CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN UNDISPUTED MOVIE

Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Bachelor Degree Of English Department Faculty of Art and Humanities State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya.



By:

JOHAN ANDIKA FERDIANSA

REG. Number: A73214044

ENGLISH DEPARTEMENT

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

2019

DECLARATION

The undersigned,

Name Johan Andika Ferdiansa

Reg. Number :: A73214044

I hereby declare that my thesis was I wrote is original work and does not imitate the work of anyone previously written or published by another person. I wrote this thesis to fulfill the requirement to get the degree of Bachelor in the English Department. Faculty of Letters and Humanities, State Islamic University Sunan Ampel Surabaya entitled *"Conversational Implicature in Undisputed Movie"*.

Surabaya, January 24th 2019



Johan Andika Ferdiansa

CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN UNDISPUTED MOVIE By Johan Andika Ferdiansa A73214044

有品

4.2

43

.45

Approved to be examined Surabaya, January 24^{th,} 2019

Thesis Advisor

Endratno Pilih Swasono, M.Pd NIP: 197106072003121001

Acknowledged by The Head of The English Department

salep

<u>Dr. Wahju Kusumajanti, M.Hum</u> NIP: 197002051999032002

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES SUNAN AMPEL STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SURABAYA 2019

v

This thesis has been approved and accepted by the Board of Examiners,

English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, State Islamic

University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya, on 11 th February 2019.

The Dean of Faculty of Arts and Humanities



The Board of Examiners

Examiner I

Examiner II

61

Endratno Pilih Swasono NIP.19710607200312100 1

Examiner III

Raudiotul Jannah, M.App.Ling NIP.19781006200501200 4

Murni Fidiyant, MA NIP.19830530201101201 1

Examiner IV

<u>Abdulloh Ubet, M.Ag</u> NIP. 196605071997031003



KEMENTERIAN AGAMA UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA PERPUSTAKAAN

Jl. Jend. A. Yani 117 Surabaya 60237 Telp. 031-8431972 Fax.031-8413300 E-Mail: perpus@uinsby.ac.id

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI KARYA ILMIAH UNTUK KEPENTINGAN AKADEMIS

Sebagai sivitas akademika UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama	: Johan Andlike Ferdionse
NIM	: A7321604F1
Fakultas/Jurusan	: Adob/Sestra ingqris
E-mail address	: Johanandika 1922 Q. amail Com
UIN Sunan Ampe	agan ilmu pengetahuan, menyetujui untuk memberikan kepada Perpustakaan El Surabaya, Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif atas karya ilmiah : Tesis Desertasi Lain-lain () Sational Implicture in Unchisputeci Movie

beserta perangkat yang diperlukan (bila ada). Dengan Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Ekslusif ini Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya berhak menyimpan, mengalih-media/format-kan, mengelolanya dalam bentuk pangkalan data (database), mendistribusikannya, dan menampilkan/mempublikasikannya di Internet atau media lain secara *fulltext* untuk kepentingan akademis tanpa perlu meminta ijin dari saya selama tetap mencantumkan nama saya sebagai penulis/pencipta dan atau penerbit yang bersangkutan.

Saya bersedia untuk menanggung secara pribadi, tanpa melibatkan pihak Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, segala bentuk tuntutan hukum yang timbul atas pelanggaran Hak Cipta dalam karya ilmiah saya ini.

Demikian pernyataan ini yang saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Surabaya, 11-02-2019

Penulis

Johon Andika nama terang dan tanda tangan

ABSTRACT

Ferdiansa, Johan Andika. *Conversational Implicature In Undisputed Movie.* Thesis. English Department, Faculty of Art and Humanities, State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Advisor: Endratno Pilih Swasono, M.Pd

Keywords: Conversational Implicature, Undisputed Movie

This research analyzed conversational implicature and the violation maxim in the movie entitled 'Undisputed' directed by Walter Hill. The researcher chose and analyzed this movie because the language style like the impoliteness is much used by the characters in that movie. The researcher used conversational Implicature theory by Grice in order to classify the conversational implicature types; generalized conversational and particularized conversational implicature. The researcher also used violation maxim as the supporting theory.

The researcher used a descriptive qualitative method to answer the two problems in this research. The first problem is to analyze what is the conversational implicature types found in the 'Undisputed' movie. Second is to analyze the violation maxim that violated by the speakers when uttering the implicatures. The data of this research was from the utterance on the 'Undisputed' movie's transcript which contained conversational implicature.

As the result, the types of conversational implicature that found in this study were generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. It was found 18 data of generalized conversational implicature and 3 data of particularized conversational implicature. This research also found four types of maxim which violated by the speakers. It was found 10 data of violation maxim of quantity, 8 data of violation maxim of manner, 2 data of violation maxim of relevant, and a datum of violation maxim of quality. In conclusion All of the implicatures and violated maxim that used by the characters in this movie generally are used to make the utterance to be impolite, some were used to soften the utterance and to insinuate the hearer.

INTISARI

Ferdiansa, Johan Andika. *Conversational Implicature In Undisputed Movie.* Skripsi. Sastra Inggris, Facultas Adab dan Humaniora, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Dosen Pembimbing: Endratno Pilih Swasono, M.Pd

Kata Kunci: Conversational Implicature, Undisputed Movie

Penelitian ini menganalisa implikasi percakapan dan pelanggaran maksim di film yang berjudul Undisputed yang di sutradarai oleh Walter Hill. Peneliti memilih untuk menganalisa film ini karena gaya bahasa seperti banyak kata-kata kasar yang digunakan para pemeran di film tersebut. Peneliti menggunakan teori implikasi percakapan dari Grice untuk menggolongkan jenis implikasi percakapan; implikasi percakapan umum dan implikasi percakapan khusus. Peneliti juga menggunakan pelanggaran maksim sebagai teori pendukung. Dia menganalisa apa itu prinsip kerjasama maksim yang dilanggar oleh para pembicara ketika mereka menyampaikan implikasi.

Peneliti menggunakan metode deskriptif untuk menjawab rumuasan masalah di penelitian ini; 1) apa jenis-jenis implikasi percakapan yang Nampak di film Undisputed? Dan 2) apa saja pelanggaran maksim yang dilanggar oleh para pembicara ketika menyampaikan implikasi? Data penelitian ini berasal dari ujaran yang mengandung implikasi percakapan yang ditemukan di transkrip film tersebut.

Hasilnya, jenis-jenis implikasi percakapan yang ditemukan di penelitian ini adalah implikasi percakapan umum dan implikasi percakapan khusus. Telah ditemukan 18 data implikasi percakapan umum dan 3 data implikasi percakapan khusus. Penelitian ini juga menemukan 4 jenis maksim yang dilanggar oleh para pembicara. Ditemukan 10 data yang melanggar maksim kuantitas, 8 data maksim manner, 2 data maksim relevan, dan sebuah data pelanggaran maksim kualitas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Inside Cover Pagei
Declaration Pageii
Mottoiii
Dedication Pageiv
Thesis Advisor's Approval Pagev
Thesis Examiner's Approval Pagevi
Acknowledgmentsvii
Table of Contentix
Abstractxi
Intisarixii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION
1.1 Background of The Study
1.2 Research Problem5
1.3 Research Objective
1.4 Significance of the study5
1.5 Scope and Limitation
1.6 Definition of key terms6
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Review of Related Literature
2.1.1 Implicature
2.1.2 Conversational Implicature
2.1.2.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature9
2.1.2.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

2.1.3 Cooperative Principle and Maxims	10
2.1.4 Violation of Maxims	14
2.1.5 Context	18
CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Research Design	19
3.2 Data Collection	20
3.2.1 Source of The Data	20
3.2.2 Instruments	20
3.2.3 Techniques of Data Collection	21
3.3 Data Analysis	22
CHAPTER IV: FINDING AND DISCUSSION	
4.1 Research Findings	23
4.1.1 The Type of Conversational Implicature	24
4.1.2 Analysis of Th <mark>e D</mark> ata	
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	
5.1 Conclusion	56
5.2 Suggestion	56
REFERENCES	57
APPENDIX	

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

In this research, the researcher analyzed conversational implicature in Undisputed Movie. The researcher focused on the characters' utterance in this movie which contains implicature. As additional information, this movie was directed by Walter Hill and published on 2002.

Actually, there had been many researches in the field of conversational implicature. Some of those inspired the researcher to make this study as a further investigation in the related topic. The first research study is made by Avinda Norhaniva from State Islamic University of Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Malang, in 2016. That research, entitled Generating Conversational Implicature Strategies on the Advertisements of Vogue Magazine, used the descriptive qualitative method as the research design. There are two objectives of the study on that research. The first is to analyze the strategies of generating conversational implicature which is used by the copywriter in Vogue Magazine. The second is to identify several possible reasons beyond generating conversational implicature in Vogue Magazine. As result, that study found two strategies that can be used to apply conversational implicature. The first was the observance of cooperative principle maxim. Another one was a violation of cooperative principle maxim. It was also found four reasons of the speakers in uttering particular implicature. Those are interestingness, increase the force of message, compete goals, and politeness.

The second previous research was created by Nadya Alfi Fauziyah from the same instantion in 2012. The title is "Conversational on The Chew Talk Show". The research is using a descriptive method. There are two objectives of the study on that thesis. The first is to investigate the types of conversational implicature found in the conversation of The Chew talk show. Another objective is to investigate the functions of conversational implicature. The result is found particularized conversational implicature and generalized conversational implicature. And the function why the speakers use the implicature is to make the situation be more fun. She said that the reason is because that talk show was informal.

Furthermore, Wang (2011) investigated conversational implicature in English Listening Comprehension. Before going to the point explaining main research findings and analysis, she mentioned four maxims of cooperative principle initiated by Grice. Those are the maxim of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. Furthermore, she also wrote about violation of the maxims. Regardless of it all, her conclusion stated that Grice's conversational implicature theory affects someone's listening comprehension, particularly in getting understanding from the conversation. The reason was the factors that influence one's listening affects his or her attention greatly.

The Reason why the researcher was interested to analyze the types conversational implicature and find the dominant conversational implicature in 'Undisputed' movie, because it talks about a place in prison and there is much implicature on the rude language used by the characters. Not only analyzing the types implicature, but the researcher also analyzed maxims that violated by the speakers when uttering the implicature and find the dominant violation maxim.

The distinction between the previous studies were that those studies analyzed the implicature on talk show and magazine which the language being analyzed is not rude although the talk show is informal. On Undisputed Movie that using most of the rude language can be brought up different implicature.

According to (Horn, 2004:3), implicature is a speaker meaning which delivers a meaning using an utterance that the meaning is not literally what he said. In other words, it is the indirect meaning or those hidden behind the meaning of words uttered by the interlocutor. It usually implies meaning which is different from the literal meaning of the words being said. So, using implicature in a speech means that the interlocutor is about to tell something indirectly.

There are two parts of implicature, the first is conventional implicature and the second is conversational implicature. The conventional implicature is implicature that obtained directly from the meaning of the word not from the conversation principle (Yule 1996:227). The conversational implicature arised because violating the conversational principle. It is different from the speaker's intention and the speaker's utterance (Grice 1975:43).

Conversational implicature itself divided into two kinds. The first is generalized conversational implicature and the second is particular conversational implicatue. The generalized conversational imiplicature is type in which the interlocutors do not require special knowledge to know the meaning of conversation because the context used in this type is a general conversation that makes in

3

interlocutor directly understand the meaning of the conversation (Grice,1975:44). The particularized conversational implicature is an implicature where some assumed knowledge is required in very specific context during a conversation (Yule 1996:234).

Furthermore, to analyze the conversational the implicature, the researcher also used the cooperative principle theory of Levinson as the supporting theory. In order to have a successful conversation, a speaker and a h. All the violated maxim are used to make the utterance to be fun, satire, and deny politely; because some of the characters have their own style language to make conversation be interested. heearer must obey the cooperative principles. The cooperative principle is a set of rules to make conversation clear, informative, and smoothly. According to Levinson (1983:100), "cooperative principle is a set of general rules described how participants 'cooperate' in conversation to achieve smooth and efficient interaction". Its mean that, there are some rules that must be required to achieve a successful conversation.

As stated by Wang (2011), the cooperative principle commonly has four maxims (Grice, 1975:28). First, the maxim of quality is about the speaker tells the truth or provable by adequate evidence. Second, the maxim of quantity is the speaker is as informative as required. Third, the maxim of relation is about the response is relevant to the topic of discussion. And the last is the maxim of manner. Speaker avoids ambiguity or obscurity, is direct and straightforward (Partridge, 2007:62).

1.2 Research Problem

This research is conducted to answer the problem in the following questions:

- 1. What are the types of conversational implicature appears in Undisputed Movie?
- 2. What are the violations maxim that violated by the speaker when uttering the implicatures?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Based on the problems, the objectives of the study are aimed:

- To describe the types of conversational implicature that appears in Undisputed Movie used Grice's Theory.
- 2. To describe the violation maxim that violated by the speakers when uttering the implicature.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The result of the study is expected to be useful for the readers, especially the student of English Department to understanding more about conversational implicature that used in public speaking or speech. Furthermore, the study expected to help the other researcher or student who interested in doing further studies related with conversational implicature and give big contributions for the other reader of literary works in the study of linguistics, especially about the cohesive conversational implicature.

1.5 Scope and Limitation

The scope in this research is focused on the conversational implicature, include in two types: Generalized implicature and Particular implicature by Grice theory, that found in Undisputed Movie. The data is from the utterance that indicated as implicature. The limitation, the researcher only analyze the conversational implicature and using violation maxim theory by Grice theory.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

This is some terms used in the study:

- 1. Implicature is part of the meaning behind literally meaning said by speaker without being part of what is said (Horn, 2004:3).
- 2. Conversational implicature is an implicature, meaning behind literally meaning that appear in conversation (Grice 1975:43).
- 3. The "Undisputed" Movie tells of an undefeated world champion George 'Iceman' Chambers who was convicted of a rape case and put in prison, where he had to face a Monroe Hutchen in the octagon of prison. they fought for their respective pride, another battle for their future and only one would get the "Undisputed" ring.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Review of Related Literature

As a purpose to answer the research problem, the researcher used these theories; speech act and context that will explain clearly in this chapter.

2.1.1 Implicature

Implicature is one branch of pragmatics. Based on Mey (2001:45) the word implicature is from "to imply". it means when speaker want to said something, he do not convey it directly but use other statement to imply what he means. based on gazdar (1979:38) implicature is part of speaker meanings implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context; besides, it is not part of what was actually said. According to (Horn, 2004:3), implicature is a speaker meaning which delivers the meaning using an utterance that the meaning is not literally what he said.

Grice (1975) refers to 'implicature' to the implication, suggestion, or meaning of a speaker that different from what he says.

I give example from the conversation between A and B.

A: Do you go to Surabaya tomorrow?

B: My mother is sick

7

B implicitly said on "my mother sick" if he cannot go to Surabaya tomorrow because his mother is sick and he wants to leave her on that condition.

Conversational implicature is divided into two, there are generalized conversational implicature and particular conversational implicature which will be explained in the following point.

Implicature is divided into conversational and conventional implicature. To understand conventional implicature, it is different from conversational implicature. in conventional implicature, the meaning is obtained directly from the word and do not depend on special context. it is different from conversational implicature that the meaning is based on maxim or cooperative principle. so the conversational implicature is a study of implied meaning based on the formal elements for structural sentence. while conversational implicature is a study of implied meaning which based on conversational context (Yule,1996). Both of them has interested to be analyzed, but in this research, the researcher would like to analyze the conversational implicature.

2.1.2 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is implications contained in a conversation where the speaker violation on of maxims in cooperative principle. According to Yule (1996:227) conversational implicature is an additional meaning that undeclared directly and must be assumed by the listener to keep the cooperative principle. According to Gazdar (1979:38), conversational implicature is a statement which might be implied by the speaker and different from the speaker said in conversation. According to mey (2001:46) conversational implicature relates to how we understand in conversation with what we want to hear. So, when the speaker as a question, the hearer response does not appropriate with the speaker intends.

for example of conversational implicature:

- A: Would you be my girlfriend?
- B: I focus on my study

B implicitly said if he cannot make any special relation like have a boyfriend. He wants not if that relation is disturbing her study. So that why she refuses it using that statement.

2.1.2.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized Conversational Implicature is when the interlocutor does not need special knowledge in the context to understand the additional conveyed meaning. According to Levinson (1983:126) state, generalized conversational implicature arises without special knowledge to any particular element of the context. so, reference or inferences are not needed to understand the additional conveyed meaning. According to grice (1989:37) state, generalized conversational implicature is categorized by using of a certain form of words in the utterance that normally have implicature.

for example the previous example:

A: Would you be my girlfriend?

B: I focus on my study

To analyze that B utterance do not special context. It just need a context that if he make a relation it can divert her focus on her study.

2.1.2.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is the implicit meaning that can only be understood by certain people since the context is limited (bound). This type has a wide range of applications that illustrate the informative expression. This implicature always calculated the expression with special knowledge of any particular context, however, most of the time, the conversation take place in a very specific context in which locally recognized inferences is assumed, Yule (1996:42). For example:

Rina: Do you go to Johan party?

Fany: My father at the home.

To analyze that utterance we cannot simply said if it is as a refusal. To analyze it we need a special context about the relation between Fany and her father. If the relation of them is good and his father just come from his work, it can be said as a refusal. But, if the relation of them is not good and Fany is uncomfortable if his father at the home, it can be said as an acceptance.

2.1.3 Cooperative Principle and Maxims

According to Levinson (1983:100), "cooperative principle is a set of general rules to describe how participants 'cooperate' in conversation to achieve

smooth and efficient interaction". In applying the cooperative principle, some rules are needed to be obeyed for achieving successful interaction.

The cooperative principle commonly has four maxims (Grice, 1975:28) explained that there are four maxims. The first is the maxim of quality which is applied when the speaker is telling truth or fact provable by adequate evidence. The next is the maxim of quantity which needs the interlocutor or speaker to be as informative as needed. The third is the maxim of relation. It is applied when the response is made is relevant to the topic that is being talked or discussed. The last is the maxim of manner, which is direct and straightforward. It is applied when the speaker avoids an ambiguous conversation (Paltridge, 2007).

Grice in Brown and Yule (1983) state that divides cooperative principle into four basic maxims as follows:

A. maxim of quality

The speaker has to convince his statement is right even though actually is false. It's mean the speaker can not say what they believe to be false and they can not say that for which they lack adequate evidence.

Example:

Johan: Andrew, do you know where is my book entitled Discourse Analysis that written by Brian Paltridge? I forget

Andrew: I have brought it, Johan, I am sorry did not say to you previously

Here when Johan asks about his book that loses it is caused Johan has forgotten her book's position. Johan asks Andrew, on this occasion Andrew says that Johan's book is brought by him. Andrew answers the question by saying the truth. That the book really is borrowed. So Andrew in this dialogue obeys the maxim of quality.

B. Maxim of Quantity

The speaker should contribute an informative statement as required to the hearer. It's mean the speaker has to make their contribution as informative as in required and do not make their contribution more informative than is required.

Ex:

Johan: Where will you go?

Andrew: I will go to Royal Plaza

From that conversation above Andrew answers Johan's question by giving information as required by Johan. It is not too much and also not too little. So here Andrew obeys the rule of cooperative principle.

C. Maxim of Relation

Maxim of Relation is a dialogue between the speaker and participant to give each other relevant information. During the conversation when the speaker says something, the participant should not reply or said something unrelevant when the speaker keeps talking with the participant.

Example:

Johan: Andrew your clothes look so elegant, where did you buy it? Andrew: I bought it in Wonocolo's Distro.

Here Andrew's answer is relevant to Johan's question because Andrew gives the answer which stays on the topic. So Andrew obeys the rule of the maxim of relation.

D. Maxim of Manner

The speaker has to avoid ambiguity, obscurity expression and also have to ve perspicuous and the important speaker utterance has to a brief and clearly when talking with the interlocutors.

Example:

Johan: Where was Yayang yesterday?

Andrew: Went to the store and bought some whiskey.

From the example above it can be known that Andrew gives to Johan a clear explanation by saying the position where Yayang was. So here Andrew already obeys the maxim of manner.

cooperative principle divided into four sub-principles or maxims. The cooperative principle is the principle of conversation that normally the participants should obey the principles of conversation to make appropriate conversation. In daily conversation, sometimes the speaker more intends to violate the maxim for certain reason such as jokes, sarcasm, etc, and it is called implicature.

2.1.4 Violation of Maxims

According to Grice (1975:49), explain how these implications are to be understood, presents four ways in which maxims may be unfulfilled. These four ways are a violation, opting out, being faced with a clash, and flouting. There may be a violating; Grice writes that a person " may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead".

According to Grice (1975:49), he states that there are some ways to violates the maxim. They may violate one of maxim or even violates all of the maxim. These are four ways of violation maxims will be explained bellow:

The first is the speaker can deliberately violate of the maxim. So, the speaker can mislead the interlocutor in some cases during the conversation. The second is the speaker can deviate from the rule of cooperative principle. the speaker can show that he or she won't use the cooperative principle. The third is there are a clash might be faced by the interlocutors in the conversation. The last is The speaker can flout a maxim.

Maxim is a set of general rules to describe how participants 'cooperate' in conversation to achieve smooth and efficient interaction. however, some people sometimes not always follow the rules. They sometimes violate the maxim. There are four types of violation maxims will be explained below: A. Violation Maxim of quality

Maxim of Quality is when the interlocutor admit his statement is right even though his or her statement actually is false. So, when the speaker do not say about reality and giving information that is not literally true, he violates the maxim of quality.

Example:

James Croycek: "Psst, Monroe. you see him through the window? big deal's got his own helicopter service. Instead of coming in here on the bus.'
Monroe Hutchen: "He's the champ."
James Croycek: "What's this shit? don't think negative, man. I don't want to hear that shit. This is your house. you own this place."
Monroe Hutchen: "If this was my house, I could get up and leave. In order to convey the implicature, James violates the maxim of quality Why it is because that prison is not Monroe's house and Monroe's own. That utterance will not violate the maxim of quality if the utterance is "although Iceman is

the heavyweight boxer champion in outside, in this prison, you are the champ".

B. Violation Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of Quantity is when the speaker should contribute an informative

statement as required to the hearer, he violates maxim of quantity.

Example:

James Croycek: "Psst, Monroe. Do you see him through the window? big deal's got his own helicopter service. Instead of coming in here on the bus." Monroe Hutchen: "**He's the champ.** " That utterance violates the **maxim of quantity**, because when Monroe said: "**He's the champ**" in proper conversation, Monroe should include other information about what his mean on commenting the special facility of Iceman. But, although it is violating the maxim of quantity, it still easy to understand that the implicature of Monroe's utterance is tried to say if Iceman is worthy to get that facility. Monroe will not violate the maxim quantity if he said "He's the heavyweight boxer champion, it is worthy if he got that facility"

C. Violation Maxim of relevance

The speakers want to convey information or answer a question have to relevant with the interlocutor said before it called maxim of relevance. So, when the speaker does not say relevant with the interlocutor said before, he violates maxim of relevance.

Example:

Reporter: "Are you fighting Montel next?" Iceman: 'Just another sucker who's gonna get his ass whipped. if the money's right, bring on Montel. nobody's running, nobody's ducking. nobody I mean, nobody can stand up to what I got."

That utterance violates the **maxim of relevant**. When Iceman said: "Just another sucker who's gonna get his ass whipped". Why it violates the maxim of relevant because when the reporter asks about is he will fight against Montel? Before Iceman answer that question he deflects the subject of conversation to convey implicitly that Montel is easy to defeat, and there is no rejection to fight Montel if the money is right. In proper conversation, Iceman should say: "Yes, I will fight and beat him. If the money's right. Bring on Montel.

D. Violation Maxim of Manner

Maxim of Manner if the speaker has to avoid ambiguity, obscurity expression and also have to ve perspicuous and the important speaker utterance have to a brief and clearly when talking with the interlocutors. So, when he said something to jokes that contain ambiguity he violates the maxim of manner

Example:

Jim Lampley: "Now, you're regarded as one of the greatest offensive fighters in the history of the sport an attacker like Dempsey, Joe Louis Rocky Marciano, Joe Frazier, just exactly how damaging to your skills in this prison stint likely to be?"

Iceman: "No damage. I will stay in shape, work out, watch what I eat, I will be fine." Jim Lampley: "But when an athlete is removed from competition." Iceman: "That's where you're making one big mistake right off. I'm not an athlete. I'm a gladiator."

That implicature violates the **maxim of manner**. When Iceman said: "**I'm not an athlete. I'm a gladiator**" because there is an ambiguity on that utterance. In proper conversation, Iceman should include the explanation on his utterance. Such as: "although I no longer workout with suitable facility and join the competition in the tournament on a long time. It can't affect my skill, because fighting is already on my soul. Even, I always win his boxing by my power and insistently punches, I more consent on that rather than my boxing skills".

2.1.5 Context

According to Holmes (1922) speech is always related to context. The meaning of the speech is based on the specific context because the context has an important role to interpret it. So, something that the speaker said not always the same with what the speaker means. For the reader or hearer, his capability to catch the meaning of a speaker is based on his ability to connect the speech or the text with the context.



CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains how the researcher collected and analyzed the data. It is including research design, data collection, data analysis, and research timeframe.

3.1. Research Design

According to Creswell (1998:15) The qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. this means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. And also qualitative research involves analysis of data such as words, examples from interviews, transcript, picture, video, recordings, notes, documents, the products and records of material culture, audio-visual materials and personal experience materials (such as artifacts, journal and diary information and naratives).

This research applied qualitative approach to find out conversational implicature that used by the characters in Undisputed Movie. Therefore, the data analyzed descriptively. Each words, phrase, clause, sentence and utterance those were indicated to contain conversational implicature during the speech in the movie was included.

3.2. Data Collection

3.2.1 Data and Data Sources

the data was taken from the transcript of the movie with approximately 1:33:58 minutes. The data was obtained from a movie entitled Undisputed as the data source. As have been told in the beginning, the reason for this movie to be analyzed was because this movie was take place on a prison. On prison, the language was more rude different than other. That was why the researcher was interest to analyze this movie.

The data were gotten by watched the movie carefully and matched the conversational texts found in the movie with the transcript. In this case, the researcher was needed to repeat some parts of the movie several times to make sure whether those parts contain data which needed by the researcher or not.

3.2.2 Instruments

The main instrument in this research was the researcher himself since he was the one who were doing analysis by watched the movie, matched its parts with this study, and did analysis until concluded the analysis results.

On the other side, there are several secondary instruments such as a personal computer or laptop and a note. The laptop is used in this research for two purposes; watched movie and typing research result. The note was for noting each part of the movie that contained implicature to the data of the research.

3.2.3 Techniques of Data Collection

The researcher taken the data from Undisputed movie. The followings was steps and techniques to collect the data:

1. Watching the movie

Since this research was in form of movie analysis, the researcher needed to watch the movie in order to get the needed data. The movie would be watched by repeating some parts several times in order to make sure whether the parts those taken by the researcher as data was acceptable or not for this research.

2. Transcribing

Making transcription was one of the important step in this research. It was aimed to ease the further processes in analyzing the data.

3. Classifying the implicatures types

After transcribed the data, the next step the researcher classifying the utterance that included in conversational implicature that found in the transcribtion and taken it in conversational implicature types table that divided the generalized conversational implicatures and particularized conversational implicatures.

4. Classifying

After the data of conversational implicatures was collected and classified, the researcher classified the violating maxim and puts the utterance on the table of violation maxim to be analyzed in the next step.

3.3 Data Analysis

After collectied the data, the researcher analyzed the data was by following steps:

1. Reading the data

In this step, the researcher read again the data to make sure that the data are acceptable for the purpose of this research.

2. Classifying the data

Before analyzed the transcription data, the researcher classified the data into the proper kinds of conversational implicature.

3. Making explanation

In this step, the researcher explained all of the conversational implicatures those were found in the transcription. Furthermore, the researcher also explained the kinds of implicatures which appear in the movie's transcription. Still in this step, the researcher also explained the dominant conversational implicature those were found in the movie.

4. Concluding

In this part, the researcher made conclusion based on the research problems and the findings that have been concepted and analyzed in this research.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter shows the discussion and the result of this study. It consists of two parts. Those are finding and discussion. In finding the speaker shows the result of the utterances containing the conversational implicature. Meanwhile, in the discussion, the researcher analyzes the finding.

4.1 Researh Findings

In this sub chapter the researcher try to answer the research question who the researcher explain the type of conversational implicature based on Grie's theory of implicature (1975) used in Undisputed Movie and concern violation of maxim. In the table contain utterance on the trancsipt Undisputed Movie. Each datum is containing utterance with implicature. The utterance containing implicature are signed with the bold text which completed with the context description and analysis. Those data are used in different setting and context. Beside that, the researcher proides the table makes the researcher easier to interpret the types conversational implicature and the violation of maxim that is appeared on the Movie.

4.1.1 The Type of Conversational Implicature

In this part, the data occurs as result of the implicature that include to type of conversational implicature based on the theory of implicature which proposed by Grice.. To make easy understandable, the explanation will be elaborated by the researcher more comple in the table below 4.1.1.

4.1.1 Conversational Implicature classification based on type of conversational implicature

DATA	Utterance	Types of Conversational Implicature		
		General Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature	
1.	"I'm not an athlete. I'm a gladiator.".		X	
2.	"Stripping you"	X		
3.	"Just another sucker who's gonna get his ass whipped."	X		
4.	"He's the champ."	Х		
5.	"This is your house. you own this place."	Х		
6.	"Look at me, what I gotta rape somebody for?"		Х	
7.	"Look at me, what I gotta rape somebody for?"		Х	
8.	"Mingo, move your shit, stay out of my way and we'll get	Х		

	along just fine."		
9.	"I gotta congratulate you."	Х	
10.	"it's not considered polite to	Х	
	ask why we're here kindas		
	violation of the ethics. You		
	know, the code?"		
11.	"I'd recommend an outside	Х	
	attorney.Another		
	speacialist."		
12.	"You kind of pretty for a	X	
	bi*ch. But I don't want to		
	owe nobody."		
13.	"Shit no. Boxi <mark>ng</mark> . it's a	X	
	matter of style. they all can		
	be beaten. right time, right		
	place, the right		
	circumastance they all can		
	be beaten."		
14.	"You know the drill. You		Х
	help him or you hurt him."		
15.	"There is no "you and me."	Х	
	I'm taking my vacation right		
	along with the warden."		
16.	"Even if he was something,	Х	

	he's been in here for ten		
	years."		
17.	"I'm just saying it might not	Х	
	be a walk in the park."		
18.	"Hit the yard."	Х	
19.	"You in here too. Probably	Х	
	gonna die in here. What the		
	money matter to you?"		
20.	"You better get ready to	Х	
	fight."		
21.	"Can I tell you a story? one	X	
	of my favorites. <mark>It</mark> 's ab <mark>ou</mark> t		
	how things get done. This is		
	a story that take place in		
	about it must have been the		
	middle 1950s. I was second		
	in"		

4.1.1 The Violation of Maxim

Data	Utterance	Violated Maxim			
		Quality	Quantity	Relation	Manner
1.	"I'm not an athlete.				Х
	I'm a gladiator."				
2.	"Stripping you"		X		

3.	"Just another			Х	
	sucker who's				
	gonna get his ass				
	whipped."				
4.	"He's the champ."		Х		
5.	"This is your	X			
	house. you own this				
	place."				
6.	"Look at me, what				Х
	I gotta rape				
	somebody for?"		\wedge		
7.	"Look at me, what				X
	I gotta rape				
	somebody for?"				
8.	"Mingo, move your				Х
	shit, stay out of my				
	way and we'll get				
	along just fine."				
9.	"I gotta				Х
	congratulate you."				
10.	"it's not considered		Х		
	polite to ask why				
	we're here kindas				
	violation of the				
L		1			

	ethics. You know,			
	cuncs. I ou know,			
	the code?"			
11.	"I'd recommend an	Х		
	outside attorney.			
	Another			
	speacialist."			
12.	"You kind of	X		
	pretty for a bi*ch.			
	But I don't want to	_		
	owe nobody."			
13.	"Shit no. Boxing.	X		
	it's a matter of			
	style. they all can			
	be beaten. right			
	time, right place,			
	the right			
	circumastance they			
	all can be beaten."			
14.	"You know the			X
	drill. You help him			
	or you hurt him."			
15.	"There is no "you		<u></u>	X
	and me.'' I'm			
	taking my vacation			

	right along with				
	right along with				
	the warden."				
16.	"Even if he was		Х		
	something, he's				
	been in here for ten				
	years"				
17.	"I'm just saying it		X		
	might not be a				
	walk in the park."				
	wark in the park.				
18.	"Hit the yard."	1.04118			Х
19.	"You in here too.			Х	
	Probably gonna die				
	in here. What the				
	money matter to				
	you?"				
20.	"You better get		X		
	ready to fight."				
21.	"Can I tell you a		X		
	story? one of my				
	favorites. It's about				
	how things get				
	done. This is a				
	story that take				
	place in about it				
	must have been the				
	middle 1950s. I was				
L	1		1		1

second in"				
------------	--	--	--	--

4.1.2 Analysis of The Data

Datum 1 (08:50-09:20)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place on television, it broadcast the interviews of George "Iceman" Chambers. It looks that Iceman using prisoner clothes on the visiting room behind the iron bars. Jim Lampley as the interviewer is asking to Iceman about his skill after the punishment.

The Conversation :	
Jim Lampley	: "Now, you're regarded as one of the greatest offensive
	fighters in the history of the sport an attacker like Dempsey,
	Joe Louis Rocky Marciano, Joe Frazier, just exactly how
	damaging to your skills in this prison stint likely to be?"
Iceman	: "No damage. i will stay in shape, work out, watch what i
	eat, i will be fine."
Jim Lampley	: "But when an athlete is removed from competition."
Iceman	: "That's where you're making one big mistake right off.
	I'm not an athlete. I'm a gladiator."

On the conversation above, Iceman utters a particularized conversation

implicature. On "**I'm not an athlete. i'm a gladiator**", Iceman thinks that if he as a boxer is more close to a gladiator rather than an athlete. Competition may important by athletes because when they no longer compete in competition on a long time, it can affect to their skills. But, Iceman thinks that if he is gladiator, he do not need competition to keep his fighting skill, because fighting is already on his soul. By Iceman, to be a boxer, people do not only need skills but more about the spirit of fighting. Furthermore, Iceman always win his boxing by his power and insistently punches, he more consent on that rather than his boxing skills.

That opinion is explained by boxing observer. It includes to **particularized conversation implicature** because to understand what Iceman means, it needs special context about what the meaning of gladiator by Iceman and how is the style fighting of Iceman.

That implicature violates the **maxim of manner.** When iceman said: "**I'm not an athlete. i'm a gladiator**" because there is an ambiguity on that utterance. In proper conversation Iceman should include the explanation on his utterance. Such as: "although I no longer workout with suitable facility and join competition in tournament on a long time. It can't affect my skill, because fighting is already on my soul. Even, i always win his boxing by my power and insistently punches, i more consent on that rather than my boxing skills".

Datum 2 (09:26-09:41)

The Situation :

The conversation occurs on jail. It looks that Iceman is using prisoner clothes on the visiting room behind the iron bars. Jim Lampley as the interviewer is asking to Iceman about the effect of his punishment on his boxing skills.

The Conversation :

Jim Lampley	: "Iceman, last week after you were convicted, boxing's various so-called governing bodies began stripping you of
Ŧ	your title belts."
Iceman	: "Stripping you. who they think they kidding? everybody
	knows I'm the champ. and I'm gonna be the champ till I
	quit."

On the conversation above Iceman utters a generalized conversation utterance. The utterance **"Stripping you"** is not only a repetition of Jim Lampley's statement but there is also an implicature that Iceman try to deny Jim Lampley's statement if the boxing governing bodies maybe can stripping his little belts but it just the belts not about the fact if the heavyweight boxing champion is will always on Iceman hand till he defeated or he finish on boxing. That utterance includes to **generalized conversation implicature** because the implicature can be understand without any special context.

That utterance violates the **maxim of quantity**, because on that utterance there is less information about what he actually means when iceman said: **"Stripping you".** On proper conversation iceman should add explanation such as: "stripping you, i think they have do something useless. The boxing governing bodies maybe can stripping my little belts but it just the belts not about the fact. Who they think they kidding? Everybody knows I'm the champ. And I'm gonna be the champ till I quit."

Datum 3 (11:15-11:24)

The Situation :

The conversation is on flashback. It looks that Iceman is in front of reporters on press conference after he beats his latest opponent Carlos Manfredy, other heavyweight boxer. The reporters ask to Iceman about what his next?

The Conversation :

Reporter: "Are you fighting Montel next?"Iceman: 'Just another sucker who's gonna get his ass whipped.
if the money's right, bring on Montel. nobody's running,
nobody's ducking. nobody i mean, nobody can stand up to
what i got."

On the Iceman's utterance above, "Just another sucker who's gonna get

his ass whipped" there is an implication occur on that. On that utterance, Iceman

implicitly said if Montel is easy opponent, and he will fight and beat him if the money is right. That utterance is include to **generalized conversational implicature** because there is no special context to understand it.

That utterance violates the **maxim of relevant**. When Iceman said: "Just another sucker who's gonna get his ass whipped". Why it violates the maxim of relevant because when the reporter ask about is he will fight against Montel? Before Iceman answer that question he deflects the subject of conversation to convey implicitly that Montel is easy to defeat, and there is no rejection to fight Montel if the money is right. In proper conversation Iceman should said: "Yes, I will fight and beat him. If the money's right. Bring on montel.

Datum 4 (13:10-13:20)

The Situation :

The conversation is occurs on Monroe Hutchen's room, the heavyweight champion from California that incarcerated on that prison, and the winner of prison boxing tournament. It is day, on free time that all of the prisoner are allowed to go out from their room, to visit other prisoner, to walking, or others. It looks that Jame Croycek, another prisoner is coming to Monroe's room to talk about the coming of Iceman.

The Conversation :

James Croycek : "Psst, Monroe. you see him through the window? big deal's got his own helicopter service. Instead of coming in here on the bus." : "He's the champ. " On Monroe's utterance above, there is an implicature on that. The utterance **"He's the champ"** is not merely to explain if he is the champion, on boxer, but that sentence is easily to understand that Monroe implicitly talk if Iceman as the champion of heavyweight boxer from Las Vegas is worthy to get that special facility in the way to go to California Sweetwater Prison. That utterance is included to **generalized conversational implicature** because there is no need special knowledge to understand the implicature.

That utterance violates the **maxim of quantity**, because when Monroe said: **"He's the champ"** in proper conversation, Monroe should include other information about what his mean on commenting the special facility of Iceman. But, although it is violating the maxim of quantity, it still easy to understand that the implicature of Monroe's utterance is try to say if Iceman is worthy to get that facility. Monroe will not violate the maxim quantity if he said "He's the heavyweight boxer champion, it is worthy if he got that facility".

Datum 5 (13:10-13:30)

The Situation :

The conversation occurs on Monroe Hutchen's room, the heavyweight champion from California that incarcerated on that prison, and the winner of prison boxing tournament. It is day, on free time that all of the prisoner are allowed to go out from their room, to visit other prisoner, to walking, or others. It looks that Jame Croycek, another prisoner is coming to Monroe's room to talk about the coming of Iceman.

The Conversation :

James Croycek	: "Psst, Monroe. you see him through the window? big
	deal's got his own helicopter service. Instead of coming in
	here on the bus.'
Monroe Hutchen	: "He's the champ."
James Croycek	: "What's this shit? don't think negative, man. I don't want
	to hear that shit. This is your house. you own this place."
Monroe Hutchen	: "If this was my house, i could get up and leave."

On the conversation above, James Croycek uttering an implicature. When James said **"This is your house, you own this place"** there is an implication on that utterance. The context is they are in a prison, normally everyone do not want to leave in prison moreover to perceive that prison as their house, so that prison is not really Monroe's house. If we just analyze the simple context without including the more deep context it will still confusing about why James just said if that prison is Monroe's house and not using "our house"? But, when we know the special context if Monroe and Iceman are same as the Heavyweight boxer from their era. Iceman is the camp in that era, Monroe is the ex-camp in 10 years ago. And on boxing tournament that always held per six months on Sweetwater Prison, Monroe always be the champion since he came 10 years ago. That why the implicature of that utterance is try to said if Sweetwater prison is Monroe's place and he is the champion on that place. Because to analyze the implicature requires special context, that utterance is classified into particularized conversational implicature

In order to convey the implicature, James violates the **maxim of quality** Why it be because that prison is not Monroe's house and Monroe's own. That utterance will not violate the maxim of quality if the utterance is "although Iceman is the heavyweight boxer champion in outside, but in this prison you are the champ".

Datum 6 (12:15-12:30)

The Situation :

Iceman is interviewed by a reporter. It is look that Iceman is behind the sail and already incarcerated in unknown prison before he moved to Sweetwater

prison.

The Conversation :

Reporter

Iceman

: "You will be moving into a new home, going to live with murderers and thieves, in california's newly-built, sweetwater prison in the mojave desert, without getting into legal strategy, let's discuss your trial. You continue to maintain your innocence?"

: "I didn't rape nobody. I done a lot of wrong shit in my life but I ain't no punk-ass rapist. Look at me, what I gotta rape somebody for?"

In conversation above, there is an implicature on Iceman utterance. When he said "what I gotta rape somebody for?", it literally means as question. But as the true meaning, that utterance is not for asking something but implicitly said if he did not rape somebody, he f*ck the girl because she wanted it and there is no benefit for him to did it. When we look at the context, Iceman is one of popular man in Amerika, he is the champion on heavyweight boxer. It can be said if money is nothing for him because he is too rich. That is why if he want to sleep with someone he can leases her. So, that utterance is included to **Particularized Conversational Implicature.** Why it be because that utterance need special context to understand the implicature. In order to establish and distribute the meaning implicitly, Iceman violets the **maxim of manner.** It can be because that utterance is not expressed to ask something but the point is to say if he did not rape the girl, and it is no benefit to did it. Iceman utterance will not violate the maxim of manner if he said "I am a rich man, I did not rape somebody. I have much money to pay a girl."

Datum 7 (16:06-16:31)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place in front of his new room in Sweetwater. He is just arrive to that place from Las Vegas, America. He talks to someone that will be his roommate .

The Conversation :

Iceman	: "Yo <mark>u g</mark> ot a name? "	
Mingo Pace	: "Mingo"	
Iceman	: "Mingo, move your shit, stay out of my way	and we'll get
	along just fine."	

Iceman utterance "You got a name?" is literally ask to Mingo is he has a name or not. When the question is yes/no question like that, of course the answer is between yes or no. But, of course it is easy to understand if the purpose of that question is not for that. When we see the context if the time when they talk is the first time they meet, that question is automatically already to understand if it is used to ask who is his name. So, that utterance is included to **generalized conventional implicature**. Why it be because there is no need special context to get the implicature. Because in order to deliver his implicature Iceman asks a question that the purpose is different with the literal meaning, so he violates the **maxim of manner** to establish his implicature. Iceman will not violate the maxim of manner if he said "what is your name?".

Datum 8 (16:31-16:44)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place in front of his new room in Sweetwater. He is just arrive to that place from Las Vegas, America. He talks to someone that will be his roommate .

The Conversation :

	get along just fine."
Iceman	: "Mi <mark>ng</mark> o, <mark>move your</mark> shit <mark>, st</mark> ay out of my way and we'll
Mingo Pace	: "Mingo"
Iceman	: "Yo <mark>u g</mark> ot a name? <mark>"</mark>

On Iceman utterance above "Mingo, move your shit, stay out of my way and we'll get along just fine", there is an implicature on it. When Mingo process that utterance without looking the context, he will hard to understand what Iceman means on his utterance. What is the real "shit" that Iceman means. But, when looking the context that Iceman is new on that prison and want to enter his new cell, he brings many of his clothes, and there is a bunk beds. It looks on that place there is Mingo's pillow, blanket, and clothes on bottom bed. After know that, so the "shit" that Iceman mean is Mingo's stuffs on bottom bed. The implicature is Iceman want to take the bottom bed and order Mingo to move on top bed. And if Mingo refuses Iceman order there will be make some problem. That utterance is categorized into **generalized conversational implicature** because it do no need special context between the communicant to understand the implicature.

In order to build his utterance, Iceman violets the **maxim of manner**. Why it be because there is an ambiguity about what is the really Iceman means about the term of "shit". Iceman will not violate the maxim of manner if he said clearly "Mingo, move your clothes and your stuffs. Go to the top bed, I want to use the bottom. Don't disturb me If you do not want any trouble"

Datum 9

The Situation : (20:36-21:21)

The conversation takes place on prison canteen on 05:00 PM and it is the eating time. There is many peoples on there, some of them is waiting in line for their food, and the others is eating their food in the table. On that situation Iceman is looking for Monroe and come to him.

The Conversation :

Iceman	: "You Monroe Hutchen?"		
Monroe Hutche	n : "Yep"		
Iceman	: "I guess you know who i am. Are you the champion in		
	here?		
Monroe Hutche	n : Yeah"		
Iceman	: "Not the heavyweight champ? "		
Monroe Hutche	n : "Champion. heavyweight or any other kind they got."		
Iceman	: "I didn't even know they had boxing in a place like this."		
Monroe Hutche	n : "Well, it's a special program. we only get bouts ever six		
	months mostly we fight guys from other prisons."		
Iceman	:" How long you been on top?"		
Monroe Hutche	n : "Ten years. ever since i got in here."		
Iceman	: "Damn. brother, that's a real fine record you got. I		
	gotta congratulate you." (Slapping Monroe)		
(Monroe pushes Iceman after he got slaped)			

That utterance is literally mean as congratulation, but it is not when we include the context. Monroe is a heavyweight boxing champion in California on 10 years ago before he entering Sweetwater prison. On that time Iceman is heavyweight boxing champion in Las Vegas. Some day after Iceman entering the prison, Mendy Ripstein, one of important man on that prison, and also has much of knowledge about boxing said to Iceman if there is a man that can beat Iceman, the man is Monroe Hutchen. When Iceman utters that utterance, he also slapping Monroe's cheek. After the utterance is bring in the context, it is already understand if that utterance is an implicature. The implication is Iceman challenges Monroe to fight, to know who is the better of them, who is the real champion. So, Iceman's utterance is included to generalized conversational implicature because it do not require special context to understand it.

In order to create that implicature, Iceman violates the **maxim of manner**. Why it be because the real purpose is different with the literal purpose. The literal purpose is to congratulate and the implicature purpose is to challenge. Iceman will not violate the maxim of manner if he said directly "That's real fine record you got. Let's fight so you know who is the better between you and me"

Datum 10 (24:07-24:33)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place in prison yard on free time. It is look that Iceman is sitting on the bench and there is Mingo, Iceman's roommate shitting beside him.

Mingo : "New duty roster just got posted. You're working in the kitchen with me."

40

Iceman	: "Look, since we're gonna be stuck together what you in
	here for?"
Mingo	: "You know, champ, I don't mean to be telling you what to
	do or anything, but it's not considered polite to ask why
	we're here kindas violation of the ethics. You know, the
	code?"
Iceman	: "Yeah"

That utterance is include to implicature because beside giving information to Iceman about the ethics for asking a prisoner about why they entering the prison, he also implicitly said if he want not answer the Iceman question. The context of that utterance is they are in prison, that is why that ethics is work. Although they are in a same cell, but they still have no strong relation yet. In order to refuse to answer Iceman question politely, Mingo using an implicature. He using a statement for explain about the ethics to say "no, I cannot answer it". Because it do not need special context to analyze the Mingo's statement, that utterance is categorized into generalized conversational implicature.

In order to make the implicature, Mingo answers the question with a statement that can be said if that is less of information about the reason why in here or answer "sorry I want not answer it". So that utterance is violating the **maxim of quantity.** Mingo will not violate the maxim of quantity if he include enough information "Sorry I want not answer it. It's not considered polite to ask why we're here kindas violation of the ethics. You know, the code?"

Datum 11 (33:59-34:13)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place on special visiting room. The prisoner and the visiter can meet each other without any barrier in a room. On that place there are Iceman and his two lawyers.

The Conversation :

Iceman lawyer's	: "Aaron's an expert. he's the man on appeals. But before
	we talk about your appeal. I need to tell you about Miss
	Tawnee Rawlins She's file a civil lawsuit in the amount of
	\$75 million."
Iceman	: "You handling that?"
Iceman lawyer's:	: "I'd recommend an outside attorney. Another
	specialist. However, we can handle your tax litigation. The

in the firm that can deal with that."

government has filed an intent to audit. We have someone

The lawyer utterance above is indicated as an implicature. When Iceman asks "You handling that?" the lawyer instead gives recommendation without explaining yes or not. The context of that utterance, the iceman lawyers have been handling tax litigation and appeals, and they think they cannot handle the civil lawsuit also. The lawyer refuses for handle the civil lawsuit using a recommendation to employ another attorney. Because that utterance do not need special context to understand, it classified to **generalized conversational implcature.**

In order to convey his meaning, the lawyer uses an implicature that violates the **maxim of quantity.** He violets the maxim of quantity Because in proper conversation, he should approve or refuse the question, and on that answer there is no information about it. Iceman's Lawyer will not violates the maxim of

quantity if he said "Sorry we cannot. I'd recommend an outside attorney. Another specialist.

Datum 12 (39:23-39:35)

The Situation :

The conversation takes on a hall of Sweetwater prison, it is on free time that all of prisoners can go out from their cells. There is Antoine Bonet, a ladyboy come to Iceman to talk about Saladin request.

The Conversation :

Antoine Bonet	: "Champ I'm looking to be your friend, champ, I'm a gift."
Iceman	: "Well, I don't need no gifts. Who sent you?"
Antoine Bonet	: "Saladin. he want to be your friend. He kind of run things
	for EL Faziz Assassins. You can check it out."
Iceman	: "You kind of pretty for a bi*ch. But I don't want to
	owe nobody. You tell him i said that. now get outta here."
Antoine Bonet	: "you may be the champ, but you are only one guy. Let me
	help you out. EL Faziz Assassins give you something, you
	take it. You do not refuse."

The Iceman utterance above is an implicature. Saladin sent Antoine, a bit*h as a gift. Knowing that Iceman said if Antoine is pretty, but he want to have an owe. From that utterance the implication is Iceman refuse to be Saladin friend and Antoine Bonet understand what Iceman means. Iceman is a heavyweight boxing champion, it should no problem if he do not join any group on that prison. And he is has a brave to refuse it. That is the reason if that utterance is mean as refusal. Because to analyze the implicature it no need special context, so that utterance is classified as **generalized conversational implicature**.

In order to create the implicature Iceman violates the **maxim of quantity.** Why it be because there is no sufficient information about the answer is he accept Saladin request or not. Moreover it can be mean as an acceptance in other context. Iceman will not violate the maxim of quantity if he said "You kind of pretty for a bi*ch. But I don't want to owe nobody and I refuse the friend request of Saladin."

Datum 13

The Situation : (44:12-44:38)

The conversation takes place on a prison yard. There is Mendy Ripstein and Jesus "Chuy" Campos talking about the fight between Monroe Hutchen and Iceman.

The Conversation :

Mendy Ripstein	: "we got the heavyweight champion of the world. and an
	unbeaten propect right here in sweetwater. quit wasting
	time. set the fucking thing up. I know fights. Long prize,
	Monroe kicks his ass we can make a lot of money here."
Campos	: "Mr. Ripstein, excuse me, but you're talking about the real
	heavyweight champion of the world. are you gonna fix the
	fight?"
Mendy Ripstein	: "Shit no. Boxing. it's a matter of style. they all can be
	beaten. right time, right place, the right circumstance
	they all can be beaten."

On mendy utterance above, there is an implicature on that. Mendy said that, every boxer especially the champion is can be beaten, in the right time, right place, and right circumstance. And one important thing in boxing is about the style of the fighter. When he said that, he implicitly said if the style of Monroe's fight is "better" than Iceman and Monroe can beat Iceman. Moreover when we look at the context, Mendy Ripstein is a boxing analyst, so that why when he told about the style of boxing fighter, he is a credible person on that field. Because to analyze that implicature do not need special context, that utterance is classified into generalized conversational implicature.

The point that want to say by Mendy Ripstein is the style of Monroe is better than Iceman and he believe if Monroe can beat Iceman. But, on that utterance there is no words that talk about it clearly. So, Mendy is violating the **maxim of quantity** to make his implicature. Mendy will not violate the maxim of quantity if he said "Shit no. Boxing. it's a matter of style. they all can be beaten. right time, right place, the right circumstance they all can be beaten. And the fighting style Monroe is better than Iceman, so why I believe if Monroe will win against Iceman."

Datum 14 : (44:52-45:11)

The Situation :

Jesus "Chuy" Campos and Mendy Ripstein are talking to a boxing caretaker Johny William. They talking about the fight between Monroe Hutchen and Iceman that wanna held by Mendy Ripstein on Sweetwater prison.

Campos	: "Mr. Ripstein wants to see the Iceman fight a prisoner we
	got in here. his name is Monroe Hutchen. "
Mendy Ripstein	: "And a real goddamn fihgt. Pure"
Johny William	: "So, what do you want us to do?"
Campos	: "I talked to the head guard. he's OK, but the warden's a
	problem. Mr. Ripstein said you take care of him."
Mendy Ripstein	: "You know the drill. You help him or you hurt him."

That utterance is an implicature, why it be because there is ambiguity about that utterance. When we look it literally, there is an ambiguity about what kind of "help or hurt" that purposed by Mendy. So, to analyze that utterance it needs a special context which understood by both character. The context is there are on prison, legally, the fight between Monroe and Iceman is cannot because it is not the period to held a boxing, and it is illegal. So that, to make the warden approve the request, he should "help or hurt" him. The special context, they are can be told as mafias, to make someone who has power to accept everything that they request is using a threat. "Hurt" on that special context means as a threat, the threat can be killing or another. Now about the "give", in boxing everyone who mixed up with it, moreover someone who has power like the warden will get a portion of the benefit if he has a contribution. So, "help or hurt" means as an offer and also as a threat. Because to analyze that utterance is needing a special context, so that utterance is classified into **particularized conversational implicature.**

Every implicature always violates the cooperative principles, it includes that utterance. In the Mendy Ripstein's utterance above, he violates the **maxim manner**. Why it be because there is an ambiguity about the term of "give or hurt". Mendy will not violate the maxim of manner if he said "You know the drill. Offer him some of the profit if he want to help us to give the permission. If he refuse it, menace him."

Datum 15 (46:01-46:15)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place in prison office. There are Mrs. Early and Mr. Mercker are talking about the boxing planning.

The Conversation :

Mrs. Early

: "Had to have been somebody in the governor's office. Soon as he got the call Mr.Backbone stared arranging his vacation. "

Mr. Mercker	: "Know what that means, don't you? this whole load of shit
	down on you and me."
Mrs. Early	: "There is no "you and me." I'm taking my vacation
	right along with the warden."
Mr. Mercker	: "Well, thank your support."
Mrs. Early	: "Oh, come on. you run the fight program here. You want
	this to happen."

There is an implicature on Mrs. Early utterance "there is no you and me". Literally, that utterance means if that job is not their responsibility. But, when we see the context that Mr. Mercker is the head of prison guard on Sweetwater prison and he do not have any schedule to go anywhere. It means if the purpose of Mrs. Early implicature is "he is your job only because I want to taking my vacation. Hear that utterance, Mr Mercker understand what she means, so that is why he quips her with saying "thank you for your support". To analyze this implicature do not need special context, so this utterance is classified into generalized conversational implicature.

In order to make her implicature, Mrs. Early violates the **maxim of manner.** Why it be because there is an ambugity about "there is no you and me". Mrs. Early will not violate the maxim of manner if she said "Sorry I cannot help you. I'm taking my vacation right along with the warden."

Datum 16 (47:20-47:59)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place on visiting room on Sweetwater prison, there is Iceman talking with Yank Lewis as Icemen's boxing manager about his fight against Monroe Hutchen.

The Conversation :

Iceman "	: "Remember you old buddy form miami, Mendy Ripstein?
Yank Lewis	: "Yeah."
Iceman	: "His boy came up to me and said. that if i fight some punk
	in here. he could maybe get me out quick."
Yank Lewis	: "If Mendy Ripstein says it, then it's the real deal. but you
	can't hear this from some other guy. you gotta hear this
	from Mendy himself. Then it's dope for sure."
Iceman	: "If it's on the real, i'll whip on this punk's ass. and be out
	of here."
Yank Lewis	: "Who's the punk? don't tell me Monroe Hutchen. he
	fought out of Oakland. he was undefeated. he was a real
	prospect, man. he's a full load."
Iceman	: "Even if he was something, he's been in here for ten
	years."
Yank Lewis	: "I'm just saying it might not be a walk in the park."

When Iceman said "Even if he was something, he's been in here for ten years." He implicitly said if now Monroe is can be weak and different with 10 years ago although Monroe was unbeatable and was real prospect. Why that is the implicature because live in prison is different with live in outside. There is no proper place to maintains his body or skill fighter. A boxer without proper training could be affecting his skills. Because to analyze this implicature do not need special context, this utterance is classified into **generalized conversational implicature.**

This implicature is violating the **maxim of quantity**. The reason is because there is no sufficient information about what he really means. He just said if Monroe have been in prison on 10 years, that bring up a question "so why?" because it is less of information about it. Iceman will not violate the maxim of quantity if he said "Even if he was something, he's been in here for ten years. Now he might be more weak without proper training".

Datum 17 (47:25-49:02)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place on visiting room on Sweetwater prison, there is Iceman talking with Yank Lewis as Icemen's boxing manager about his fight against Monroe Hutchen.

The Conversation :

Iceman	: "His boy came up to me and said. that if i fight some punk
	in here. he could maybe get me out quick."
Yank Lewis	: "If Mendy Ripstein says it, then it's the real deal. but you
	can't hear this from some other guy. you gotta hear this
	from Mendy himself. Then it's dope for sure."
Iceman	: "If it's on the real, i'll whip on this punk's ass. and be out
	of here."
Yank Lewis	: "Who's the punk? don't tell me Monroe Hutchen. he
	fought out of Oakland. he was undefeated. he was a real
	prospect, man. he's a full load."
Iceman	: "Even if he was something, he's been in here for ten
	years."
Yank Lewis	: "I'm just <mark>saying</mark> it might not be a walk in the park."
Iceman	:" I don't believe this shit."

When Yank Lewis heard if Iceman will fight against Monroe Hutchen. He said if fight against Monroe it might not be a walk in the park. On that utterance, implicitly Yank Lewis said if Monroe is a hard enemy looked for his track record. The worst, Iceman can be beated by Monroe. But, to make it soft and without intend to offend iceman, Yank Lewis use " it might not be a walk in the park" or "it will not easy" to deliver his meaning. Because to analyze the implicature do not need special context, this utterance is classified into generalized conversational implicature.

When sending his implicature, Yank Lewis is violating the **maxim of quantity**. It because in order to say if Monroe is a hard enemy he use sentence "it might not be a walk in the park". Actually he can make it simple and clearly if he said directly that "Monroe is a hard enemy".

Datum 18 (45:29-45:57)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place on Mr. Warden room. He is talking with Mr.

Mercker the head of s

The Conversation :

Mr.	Wa	rden
-----	----	------

: "In six weeks, i'm going on vacation. On the fifth, i'll be gone for two weeks. First week in new Orleans. Second week visiting friends in Tuscon, Arizona. If while i am gone, if Mr. Hutchen happens to get into a sparring match. with Mr. Chambers, i don't want to hear about it. and when i get back. I want this whole goddamned enterprise finished." : "Yes. sir." Mr. Mercker Mr. Warden : "Leaving no evidence, no videotape. and never to be spoken of in my presence." : "Anything else, sir?" Mr. Mercker : "Hit the yard." Mr. Warden Mr. Mercker : "Thank you."

Mr. Warden's utterance above "hit the yard" is an implicature. The context of that utterance is they are on an head office, they has no previous conversation that related with the work on yard. That why the Mr. Mecrker's utterance above is an implicature. "Hit the yard" implicitly mean as "enough" or "you can go out". That implicature is use to respond Mr. Mercker question. This utterance is included to implicature because when it used in different context it can means like "dig the yard" or any others. So that is why that utterance is an implicature. Because to analyze that utterance do not need special context, that utterance is classified into generalized conversational implicature.

That implicature is violating the **maxim of manner.** Why it be because there is an ambiguity about the real meaning of "hit". After analyzing it can be understand if "hit" means he can go and nothing else to say. Mr. Warden will not violate the maxim of manner if he said "Nothing else, you can out".

Datum 19 (48:18-49:23)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place on Monroe's isolation room. There is Mendy Ripstein and James Campos talk to Monroe Hutchen about the plan of the fight between Monroe versus Iceman.

The Conversation :

Mendy Ripstein	: "Yes, I want you to fight him, on the cage, no gloves,
	bare-fisted, to the finish. I make a couple of calls, I put
	down some money. There's some people on the outside,
	that know you. Everybody knows him. We'll get maybe
	twenty, thirty-to-one odds. It's easy to spread around,
	maybe two hundred thousand. You win, that's four million
	bucks, maybe more and I think he can't wait."
Monroe Hutchen	: "What's in it for me?"
James Campos	: "Mr. Ripstein uses his influence. You stay out of solitar.
	Get the privileges you ben missing."
Monroe Hutchen	:" Privileges? Offer me half the profit."
Mendy Ripstein	: "Oh, I don't think so. I'm putting up all the dough on a real
	long shot. I'm talking all the risk. What are you worried
	about money for? What are you gonna buy in here?"
Monroe Hutchen	: "You in here too. Probably gonna die in here. What
	the money matter to you?"
Mendy Ripstein	: "You're gonna get ten percent."

There is an implicature on Monroe's utterance. When he utters "You in here too. Probably gonna die in here. What the money matter to you?" he implicitly said if although he cannot use his money to buy something, but he still has family in outside that maybe need the money. When we look the context, Monroe is ex boxing champion on 10 years ago. As a boxing champion, ofcourse he was so rich. But now he is not, that is why he thinks about his family, mother or maybe his sister. Moreover, knowing if money is useless in jail but he still want it. It is indicated that the money is not for him. Because to analyze this utterance do not need special context, this utterance is classified into **generalized conversational implicature.**

When Monroe utters that utterance he violates the **maxim of relevant.** Why it be because in proper conversation he should answer when he asked by a question. But he instead asking a question also to implicitly said if the money is for his family and he need it also. Monroe will not violate the maxim of relevant if he said "Although I cannot use the money in here. But maybe same like you, I also have someone in outside who needs the money".

Datum 20 (50:24-51:17)

The Situation :

The conversation takes place on a room. There is Mingo Pace and Iceman talk to Mendy Ripstein and Jesus Campos about the price of Iceman fight against Monroe Hutchen.

The Conversation :

Mingo Pace : "The Iceman doesn't want any disappoinments. He expects to negotiate."
Jesus Campos : "You have to understand. That Mr. Ripstein is a great boxing enthusiast, a great student of the art. A great historian of the prize ring. Mr. Ripstein believes the truest purest expression of the sport was the bare-knuckle fights of the nineteenth century the Queensbury rules."

Mendy Ripstein	: "Oh, no, no. the london prize Ring rules. Queensbury
	change the rules to the ones that we got now."
Iceman	: Look, let's cut through all this bullshit. I want out.
	otherwise, no fight. How you gonnal pull it off?
Jesus Campos	: "We handle that through the Department of Corrections.
	We got a guy on the committee."
Iceman	:" I got your word on this? "
Mendy Ripstein	: "You better get ready to fight."

There is an implicature on Mendy's utterance. The meaning of that utterance is "yes, you got my promise". The context of that utterance is in the conversation on minutes 47:46. Iceman got advise from Yank Lewis, his manager, if Mendy Ripstein want to make a deal, make sure he heard it from Mendy himself. That is why Iceman asked to Mendy can he got his word or his promise? After Iceman asked it Mendy answer it with a suggestion that he better get ready to fight. Mendy implicitly said if he undertakes his promise if win or lose Iceman will get his freedom. Because to analyze that utterance do not need a special context, that utterance is classified into generalized conversational implicature.

When he convey his implicature, Mendy violates the **maxim of quantity.** Although there is an implicature that he undertakes his promise, but he did not said it directly. It makes that utterance is less of information about the proper answer. Mendy will not violate the maxim of wuantity if he said "Yes you can take my words. Now you better get ready to fight."

Datum 21 (01:00:03-01:02:00)

The Situation:

The conversation takes place on Sweetwater Octagon. There is Mendy Ripstein and Jesus Campos talk to Mr. Warden and Mr. Mercker about the permittance of the fight between Monroe versus Iceman.

The Conversation :

Mr. Warden	: "I don't make it a habit of meeting with prisoners. I'm doing this out of deference to Mr. Mecker here. Who thought it'd be a good idea. however, any attempt to have me reinstate the fight. beteween Mr. Chambers and Monroe
Mendy Ripstein	Hutchem will be futile. It has been irrecovably cancelled." : "Can I tell you a story? one of my favorites. It's about
Wendy Repstern	how things get done. This is a story that take place in
	about it must have been the middle 1950s. I was second
	in charge of certain operations. Second to a Mr. Meyer
	Lansky. There was this casino, a new one, that had been
	built in a neighboring town. But the mayor, he wanted to close that casino. Because he did not like gambling.
	He tought it brought the wrong kind of people. So he
	ordered the casino closed. ohh. i had to report this to
	Mr. Lansky. So Mr. Lansky, he told me, he says "you
	tell that mayor that the casino stays open, no question"
	but that the mayor had a choice. He could choose to be
	killed, or he could choose to have a great deal of money
	deposited in his bank account. it was his choice. in either case, the casino stays open. "
Mr. Warden	: "What happened to the mayor? "
Mendy Ripstein fireball.	: He died, he hit his ignition and his car exploded like a
Mr. Warden me?"	: "You're gonna stand there and let this hoodlum threaten
Mr. Mecker	: "Well, sir, i don't much want my car to blow up. "

On that Mendy's long sentences, there is an implicature. When Mendy told a story about a mayor at the middle of 1950s who dead because he forced to close a casino, Mendy implicitly said if Mr. Warden forces to do not permit the permission of fight between Monroe versus Iceman he will die. And if he permits it he will get a lot of money. The reason why that is the implicature because the same of the story with the situation. Because to analyze that implicature do not need special context, it is classified into generalized conversational implicature.

When Mendy conveys his threaten using that story, he violates the **maxim** of quantity. Why it be because Mendy actually can utter it directly and do not need long story that make it convoluted. Mendy will not violate the maxim of quantity if he said directly "I offer you to help me and you will get some of the profit. And if you refuse my request to give the permit, something bad will happen to you or your family."

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

Based on analyzing the data, the researcher found two types of Implicature. First is generalized conversational implicature. Second is particularized conversational Implicature. Generalized conversational implicature is dominant with 17 data. And particularized conversational implicature is 4 data. All of the implicatures that used by the characters in this movie generally are used to make the utterance to be impolite, some were used to soften the utterance and to insinuate the hearer.

The result of a violated maxim, it is found that violation maxim of manner was dominant with 10 data. The second is violation maxim of manner with 8 data, third is violation maxim of relevant with 2 data, and the last is violation maxim of quality with 1 datum. All the violated maxim are used to make the utterance to be fun, satire, and deny politely; because some of the characters have their own style language to make conversation be interested.

5.2 Suggestion

For the next researcher, the researcher suggests focussing on the type of conversational implicature. It can be the generalized conversational implicature or the particularized conversational implicature. With a focus on one of them it can make the study deeper, especially the particularized conversational implicature.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Gillian and Yule, George. 1983. Discourse Analysis. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Creswell, John W. 2014. Research Design (Qualitative, Quantitative, Mix Methods Approach). Library of Congress Cataloging.
- Fauziyah, Nadya A. 2106. Conversational Implicature On The Chew Talk Show, Malang: UIN Sunan Maulana Malik Ibrahim.
- Fitriany, Avinda N. 2016. Generating Conversational Implicatue Strategies on The Advertisments of Vogue Megazine, Malang: UIN Sunan Maulana Malik Ibrahim.
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1979. Pragmatics Implicature, Presupposition, and Logical Gorm. New York: Academic press, New York
- Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and Conversation, in P. Cole and J.L. Morgan eds, Syntax and Semantics, vol. 3. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. Paul. 1981. *Presupposition and Conversational Implicature*. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. Paul. 1989. *Studies In the Way of Words*. Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1992). An Introduction to sociolinguistic, United State of America. Longman: New York.
- Horn, Laurence R. (2004) Implicature. In L. Horn and G. Ward (eds), Handbook of Pragmatics, Chapter 1. Oxford: Blackwell, pp.3-28
- Hu, Z.L. Linguistics: Linguistics: A Course Book. Beijing: Peking University Pre 2006 Dirksen Cj, Arthur K. (1968). Advertising Principles and Problems 3rd Ed. USA: Library of Congress Catalog Card.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. Conversational implicature. In *Pragmatics* pp. 97-166. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2000 Presumptive Meanings the Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature. Cambridge. MA: MFF Press.

- Mey, Jacob L. (ed.) 1988. *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Mey, Jacob L. 1993. An Introduction to Pragmatics. Massachusetts: Best-set Type letter Ltd.
- Nanda, Sudarsono and Sukyadi. 2012. Conversational Implicature of The Presenters in Take Me Out Indonesia. Conaplin Journal. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistic, Vol.1 (2) 120-138.
- Paltridge, Brian. 2006. *Discourse Analysis (An Introduction)*. London: British Library Cataloguing
- Wang, H. (2011). Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2(5), 1162-1167.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

https://dunia21.org/undisputed-2002/