Conversational Implicatures in "Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1" Movie Series: Pragmatics Study

Zulfa Rahmadita Rachman[1], Heri Heryono[2]

[1,2]English Department, Widyatama University, Indonesia
zulfa.rahmadita@widyatama.ac.id, heri.heryono@widyatama.c.id

Abstract

This study focuses on the conversational implicature in Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1. It aims to analyze the types of conversational implicature and the reasons why the implicature occur spoken by the casts in the movie series. There are two types of conversational implicature in the movie series. Particularized conversational implicature and generalized conversational implicature. This research used descriptive qualitative method and obtained 9 particularized conversational implicature, and 22 generalized conversational implicature. The result of the research showed that in particularized implicature there are violations against maxim of relation (11.1%), maxim of manner (33,3%), maxim of quality (11.1%), and maxim of quantity (44.4%). Meanwhile, in generalized implicature, there are indefinite implicature (54.5%) and scalar implicature (36.3%). In addition, the reasons of conversational implicature are found, those are teasing, refusing, hurting, apologizing, convincing, wishing, caring, showing arrogance, disappointment and anger, reminding, informing, guessing, and self-defending.

I. Introduction

Language is the most comprehensive and effective way of transferring thoughts, messages, intentions, emotions, and opinions to others, Walija (1996). From that statement, it can be inferred that language is a means for communication and Interaction to deliver what the message spoken by human is all about. Language is one of the most important things in the life of every human being. Each of them is of course inseparable from language, the first time a child gets a language that is heard directly from the father or mother when the child is born into this world. Then as time goes by and as the child grows, they will acquire a language other than the language taught by the mother and father, either in the form of a second, third, foreign language or so on which is called language acquisition where it depends on the social environment and cognitive level possessed by these children through the learning process in their environment. (Purba, N. et al. (2020).

Languange that is conveyed through utterences could not be understood just by the literal meaning or semantics but also on the pragmatics point of view. Because the utterence is not always expressed explicitly, it's often expressed in indirect way or implicitly in many occasions. According to Yule (1996), Pragmatics is the study of "speaker meaning," or how we interpret what is said even when it is not actually stated (or written).

Conventional Implicature and non-conventional Implicature, often known as conversational Implicature, are the two main types of implicature Grice (1975). The conversational implicature is the focus of this research. Conversational implicatures cause

the speech partner to understand the speaker's intention, which is different from the speech intention which is divided into two subparts, they are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. A generalized implicature is one that can be inferred from a discussion without the use of a specific context. Particularized conversational implicature is an implicature that can only be derived in a particular context and based on the assumption of the addressee that the speaker is following the conversational maxims or at the very least the cooperation principle (maxim quality, maxim quantity, maxim relevance, and maxim manner}.

There is a movie series namely "Stranger Things" on Netflix that is becoming one of the most popular shows. Stranger Things manages to combine a coming-of-age story, horror series, conspiracy thriller, and adventure story. The series never focuses too heavily on one of these genres, instead combining elements from all of them to tell an engaging story. Many of the conversations occur in it contain implicatures, which is why the writer is interested to analyze conversational implicature out of the Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1 that will be the object of this research to analyze the types of conversational implicature and the reasons why the implicature occurs by the characters utterances.

II. Review of Literature

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of meaning spoken by the speaker, Yule (1996). Pragmatics is the study of meaning as conveyed by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. In consequence, it is more concerned with determining what people mean by their utterances than with determining on which words or phrases they use.

Huang (2007), following Levinson (2000), implemented the following pragmatics definition: "Pragmatics is the methodical study of meaning on the strength of, or as a result of the use of language. Pragmatics central research areas include implicature, presupposition, deixis and speech acts." That defines pragmatics focuses at the systematically study of meaning as consequence of language use.

2.2 Implicature

According to Grice (1975), Implicature is distinguished into two major classifications; conventional Implicature and non- conventional Implicature which also called conversational Implicature. Conversational implicature is an indirect or implicit speech act that refers to what is implied but not explicitly stated by a speaker's utterance. The term implicature, widely known as the antonym (opposite) of explicature, which is eminently stated assumption.

2.3 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is attained from "a general conversational principle plus a set of maxims that the speaker generally follows," according to Brown and Levinson (1987) and Yule (1996). Gricean maxims relates to conversational implicature which followed the Grice's cooperation principle. Through conversational implicature (Yule 1996), the speaker has conveyed more than he said, whilst the hearer identifies the meaning through inference. This agrees with Grice (1975), who defines implicature as when a speaker's meaning or implication differs from what is spoken. Grice separates conversational implicature into two types, according to Levinson (1983). There are two

kinds of conversational implicature: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

2.4 Generalized Conversational Implicature

There are two kinds of generalized conversational implicature; phrases with indefinites, using articles "a/an" or 'the", and scalar implicature is an implicature that ascribes a hidden meaning to an utterance beyond its explicit or literal meaning, implying that the utterer had a motive for not applying a further informative or powerful locution on the same scale (all, few, many, most, some…,}.

2.5 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature occurs when a conversation actually occurs in a very particular context, directly recognized interferences are assumed. At some points, to grasp what the speaker really means, the listener is expected to have particular knowledge.

Following Grice of logical conversation norms, Grundy (2000) summarizes that understanding the cooperative principle and thus its maxims allows a receiver to deduce inferred meanings (or implicatures) of utterances. Because it is meant to make conversational contributions 'cooperative,' particularized conversational implicatures are categorized into the Cooperative Principle. A particularized conversational implicature is a follow-up wherein a listener first try outs to understand a sentence using only the maxims; if this fails, he uses implicatures to discern the meaning and speaker's aim.

Grice identifies four key categories (or maxims) that produce results that follow the "Cooperative Principle".

1. Maxim of Quantity

   The category of Quantity relates to the quantity of information. The Quantity Maxim is also known as the Informativeness Maxim. (Kearns, 2000). Maxim 1 involves a speaker to provide enough information for a listener to recognize his intent. Maxim 2 involves a speaker not to repeat information by using extra words.

2. Maxim of Quality

   Be truthful or honest. Aim to make your contribution genuine. Do not say anything that you believe to be factually inaccurate. Do not say anything for something that you do not have sufficient evidence, Grice (1989).

3. Maxim of Relation

   Be relevant. The maxim of Relation requires using appropriate utterances relevant to   a preceding   conversation, that must be pertinent (Mey, 2009, Bara, 2010). A speaker should indeed attach his ongoing utterance to a previous participation, so as to give talk exchange cohesive clues. Brown and Yule (1983) translate this maxim of relation into a way more particularly beneficial form: "Create your contribution to be pertinent to the existing topic structure. ", in   which The speaker makes a contribution that is closely related to the most recent information included in the topic. Maxim of Manner
   Be unambiguous or perspicuous. It has to do with how what has been said is said; avoid insignificance of expression, avoid ambiguity, and be concise. (Avoid excessive elaboration.), and be well ordered, Grice (1989).
    Reasons of why the conversational implicature occurs:

   The first is because of violation towards maxim of quality consisting the motive of teasing, refusing, hurting, apologizing, convincing someone, showing arrogance, wishing, and caring. Secondly is because of violation towards maxim of quantity consisting the motive of convincing, teasing, and hurting. Thirdly is because of violation towards maxim

of relation consisting the motive of reminding, informing, guessing, addressing anger, and self-defending. Lastly, it is because of violation towards maxim of manner consisting the motive of showing disappointment and ignorance, teasing, reminding, and informing.

III. Research Method

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) stated, descriptive qualitative research mean that the information gathered was in the form of words or images rather than numbers. This study used descriptive qualitative research to collect the data. The data is obtained by transcribing the script of the movie series and the writer observed the utterances in the script that indicates the conversational implicature, its violations towards maxims, and the reasons why they occur.

IV. Result and Discussion

This section will be explaining about   the types of conversational implicature that occur in Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1 Movie Series and the reasons of the conversational implicature that occur in Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1 Movie Series.

The writer discovered the conversational implicature in the movie series Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1 executed by the characters in the movie after analyzing the data. The focus of this study's research, findings, and discussion will be on the types of conversational implicature and the reasons of conversational implicature occurs. There are 9 particularized conversational Implicatures, 22 generalized conversational implicatures, violation of maxim quality, quantity, relation, and manner were also found in the script.

4.1 Particularized Conversational Implicature

A conversation with a specific meaning that necessitates a specific situation in order to understand the meaning that is inferred in it.

There are 9 of particularized implicatures occur in the drama series Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1. The writer decided to choose only the most interesting ones to be included to deputize particularized conversational implicature.

1) Data 1
Violation Against Maxim of Quality
Maxim of Quality involves the person of being able to give the truth information. False information disrupts conversation and leads to miscommunication.
Joyce   : "Where's Will?" 00:11:23 – 00:11:24
Jonathan: "Oh, I didn't get him up yet. He's probably still sleeping."
From the conversation above, Joyce asks to Jonathan about where his brother (Will) is. He gives an unsure answer indicates with the word "probably" that caused him violating the maxim of quality because he might give the wrong answer. He says "Probably" because he hasn't wake him up, he guesses that Will might still in his room.

The reason why this implicature occurs is to convince Joyce by telling her of what he (Jonahan) is guessing about where his brother is even though he is not really sure whether he is saying the truth or not.

2) Data 2
Violation Against Maxim of Manner
Cutting (2002) stated, violating the maxim of manner as giving ambiguous and unclear statements in order to prevent a concise and proper response in a verbal exchange.
X: Are you sure you're okay, Chief?" 00:34:01 – 00:34:05
Chief: "Listen, I want you to call Flo."

In that context, chief wanted to tell that she doesn't need to waste too much time by asking him and she doesn't need to worry about him, but the utterance that he is given is ambiguous because X could not get the answer whether he is okay or not which makes his words ambiguous and violates the maxim of manner.

The reason of this implicature happens is that to ignore. In this case, the chief is ignoring X question to him because he thinks there is the other thing that is more important to be taken care of and also, he is being ignorance to himself by not answering of what is being asked, but telling her to mind the other thing instead of his condition.

3) Data 3
Violation Against Maxim of Quantity
Maxim of quality expects the person speaking to give details that the listener needs. The details must not be more or less than what is necessary.
Barb: "Did he?" 00:14:09 – 00:14:10
Nancy: "I told you, it's not like that. Okay, I mean, yes,
    he likes me, but not like that. We just made out a
    couple times."

The conversation above shows Barb as a friend of Nancy that is curious about her friend's relationship with someone. Barb asks her if he ever called her or not. Nancy could have answered with yes or no but she replies with a long answer and not giving her the exact answer. Because, she feels uncomfortable of answering Barb's question and doesn't want others to hear about it. In order that, she can avoid answering it. In this case, she's clearly violating the maxim of quantity.

The reason why the implicature occurs is to convince someone else. In that conversation, Nancy is trying to avoid the question by convincing her friend to believe of what she is saying even though she is not giving her the answer that it should be.

4) Data 4
Violation Against Maxim of Relation
Speaker must make certain that the explanation provide is pertinent to the previous situation by getting rid of irrelative explanation.
Barb: "So, did he call?" 00:14:04 – 00:14:06
Nancy: "Keep your voice down."

Those utterances between Barb and Nancy shows that Nancy obviously wanted to avoid the question by giving her the answer "Keep your voice down." because she doesn't want everyone knows the truth that ends up she completely gives irrelevant and out of context answer to Barb which results in violating the maxim of relation.

The reason of why this conversation happens is that to address anger. In this context, Nancy is telling Barb to keep her voice down indicates that she expressing her anger that she is angry because she is worried if others will hear them talking.

4.2 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Grice (1975) stated, there is disruption to the implicit meaning that happens inside any sort of setting.

There are 22 of generalized conversational implicatures occur in "Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1" Movie Series. The writer decided to choose only the most interesting ones to be included to deputize generalized conversational implicature.

1) Data 5
Indefinite Conversational Implicature

Phrases with indefinites, using articles "a/an" or 'the".

Dad: "He had a key to the house, right?" 00:31:52 – 00:31:54

Jonathan: "Yeah,"

The context is, the Dad implies "he" as his son or Jonathan's brother that is lost. He asked if his son had a key to the house to make sure that when he comes home, he can get in by himself if he has the key.

This utterance happens because the word "the" in "the house" that is referring to Jonathan's and his brother's house shows that they know which house they are talking about. If he wanted to be more specific he could have said Jonathan's house.

2) Data 6
Scalar Conversational Implicature

Scalar implicature is associated with a value scale. it can be shown by the application of most, all, some,many, always, few, sometimes. and often.

Phill: "Said some kids are stealing the Gnomes out of his garden again." 00:16:34

The context is Phill tells someone that some kids or Will's friends are stealing Gnomes.

The reason why this utterance occurs is to inform that some kids are stealing something. It's easy to understand generalized conversational implicature because there is no special context is required to expose the concealed meaning. The word "some" indicates that is not all the kids are stealing Gnomes in the garden and they know which "some kids" they are talking about.

V. Conclusion

According to the findings, this script has two types of conversational implicature, generalized and particularized conversational implicature, as defined by Grice theory. However, the distribution of these categories was found to be quite unbalanced, with generalized conversational implicature occurring more frequently than particularized conversational implicature. In spite of that, the violation towards maxims tends to more often to be occurred in particularized conversational implicature.

The most frequent violation towards maxim occurred by the the characters in Stranger Things Season 1 Episode 1 is the violation against maxim of quantity (44.4%), because it is noticeable when the speaker is not giving enough information or giving unnecessary information. Subsequently, followed by the violation against maxim manner (11.1%), relation (11.1%), and quality (11.1%). However, this doesn't mean that violation of maxim couldn't be happened in generalized conversational implicature. Besides, in one side of the type of conversational implicature, that is generalized conversational implicature, the writer has noticed that indefinites conversational implicature (54.5%) occurs more often than scalar conversational implicature (36.3%). Furthermore, the reason

of conversational implicature are discovered as to tease, refuse, hurt, apologize, convince, wish, care, remind, inform, guess, self-defend, show arrogance, disappointment, and anger.

References

Akmal, Saiful, (2020), Conversational Implicature Analysis in "Kingdom of Heaven" Movie Script by William Monahan

Ameedi, R A, (2013), Particularized Conversational Implicature in English Religious Texts

Christina, Vivian, (2021), Conversational Implicature Analysis In TV Show "F.R.I.E.N.D.S": Pragmatic Approach

Igwedibia, Adaoma, (2017), Grice's Conversational Implicature: A Pragmatics Analysis of Selected Poems of Audre Lorde

Nuringtyas, S, (2018), Flouting Maxim Analysis on Dialogue of Characters in Pitch Perfect Movie

Panjaitan, Barton Halasson, (2018), An Analysis of Implicature Found in The Conversation Between Tika Romauli Siregar with her prospective mother-in-law Through WhatsApp (WA) Chats

Purba, N. et al. (2020). Language Acquisition of Children Age 4-5 Years Old in TK Dhinukum Zholtan Deli Serdang. P.19-24

Raharja, Satria, (2019), Maxim Cooperative Principal Violation by Dodit Mulyanto in Stand-up Comedy Indonesia Season 4

Siahaan, S R, Natsir, Muhammad, (2015), Conversational Implicature in Mata Najwa's Talk Show

Simatupang, E C, (2019), Syntactic and semantic analysis on slogans of aviation companies in ASEAN countries

Sofyan, A., et al, (2022), The Analysis of Conversational Implicature Between Students and Teachers at Al-Azhar Islamic Boarding School