Jennifer. But as we can see the question from Fran that "Do you think they're " and Marla answer "Probably" that's stolen what Marla said included in the maxim for quantity because it gives a little information to Fran.

Extract 44 :

Figure 9*Marla brought the diamonds to the Jewelry shop*

1.10.17 Marla: "What are we talking retail?"
1.10.19 Vee: "Mm, 175, maybe 200 grand."

In extract 44 above, Their conversation occurred when Marla was at jewelry. Marla's words "What are we talking retail?" get less specific answers and break the rule of maxim of quantity. Vee gives two possibilities "175 maybe 200 Grand" which should give only one answer.

Flouting Maxim of Quantity
Extract 8 :

Figure 10. *Jennifer is confused why she has to have a guardian*

17.05   Jennifer: "Have I done something wrong?"

17.08   Marla: "**Oh, no, ma'am. This is to help you. The court has ruled, under the guidance of your doctor, that require assistance in taking care of yourself. The court has appointed to me to be your legal guardian.**"

In extract 8 above, Their conversation occurred when Marla was trying to convince Jennifer that she had to come with Marla because the court appointed Marla to be Jennifer's legal guardian. Jennifer looks still confused and then Marla assured with said " **This is to help you. The court has ruled, under the guidance of your doctor, that require assistance in taking care of yourself.**" As we can see Marla's utterance based on the context has provided incorrect information, Marla floating maxim of quality. In fact all the documents that Marla brought to convince Jennifer are fake.

Extract 9 :

Figure 11. *Marla keeps giving reasons why Jennifer should come with her*

17.31   Jennifer: "I'm not struggling, I'm fine. I'm more than fine. I don't need help."
17.38   Marla: "**I'm afraid it's not up to you or me to decide. The court has ruled that you do need help and, as your legal guardian, it's my duty to ensure that adequate care is supplied to you at all the times.**"

In extract 9 above, it has the same context with extract that yang previously described. In this extract we can see Marla's words " **The court has ruled that you do need help and, as your legal guardian, it's my duty to ensure that adequate care is supplied to you at all the times.**" is information that doesn't correspond to reality. Marla tried to look sympathetic and tried to make a statement that Jennifer would be safe if with her. Marla's speech is breaking the rule of maxim of quality.

Extract 11 :

Figure 12. *Marla threatens Jennifer for come with her*

18.00   Jennifer: "I'm not going anywhere"
18.05   Marla: "**This is a court order. And if you don't comply with it, I'm afraid you may be in some trouble.**"

In extract above, Marla still looks convincing and threatens Jennifer with saying " **if you don't comply with it, I'm afraid you may be in some trouble".** Marla's utterance is included in the Flouting maxim of quality because she even brought the police to prove to Jennifer that She is the legal guardian.

Flouting Maxim of Relation
Extract 19 :

Figure 13.*Dean is in Marla's room office*

36.57   Dean: "This is beautiful office. These all your awards?"
37.04   Marla: "**What can I do for you, Mr. Ericson?**"

In extract 19 above, Their conversation takes place in Marla's room. Dean ask "These all your wards?" but Marla's answer "What can I do for you" is a flouting maxim of relation because what Marla gave to the interlocutor wasn't relation with the context in question. Marla should have answered "yes that is my wards" but Marla instead answered something unrelated.

Extract 32 :

Figure 14. *Marla asked about Jennifer's condition but Jennifer didn't really respond*

45.10   Marla: "Jennifer. How are you feeling?"
45.14   Jennifer: "**Why do I know you?**"

Their conversation above occurred when Marla visited and saw Jennifer's condition in the hospital. Marla's question "How are you feeling" and gets an answer that is irrelevant to the question she gave. Jennifer should answer about the feelings she is right now but She's answer "Why I do know you" their conversation it's flouting maxim of relation.
Extract 34 :

Figure 15. *Jennifer keeps diverting Marla's questions*

46.29   Marla: "Jennifer, who are you?"
46.36   Jennifer: "**So much drugs. Drugs, I can't think**."

Their conversation is still in the hospital park. Marla was curious about Jennifer so she asked "who are you" but Jennifer did not answer Marla's question but made a statement that She took so much medicine that she can't think. Their conversation is a flouting maxim of relation because listeners give a response that isn't related to the topic being discussed.

Flouting Maxim of Manner
Extract 33 :

Figure 16. *Marla is getting confused because Jennifer keeps acting weird*

46.09   Jennifer: "You're in trouble now"
46.13   Marla: "Really? Why?"
46.15   Jennifer: "Yeah, He's c-o-m-i-n-g"

In extract above, Jennifer makes a statement that Marla is in trouble because she has put Jennifer in the hospital. Marla asks "Really? Why?" then Jennifer answered "Yeah, He's

coming" incoherently because it looked like she was exhausted from taking too many drugs according to the context of their previous conversation. Their conversation is included in the implicature but flouting maxim of manners.

Discussion

After explaining the extract of the conversational implicature that the main character used, the researcher can finally answer the research question that is; the first question is about the conversational implicature that used by the main character in "I Care a Lot" movie and the second question is about violations maxim that is used by the main character. The first question is the type of conversational used in the main character, Grice (1975) divided into two categories: conversational implicature, which are Generalized Conversational Implicature and Particularized Conversational Implicature.

The main character in this research mostly uses generalized conversational implicature because the speaker fails to make the conversation specific. The use of this conversational implicature is fewer than generalized which has been described before because it requires a special context to be able to understand. Back to the definition of Particularized Conversational Implicature, Grice (1975) states that, A conversation that takes place in a particularly precise setting is known as particularized conversational implicature. In general, Particularized conversational implicature also can occur in the violation of the maxim of relation and the violation of the maxim of manner. In particular conversational implicatures, the same background knowledge is needed to interpret what the main character says in the film "I Care a Lot".

Furthermore, the researcher finds the answer that the main character mostly violates the maxim of quantity and maxim of relation. In this film, the main character flouts the maxim of quantity because the speaker does not make information as is needed or more informative than is needed. In this case, the main character in this movie mostly uses High context culture Hall (1990) because In high-context communication, the listener is supposed to deduce the message's meaning from the context.

Moreover, Related to the context culture, flouting maxim quantity occurs because in low-context keep giving them information that they don't want. The main character actually used both of them, which is high and low context culture but the high culture context is one that tends to predominate because people in high-context societies do not demand much in the way of background information for most everyday interactions.

As Cutting states that, Flouting maxim of quantity occurs when the speaker gives too little or too much information. Therefore, by violating the maxim of quantity, most listeners will not ask again because the speaker has explained information that is not even needed by the listener. In addition, the maxim of relation occurs because many conversations in the film do not know the context and the topic being discussed, going back to As Cutting says that the speaker who violates the maxim of relation expects the listener to understand the meaning behind the unspoken utterance and make a connection between what is said.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions, the writer collected several points for easier understanding about this research. The conclusion is as follows:

1. The researchers found the main character mostly used generalized conversational implicature, furthermore "I care a lot" has a lot of conversational implicature, and it's important to pay attention to it in everyday life as well.
2. The researchers found that the main character violates all the maxim but, In General the main character a lot violates maxim quantity and relation because the conversation in the movie dominant use style more informal language and dominant use a high context culture.
3. Generally, both violations of the maxim occur because the conversational implicature used is dominant generalized conversational implicature, in addition to that because context and flow from the movie is hard to guess. In other words, we need special knowledge in order to interpret and understand the speaker 's speech.

REFERENCES

Black, E. (2005). *Pragmatic stylistics*. Edinburgh University Press

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.

Cutting, J. (2005). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge

Fauziyah, N. A. (2016). *Conversational Implicature in chew talk show*. (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim).

He, Y. (2012). Cooperative principle in English and Chinese cultures. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Pragmatics, discourse analysis, stylistics and "The Celebrated Letter."*

Levinson, P. (2016). The Flouting of the First Amendment - transcript of June 2005 Keynote Address by Paul Levinson, (October).

Levinson, S. C. (1987). Implicature explicated? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *10*(4), 722-723

Lotto, L. S. (1986). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods: Matthew B. Miles and A. Michael Huberman. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *8*(3), 329–331.

Nanda, S., Sukyadi, D., & Sudarsono, M. I. (2012). Conversational implicature of the presenters in Take Me Out Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 120–138.

Thesis, A., & Prihatini, Y. W. (2018). *Conversational Implicatures In " The Foreigner " Movie English And Literature Department Alauddin State Islamic University Of Makassar*.

Yin, R. K. (2015). Qualitative research from start to finish. Guilford publications.

Yule, G. (2016). The study of language (Sixth Edit). Cambridge University Press.