An Analysis of Particularized Conversational Implicatures in Breaking Dawn 1 Movie

Warunee Sae-aia[*] iD

Surin, Thailand

_____

Abstract

In realistic human conversations, linguistic tools such as irony and metaphor are applied to add more vibrant and artistic language features to create hidden messages in speech. This research is about the study of particularized conversational implicatures in Breaking Dawn 1 movie, using the theory of Cooperative Principles by Grice. The research objective was to investigate the types of particularized conversational implicatures produced in the movie. The samples were the utterances produced in the conversations in the movie. The instruments were the original movie transcript of Breaking Dawn 1 movie. The statistics used to analyze the quantitative data were frequency and percentage, and the qualitative data were analyzed by a descriptive method though content analysis. The results revealed three types of particularized conversational implicature: Group A (no maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated), group B (maxim is violated, but the violation is explained by a clash with another maxim), and

_____

[*] Corresponding author.
E-mail address: wsaeaia@gmail.com

group C (a maxim or at least cooperative principle is flouted). Group C was the most frequently produced with the frequency of 42 (76.36%), followed by group A (f = 11, 20.00%), and group B (f = 2, 3.64 %). The most used linguistic device in group C was irony, followed by metaphor.

Introduction

English language has dominated the world of education, business and industry, entertainment, and universal communication in our globalized world. Universally, English speaking competency in authentic English conversations is credited the most challenging goal for most ESL and EFL students worldwide. The use of movies as English teaching and learning resource has become a well-known, practical approach for English language teachers and learners (Albiladi & Abdeen & Lincoln, 2018). Generally, English spoken in movies helps improve students' English skills since it is very natural and similar to what is heard when speaking with native English speakers. Still, the language barriers prevent the learners from understanding the messages in the movies in the way that what the actors are saying is not what they are implying. Consequently, the study of particularized conversational implicature governs an in-depth investigation of implicit massages conveyed in English language.

Particularized conversational implicature is a universally discussed matter, for it conveys a different meaning from the literal utterance without intending to deceive. The particularized conversational implicature (PCI) of Grice (1975) and Yule (1996) was adopted as the theoretical support for this study due to the most received attention in recent linguistic studies. Particularized conversational implicature in movies, novels, plays, comic strips, newspaper cartoon or broadcast messages was conducted by various researchers in different locations. Some studies on conversational implicature analysis were, for instance, Dechagan's research on conversational implicature in the Blondie and Dagwood comic strips (2010),

Vo's research on conversational implicatures in Titanic movie (2011), Savetamalya's research entitled conversational implicature in the column Laugh! It is the best medicine in reader's digest (2011), Anita's research entitled conversational implicature in From Paris with Love movie (2013), Le's research on implicatures in Romeo and Juliet play by William Shakespeare (2013), Lestari's research entitled the analysis of conversational implicature on the movie script of Despicable Me (2013), and a research of Kondowe, Ngwira and Madula entitled linguistic analysis of Malawi political newspaper cartoons on president Joyce Banda: Towards Grice's conversational implicature (2014).

Breaking Dawn 1 is a romantic, drama and fantasy movie that holds different settings, main characters, and English conversations of standard American English language. Its conversations contain different types of implicature and hidden messages among interlocutors. For that reason, Breaking Dawn 1 movie was chosen to be investigated for this research.

Literature Review

1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a study to investigate unsaid or unwritten meaning that is invisible in an utterance or a conversation (Yule, 2010). It concerns communication in human society driven by the context of language in use in cooperation with a particular condition of the community (Mey, 1993), and comprehends how to explore utterance interpretation of entire social communication in different manners (Meyer, 2009). Conclusively, the production and interpretation of the invisible meaning interpreted by the hearer rely on a particular context under a particular circumstance, the distance of shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer, and entire social context interpretation without the consideration of semantic theories.

2. Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975) stated that in successful human communication, people have a tendency to follow the rules and are expected to observe them. His concept

of Cooperative Principle is to suggest that the interlocutors in a conversation should "make their contribution as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which they are engaged." It is comprised of four maxims called conversational maxims or Grice's maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

3. Conversational Maxims

Quantity
 1) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of exchange).
 2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true.
1) Do not say what you believe to be false.
2) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
Relation: Be relevant
Manner: Be perspicuous
1) Avoid obscurity of expression
2) Avoid ambiguity
3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
4) Be orderly (Grice. 1975: 45-46)

Maxim of quantity requires the interlocutor to contribute appropriate amount of information; not too much nor too less.
Maxim of quality requires the speaker to deliver such true information, and avoid the contribution that cannot be proved by adequate evidence.
Maxim of relation requires relevant contribution when engaging in a conversation.
Maxim of manner requires the participant to avoid using difficult, unclear terms in a conversation, and be concise and well-organized when making contribution.

4. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Apart from the concept of Cooperative Principle, interlocutors in a conversation also have to pay close attention in various aspects including emotion, setting, facial expression, verbal language, gesture, surrounding atmosphere, background knowledge and social context. Grice (1975) stated that what was implicated (implicature) and what was said were part of speaker meaning. The additional meaning carried by a particularized conversational implicature occurs when one of the maxims or at least the cooperative principle is exploited by either violating, flouting, opting, or facing a crush. It is the hearer to predict particularized conversational implicatures via inference (Meyer, 2009 & Yule, 1996). In conclusion, to recognize a particularized conversational implicature, we need specific knowledge and background to understand an utterance in the context in agreement with what is expected to be said.

According to Grice (1975) the three groups of particularized conversational implicature (PCI) were illustrated in cooperation with cooperative principle and conversational maxims as follows:
1. Group A: No maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated.

2. Group B: A maxim is violated, but the violation is explained by a clash with another maxim.

3. Group C: A maxim (or at least cooperative principle) is flouted.
The illustrations of the three types of particularized conversational implicature (PCI) are as the followings:

1. Group A: No maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated.
Example 1:
Rick: Hey! Coming to the wild party tonight?
Tom: My parents are visiting.

Under this circumstance, Yule (1996) provided an example of the conversation between Rick and Tom. Apparently, Rick's question requested the answer either yes or no, Tom's response did not appear to adhere to relevance. However, Tom meant to implicate the answer *no* by giving Rick the reason why not.

Most of the time our conversations take place in such specific context that sometimes the particularized conversational implicatures can be calculated without any special knowledge of those occasions.

2. Group B: A maxim is violated, but the violation is explained by a clash with another maxim.
In example 2 (Grice, 1975), A and B were planning the itinerary for their vacation in France. Both knew that A wanted to visit C and they had no reason not to do so.
A: Where does C live?
B: Somewhere in the south of France.
According to the conversation, B was violating the maxim of quantity by obviously responding A with inadequate information that A needed for the itinerary. B was aware that more information was required but B was, at the same time, trying to observe the maxim of quality (Do not say what you lack adequate evidence). Consequently, B implicated that he did not know in which town C lived.

3. Group C: A maxim (or at least cooperative principle) is flouted at the level of what is said for the purpose of producing a conversational implicature, and the hearer is to assume that the maxim (or at least cooperative principle) is observed at the level of what is implicated.
Group C1: A flouting of the first maxim of quantity (Make your contribution as informative as required)
The utterance illustrated group C1 was as in a tautology in example 3 (Grice, 1975).
Example 3:
A: Women are women.

At the level of what was said in example 3, it was obviously not informative enough to state such remarks as in example 3. It was, however, as informative as required at the level of what is implicated. The statement implicated that women are the same.

Group C2: A flouting of the second maxim of quantity (Do not give more information than is required)
Example 4:
Sue is at the party standing next to a beautiful woman, Kate, who is Sue's friend. Sue is introducing Kate to her other friends.
Sue: This is Kate, my friend from high school and she is single at the moment.
According to Sue's remark, it initially seemed over informative. What was stated was that Kate has been a friend of Sue for a long time. She might have been married, had a boyfriend or just broken up or never been in a relationship, but now she is single. It implicated that Sue was trying to give her other friends (especially male friends) a chance to meet Kate and implying that Kate was open for new people, new friends or a new relationship and her previous status was not important since she is now single.

Group C3: A flouting of the first maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false)
Example 5:
A and B are going to leave home for a picnic. Once they look outside, the sky is getting dark and a storm is brewing.
A: Nice weather!
When A produced such a statement, A was flouting a maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false). By saying so, A implied that A was so upset about the bad weather because they are about to go out for a picnic, but obviously it had to be canceled.

According to Grice (1975), there were four types of linguistic use under group C3.

C3.1) Irony (Sarcasm)

Example 6:

A: What do you think about C?

B: He is a fine friend.

When B said that statement with a certain tone of voice and a certain kind of facial expression, B obviously implicated that C was not a fine friend at all. It presented that a particularized conversational implicature was displaying when the flouting of the first maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false) was exploited by using irony.

C3.2) Metaphor (Simile)

An example of using metaphor (Grice, 1975) was in example 7.

Example 7:

A: You are the cream in my coffee.

The first intention of saying this metaphor would reach the hearer to interpret the implicature as you are my best friend yet the second level of its interpretation would be the irony meaning as an annoying or boring person.

C3.3) Meiosis (Litotes)

Meiosis is the use of language to express an understatement for rhetorical effect. When this lady was recently fired, caught that her husband had an affair, and known that her kid got some trouble at school. Her answer to the question asked was an implication using meiosis as in example 8.

Example 8:

Woman's friend: Hey! Are you alright?

Woman: Oh! I'm fine. Just a little upset.

According to her situation, she definitely was not fine nor just a little upset. In fact, she was conveying the implicature that she is extremely discontented and very upset.

C3.4) Hyperbole

Hyperbole is the use of language for the exaggeration. An example of hyperbole was as the following statement in example 9.

Example 9:

A: Every young girl loves Justin Bieber.

It was obvious that Justin was very famous, though it was not literally that every young girl loves him. This statement gave the implicature that in fact he was very famous and very hot among young girls and it would be unbelievable if there was the fact that some young girls did not like him.

Group C4: A flouting of the second maxim of quality (Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence)

Example 10:

A husband and a wife are about to leave their house, the husband is looking for the car key and he asks his wife.

Husband: Where is the key?

Wife: Probably somewhere in the house.

Obviously, the wife was flouting the second maxim of quality (Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence). In this case, she clearly was not helping on finding the key by saying that remark. The wife, however, was implicating that she had no idea where the key was or where to look for. To produce such an implicature here may deliver an unclear intention, with a certain tone of voice or facial expression, the hearer may interpret as a sarcastic remark instead of a simple "I don't know."

Group C5: A flouting of the maxim of relation

Example 11:

A: Mr. Smith is an old bag.

B: The weather has been quite delightful this summer, hasn't it?

Grice (1975) gave the explanation of the case when the maxim of relation was flouted. At a tea party, A conveyed such a remark, after a short silence, B responds. B's response flouted the maxim of relation, A had to preserve the assumption of cooperation with the local inference why B made an apparently non-relevant response. The implicature here was essentially that A's remark should not be discussed and A had committed a social blunder.

Group C6: A flouting of the maxim of manner (Avoid ambiguity)

Grice (1975) gave an example of this group as referred to Blake's lines in example 12

Example 12:

A: Never seek to tell thy love, love that never told can be.

According to example 12, "love that never told can be" could have a double ambiguous meaning. It may mean either "love that cannot be told" or "love that if told cannot continue to exist". This ambiguity may be caused by the sophistication of the poet that the explicit saying was doubted and the poet was only conveying or suggesting both of them.

Group C7: A flouting of the maxim of manner (Avoid obscurity)

Example 13:

A man and a woman are having a conversation about English language, while a kid is sitting next to them.

Man: There are 21 letters in English alphabet, right?

Woman: No, 26.

Man: Oh! Sorry. I forgot U R A Q T.

Woman: That's funny.

In this talk exchange, the man was intensively flouting the maxim of manner (obscurity). He intended to convey his feeling towards her by making his remark more impressive and obscure, and expect her to know that he was being obscure for not wanting the kid to understand the talk. His implicature was that he thinks she is beautiful or he likes her. The set of letters U R A Q T would locally stand for "You are a cutie."

Group C8: A flouting of the maxim of manner (be brief)

Grice (1975) displayed an example of this case using the comparison between statement a) and b) as follows:

Example 14:

A: What song did miss X sing?

B: a) Miss X sang "Home sweet home".

   b) Miss X produced a series of sounds the corresponded closely with the score of "Home sweet home".

When B chose statement b) instead of a), B failed to observe the maxim of manner (be brief), and was implicating that miss X performance was terrible.

Group C9: A flouting of the maxim of manner (be orderly)
Example 15:
A: How did you drive here? I have been waiting for so long.
B: It wasn't easy. I drove through short-cuts and I jumped into my car right after I got the text message.
According to example 15, A was complaining about how long it took B to get here. As B's response, it could be inferred the way may be complicated and it may give B a hard time to finally get here, and showed that B did not feel good about it. B rose a flouting of the maxim of manner (be orderly) to let A know that B did the best, and was not happy with the complaint. Unlike the previous maxims, the maxims of manner (be orderly) have to do with how what is said is said.

5. Breaking Dawn 1 Movie

Breaking Dawn 1 movie is adapted from the fourth book of the best-selling twilight saga series. The movie is romantic, drama and fantasy about the mixture of juvenile love, fight, outrage, and joy among teenage vampires, werewolves, humans, friends, and family that makes the movie full of realistic conversations in situations of human society. Besides, the movie received global box office success and has been globally admired among young filmgoers. Breaking Dawn 1 movie offers standard American English that is considered the most widely spoken due to the influence of American culture, economy, politic, entertainment. It is highly recognized in practical use for English learners and those who are learning and developing English language competence. Therefore, the movie script of Breaking Dawn 1 movie was chosen for the case study of this research. The applicable and profitable result of this study explicitly contributed to students who study pragmatics and conversational implicature, and was rationally useful for English language learners, and those who are developing and mastering their understanding of spoken English to enhance their English language comprehension.

Research Objectives

This research objective was to investigate types of particularized conversational implicatures produced in Breaking Dawn 1 movie.

Research Methodology

1. Research Design

The researcher used descriptive research design for this research data analysis.

2. Samples

The samples of this research were 1026 utterances extracted from the script of the conversations in Breaking Dawn 1 movie.

3. Instruments and Procedures

The research samples were collected from the scripts retrieved from http://transcripts.foreverdreaming.org and the English subtitles in the original movie Breaking Dawn 1.

The reliability of the qualitative data was examined by the inter-coder reliability coefficients of 0.80 or 80 % (Neuendorf, 2002 & Wannaruk, 1997 cited in Prachanant, 2006). The three inter-coders in this research were two lecturers who were native English speakers and the researcher herself. The differences of the outcome were discussed to find out the central agreement. The validation of the data was supervised by the research supervisors to obtain feedbacks and corrections (Elliott & Timulak, 2005).

The statistical data were analyzed through frequency and percentage using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The results were presented as frequency and percentage of the occurrence of each category mentioned in Data Categorization.

4. Data Collection

The method of data collection were stages adapted from Lacey and Luff (2007) as follows:

4.1 Generating movie scripts, the script of the movie in this research were developed from two different sources:

1) The movie script from English subtitles in the original movie

2) The movie scripts from the website

http://transcripts.foreverdreaming.org.

The researcher cross-checked three times for the accuracy of the movie script to ensure reliability and validity.

4.2 Data Organization, for easily retrievable and systemized sections of data, a simple digit number e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc. was given to each utterance to create a unit of data. The followings were examples of numbering the utterances in a dialog.

Alice: You just have to break them in.
Bella: I've been breaking them in. For three days. Can I just go barefoot?

↓

Alice: You just have to break them in. [5]
Bella: I've been breaking them in. [6] For three days. [7] Can I just go barefoot? [8]

Utterance 5: *You just have to break them in.*
Utterance 6: *I've been breaking them in.*
Utterance 7: *For three days.*
Utterance 8: *Can I just go barefoot?*

4.3 Data Familiarization, the researcher read the movie script, watched the films with replication, and did some research on general background and cultural background to acquire further familiarization and the right understanding of the social context in the movie.

5. Data Analysis

The data analysis adapted from Khandkar (n.d.) was structured to address the prior research objectives. The stages of data analysis were as follows:

5.1 Theoretical Framework, the particularized conversational implicature theory (PCI) by Grice (1975) and several examples by Yule (1996) were adopted for the theoretical support to examine cases where particularized conversational implicatures were produced in the movie. Particularized conversational implicature (PCI) is context-dependent which means that it requires special information to interpret the hidden meanings of the expressions.

5.2 Data Categorization, the areas of interest were categorized into 15 coding concepts as follows:

1) A: No maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated.

2) B: A maxim is violated, but the violation is explained by a clash with another maxim.

3) C1: A flouting of the first maxim of quantity (Make your contribution as informative as required)

4) C2: A flouting of the second maxim of quantity (Do not give more information than is required)

5) C3: A flouting of the first maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false)

6) C3.1: A flouting of the first maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false): Irony (Sarcasm)

7) C3.2: A flouting of the first maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false): Metaphor (Simile)

8) C3.3: A flouting of the first maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false): Meiosis (Litotes)

9) C3.4: A flouting of the first maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false): Hyperbole

10) C4: A flouting of the second maxim of quality (Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence)

11) C5: A flouting of the maxim of relation

12) C6: A flouting of the maxim of manner (Avoid ambiguity)

13) C7: A flouting of the maxim of manner (Avoid obscurity)

14) C8: A flouting of the maxim of manner (be brief)

15) C9: A flouting of the maxim of manner (be orderly)

5.3 Data Codification, the conceptual coding was sub-divided into two phases, and each phase was coded two times:

1) The first phase, particularized conversational implicatures were underlined and labelled as PCI.

2) The second phase, the utterances that carried 15 different classifications of particularized conversational implicatures were underlined and labelled as A, B, C1, C2, C3, C3.1, C3.2, C3.3, C3.4, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, and C9

5.4 Data Interpretation, the researcher analyzed the qualitative data using a descriptive method through content analysis to interpret the meanings of conversational implicatures. The outcomes of research analysis were supervised by research advisers and corrected in accordance with their feedbacks.

Results

The results were presented according to the research objectives to investigate particularized conversational implicatures produced in Breaking Dawn 1 movie. Three groups of particularized conversational implicatures were found: Group A: No maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated, group B: A maxim is violated, but the violation is explained by a clash with another maxim, and group C: A maxim (or at least cooperative principle) is flouted. Group C was the most frequently produced with the frequency of 42, followed by group A (f = 11), and group B (f = 2). Total occurrence of different types of particularized conversational implicatures produced in Breaking Dawn 1 movie was presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Total Occurrence of Types of Conversational Implicature Produced
Breaking Dawn 1 movie

Groups of particularized conversational implicature	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Group A: No maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated	**11**	**20.00**
Group B: A maxim is violated, but the violation is explained by a clash with another maxim	**2**	**3.64**
Group C: A maxim is flouted	**42**	**76.36**
C1: A maxim of quantity (Make your contribution as informative as required)	0	0
C2: A maxim of quantity (Do not give more information than is required)	1	1.82
C3: A maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false/ false statement)	7	12.73
C3.1: A maxim of quality (Irony)	9	16.36
C3.2: A maxim of quality (Metaphor)	5	9.09
C3.3: A maxim of quality (Meiosis)	3	5.45
C3.4: A maxim of quality (Hyperbole)	2	3.64
C4: A maxim of quality (Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence)	0	0
C5: A maxim of relation	9	16.36
C6: A maxim of Manner (Ambiguity)	3	5.45
C7: A maxim of Manner (Obscurity)	2	3.64
C8: A maxim of Manner (Brief)	1	1.82
C9: A maxim of Manner (Orderly)	0	0
Total	**55**	**100**

According to the data codification presented in Table 1, 55 particularized conversational implicatures out of 70 implicatures were found in 1026 utterances attracted from the script: 11 implicatures were coded as group A (20.00%), 2 implicatures were coded as group B (3.64 %), and 42

implicatures were coded as group C (76.36%). Sub-classifications namely C1, C4 and C9 were not found in the conversation of the movie script.

In accordance with data analysis, 12 sub-classifications of particularized conversational implicatures coded as group A, group B, group C (C2, C3, C3.1, C3.2, C3.3, C3.4, C5, C6, C7, C8) were analyzed to interpret the obtained data as follows:

Group A: No maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated

Datum 1:

Situation: Everyone gathers at the wedding waiting for the bride to walk the aisle. Jessica and Angela, Bella's friends, are talking.

Dialogue:

Jessica: <u>So, you think Bella's gonna be showing?</u> [128] +> PCI (group A)

   Angela: Jess, she is not pregnant. [129]

Data interpretation:

As presented in datum 1, utterance [128] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group A. From the background of the movie, Jessica is jealous of Bella's sudden wedding. With a smile and a specific look on Jessica's face, she implies that Bella may be pregnant and will not show up at the wedding because of the physical appearance of her pregnancy. No maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated when producing this implicature.

Group B: A maxim is violated, but the violation is explained by a clash with another maxim

Datum 2:

Situation: Edward and Bella are talking in Bella's house the night before the wedding. He tries to convince Bella to change her mind about turning herself into a vampire after the wedding. Bella, however, is not going to change her mind. Edward walks over to the window, looks out, then turns and faces Bella again.

Dialogue:

Edward: I'll meet you at the altar. [69]

Bella: <u>I'll be the one in white.</u> [70] +> PCI (group B)

Data interpretation:

As presented in datum 2, utterance [70] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group B. According to the background of the movie, Edward loves Bella to death that he does not want to see her change into a vampire who will crave for human blood. He wants her to live a normal human life, but Bella is willing to sacrifice her family, friends and her human life to be with him, and will not change her mind. In western cultures, it is customary for the bride to wear white. There is no need for Bella to tell Edward that detail, unless she wants to implicate that she will marry him and never change her mind.

Group C2: A maxim of quantity is flouted (Do not give more information than is required)

Datum 3:

Situation: After Bella wakes up as a vampire, Carlisle sends a letter to Aro, a vampire leader in Italy, to let him know that now Bella is a new born vampire.

Dialogue:

Aro: Oh, it's from Carlisle. [1013] <u>which is spelt with an S</u>, sweet Bianca. [1014] +> PCI (group C2)

Data interpretation:

As presented in datum 3, utterance [1014] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C2. From the background of the story, Aro hates Carlisle because he gets more powerful as his family members have unique powers as gifts. Aro always wants to kill Carlisle and get Alice to join his clan. By saying utterance [1014], Aro implicates his hatred toward Carlisle using too much information than is required.

Group C3: A maxim of quality (Do not say what you believe to be false/ false statement)

Datum 4:

Situation: Jasper and Carlisle are carrying benches for the wedding. Emmett comes in carrying a long tree trunk.

Dialogue:

Emmett: Where do you want them, boss? [14] +> PCI (group C3)

Alice: On either side of the aisle. [15]

Data interpretation:

As presented in datum 4, utterance [14], contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C3. From the background of the movie, Emmett, Alice and Rosalie are the members of the Cullen's. Calling Alice boss is a false statement, however, to everyone in Cullen family, Alice is an enthusiastic wedding organizer that no one can have any disagreement against her. Emmett implies that she is in charge of organizing an entire wedding and he will follow her lead.

Group C3.1: A maxim of quality is flouted using irony

Datum 5:

Situation: In the morning of the wedding day, Charlie and Renee come to see Bella in her dressing room. Charlie opens the gift box containing a sapphire hair comb.

Dialogue:

Renee: We thought you needed something blue. [103]

Charlie: And something old. [104] Besides your mother. [105] +> PCI (group C3.1)

Data interpretation:

As presented in datum 5, utterance [105] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C3.1. Something old, something new, something borrowed, something blue, the four objects that the bride adds to her wedding outfit or carries with her on the big day are for good luck charms following the tradition from an old English rhyme. On Bella's wedding day, her parents prepare something blue and old for her and Charlie tries to make her relax by making a humorous irony. Charlie's utterance

shows their good friendship, and implies that Renee is old yet cannot be used as a lucky charm.

Group C3.2: A maxim of quality is flouted using metaphor
Datum 6:
Situation: The night before the wedding day, Edward comes to see Bella at her house.
Dialogue:
Edward: <u>I was just checking for cold feet.</u> [21] +> PCI (group C3.2)
Bella: Well, mine are toasty warm. [22]
Data interpretation:
As presented in datum 6, utterance [21] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C3.2. According to the movie, Edward is worried about Bella's decision to marry him with their agreement that she will marry him if he turns her. He wishes she changed her mind for he never wants her to become immortal. Checking for cold feet is a metaphoric expression Edward uses to imply that he may see or wants to see Bella having the discouragement of marrying him.

Group C3.3: A maxim of quality is flouted using meiosis
Datum 7:
Situation: At Cullen's house, Bella walks in her wedding shoes slowly, she looks down at her feet and stumbles a little.
Dialogue:
Alice: You just have to break them in. [5]
Bella: I've been breaking them in. [6] For three days. [7] Can I just go barefoot? [8]
Alice: No, absolutely not. [9]
Bella: <u>Just thinking it's a little much, you know?</u> [10] The dress and the shoes, and all of this. [11] +> PCI (group C3.3)
Data interpretation:
As presented in datum 7, utterance [10] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C3.3. According to the setting, Alice is trying to prepare Bella for her wedding day. She wants her wedding to be perfect and makes Bella try her new pair of wedding shoes. Bella, on the other hands, is not so enthusiastic about it. She requests to walk bear feet

on her wedding day and says that everything is a little too much. Utterance [10] is an understatement expression (meiosis) that Bella makes to imply that everything is way too much and she is not into it.

Group C3.4: A maxim of quality is flouted using hyperbole
Datum 8:
Situation: On Bella's wedding day, Edward takes Bell away from the crowd and suddenly Jacob appears ahead of them.
Dialogue:
Bella: Where have you been? [256] We were gonna put your face on a milk carton. [257] +> PCI (group C3.4)
Jacob: Mostly northern Canada I think. [258] It's weird to be back on two legs again, in clothes. [259] Gotten out of practice with the whole human thing. [260]
Data interpretation:
As presented in datum 8, utterance [257], contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C3.4. According to the beginning of movie, Jacob runs away from home when he sees an invitation card for Bella's wedding, and no one sees him again. Bella is worried about him and looks forward to hearing from him. Historically, a photo on a milk carton, began in the early 1980s, was a United States-based custom of printing advertisements on milk cartons to draw attention to a missing child. Bella's remark is an exaggerated statement to imply how much she has been worried about him.

Group C5: A maxim of relation is flouted
Datum 9:
Situation: Jasper and Carlisle are carrying benches for the wedding. Emmett comes in carrying a long tree trunk.
Dialogue:
Emmett: Where do you want them, boss? [14]
Alice: On either side of the aisle. [15]
Rosalie: What aisle? [16]
Alice: Does no one have vision? [17] +> PCI (group C5)

Data interpretation:

As presented in datum 9, utterance [17] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C5. From the background of the movie, Alice is always into fashion and eager to manage Bella's wedding. Everyone in the Cullen knows that Alice is in charge of organizing and planning it. Once that Rosalie asks her what aisle, Alice realizes that the other vampires have no sense of fashion and need her opinion and decision on the decoration. Alice responds to Rosalie by flouting a maxim of relation to produce an implicature which implies that she has to tell them everything and it is irrelevant to the question asked by Rosalie.

Group C6: A maxim of manner is flouted using ambiguity
Datum 10:
Situation: At the Cullen's house, Bella, Edward, Rosalie, and Jacob are talking about the baby's name.
Dialogue:
Bella: I was playing around with our moms' names. [922] Renée and Esme. [923] And I was thinking... Renesmee. [924]
Jacob: Renesmee [925]
Bella: Too weird? [926]
Jacob: Um... [927] +> PCI (group C6)
Data interpretation:

As presented in datum 10, utterance [927] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C6. Jacob does not agree with the name of the baby that Bella has decided but he does not say it to upset Bella. By saying utterance [927] with a certain tone and facial expression, Jacob produces an implicature using unclear or confusing statement, which can be understood in more than one way. It shows an uncertainty as if Jacob is thinking about it or it is a simple "Yes, it is weird." to the question asked.

Group C7: A maxim of manner is flouted using obscurity
Datum 11:
Situation: Jacob hurries to the Cullen's house once he learns that Bella is back from the honeymoon and she is really sick. Jacob walks into the house

and see Bella's huge pregnant belly, he gets angry and everyone starts arguing.
Dialogue:
Esme: Rose! All this fighting isn't good for Bella. [547]
Alice: The fetus isn't good for Bella. [548] +> PCI (group C7)
Rosalie: Say the word, Alice. [549] "baby" It's just a little baby. [550]
Data interpretation:
As presented in datum 11, utterance [548] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C7. From the movie background, the half human-half vampire baby that is growing inside Bella's body is making her weaker and seen as a threat to her life. Only Bella and Rosalie want to keep the baby, but everyone else wants to destroy it. The fetus is a terminology to call an unborn offspring of a mammal, in particular, an unborn human baby more than eight weeks after conception. Calling it the fetus instead of the baby, Alice implicates her uncertainty and discrepancy to accept it as a human baby but a demon.

Group C8: A maxim of manner is flouted (be brief)
Datum 12:
Situation: Jacob tries to convince Bella to give up her offspring, but Bella is not convinced. He gets up and leave the Cullen's house with anger and the other wolves gather in their wolf form communicating through their thoughts.
Dialogue:
Sam: We have to protect the tribe. [620] What they've bred won't be able to control its thirst. [621] Every human will be in danger. [622]
Jared: We're ready. [623]
Leah: No time to waste. [624]
Jacob: Now? [625]
Sam: We must destroy it before it's born. [626] +> PCI (group C8)
Seth: You mean, kill Bella? [627]
Data interpretation:
As presented in datum 12, utterance [626] contained a particularized conversational implicature classed as group C8. According to the movie background, the wolves have been protecting the tribe and human for a long

time and if something is considered a danger to the community, they will destroy it. Every wolf agrees with Sam to kill Bella and her baby and it shocks Jacob since they will never kill a human soul. Being an alpha, Sam provides his reason to support his decision in his utterance [626] using the flouting of maxim of manner (be brief) to implicate the answer "Yes" to the question asked by Jacob. The implicature that Sam makes concludes the situation that they will do it now although it means to kill Bella and also forces Jacob to join him.

Discussion

According to the research results, group C (a maxim or at least cooperative principle is flouted) of particularized conversational implicature was the most produced in Breaking Dawn 1 while group A (no maxim is violated, or at least it is unclear that any maxim is violated) and group B (a maxim is violated, but the violation is explained by a clash with another maxim) were less produced. That was because group C of particularized conversational implicature contained more various linguistic tools for the speakers to create such implicatures by flouting a maxim. When creating implicatures by the concept of group C (flouting a maxim), many strategies classified by Grice's maxims could be used. Maxim of quantity includes the concept of making the contribution as informative as required and giving more information than is required. Maxim of quality includes providing false statement or what is believed to be false, the use of irony, metaphor, meiosis or hyperbole and saying that for which you lack adequate evidence. Maxim of relation includes providing irrelevant response, and maxim of manner includes using of ambiguity and obscurity, or not providing brief or orderly statement. With these strategic tools, the speakers can contribute more creative and stimulating utterances in the talk exchange.

When comparing each maxim, the result revealed that the presence of flouting a maxim of quality was the most frequently found in this case. The most used linguistic tool of maxim of quality to create implicatures was irony, followed by false statement, metaphor, meiosis and hyperbole respectively. The reason to support the result was that the movie Breaking

Dawn 1 itself contained different roles of characters and a great deal of specific knowledge and background. Having been through many strenuous circumstances, the characters in the movie have developed their personalities, personal passions, close acquaintanceship and intimacy, acquired more specific information, and shared knowledge and particular experiences in specific situation. Similar to real human communications, they occurred in a very specific circumstance, took place in a specific situation and interlocutors held specific information of that specific situation (Yule,1996). Consequently, it led to the presence of conversations that took place in very specific surroundings. For that reason, the interlocutors needed to pay close attention to one another in order to communicate successfully. When they had to deal with choosing the language tools, the more sophisticated ones would be the first option for their creative style of language. Not only is irony a rhetorical device, it is also a subtle communication strategy used by the speaker to draw attention from the hearer. The use of irony in speech shows the ability and wisdom of the producer, and forms a connection between the interlocutors when they understand each other and while having a good conversation. When used carefully, irony and such other tools add extra amusement and engagement to the message delivered. Anatole France quoted once that "a world without irony would be like a forest without birds: Irony is the gaiety of meditation and the joy of wisdom" (Fulford, 1999).

However, this result was in disagreement with the results of Andresen (2013) who studied flouting the maxims in comedy: An analysis of flouting in the comedy series "Community". The results of Andresen's study revealed that the presence of flouting a maxim of quantity was the most frequently produced in this case. It was basically more straightforward to determine flouting a maxim of quantity and quality since this was less complicated to identify whether the speaker was informative, gave too much information, or false statement. Additionally, the main character who produced implicatures by flouting a maxim of quantity and quality was the leader of the team. His narcissistic characteristics determined the use of flouting a maxim of quality to comment the inferior appearance of others, and the use

of flouting a maxim of quantity reflected his leadership to pass on orders to his fellows and deliver information which was for comic effects of the series.

Moreover, the research result was also irrelevant to the research results of Kondowe, Ngwira & Madula (2014) whose study was about linguistic analysis of Malawi political newspaper cartoons on president Joyce Banda, Lestari's research (2013) entitled the analysis of conversational implicature on the movie script, and Savetamalya's research (2011) entitled conversational implicature in the column Laugh. The results revealed that the most used tool to create implicatures was flouting a maxim of manner. Kondowe, Ngwira & Madula (2014) claimed that flouting the maxim of manner was the majority selected by the cartoonist through the use of fudging strategies such as vague information to create humorous effects and to reduce the strength of their assertions especially when they tried to avoid political involvement. Lestari (2013) asserted that flouting the maxim of manner in the cartoon scripts offered a platform of relaxing, irrelevant statements and ambiguous sentences to provide harmonious atmosphere and add artistic feathers to the scripts. Savetamalya (2011) also stated that implicatures in Laugh were caused by the presence of flouting a maxim of manner. With the use of puns, sound association, spoonerism, and ambiguity, these language tools played a significant role to generate amusing feelings and humor to the comic scripts.

A standard feature in most comic, cartoon, and animation allows not only for easier localization, but it is elementary and culturally neutral which means that it is required to be attractive to all audiences. The scripts mainly aim at creating and delivering humor to the audience. With that specific purpose, the language chosen by the script writers would particularly be more selective and decisive in a less natural way to achieve humorous effect. Unlike comic medium, movie scripts of Breaking Dawn 1 was initiated for more authentic features. When influenced by real human behaviors, personal relationships, and social impacts, the language in movie scripts would be more emotionalized, genuine and originally humanlike. Decisively, these variations could allow distinctive linguistic features to inversely dominate the languages used in the scripts.

Recommendations

1. Implications

Particularized conversational implicature dominates the area of English language intellectual capacity. It is not simply produced nor understood, yet it is an astounding and applicable tool for English language in use. Accomplishing advanced level of English terminology and grammar structures alone would not be enough to achieve English fluency. English learners must give precedence to appropriate and successful communication, and profoundly understand authentic context of English. The learners of English language should deepen the significance of particularized conversational implicatures, and pay close attention to the true meanings in contextual clues in English conversation.

2. Further Studies

This study aimed to investigate the region of particularized conversational implicature in the scope of English conversations done by native English speakers in a fantasy movie script. For more diversity, an investigation of the significance of particularized conversational implicature in cross-cultural communication in different medium would add more value to English acquisition cycle. It could be a guideline to gain more advantages for realistic purposes, understanding on how universal English learners cope with implications in English language, and how to improve English intelligence.

References

Albiladi, W.S., Abdeen, F., & Lincoln, F. (2018). Learning English through movies: Adult English language learners' perceptions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8, pp.1567-1574.

Andresen, N. (2013). *Flouting the maxims in comedy: An analysis of flouting in the comedy series community: English III: Degree project in linguistics*. Sweden: Karlstads University.

Anita, S. M. (2013). *Conversational implicature in "from Paris with love" movie directed by Pierre Morel*: *Pragmatic study*. Indonesia: University of Gorontalo.

Dechagan, A. (2010). *Conversational implicature in the "Blondie and Dagwood" comic strips* (Master's thesis). Thailand: Chiang Mai University.

Elliott, R. & Timulak, L. (2005). Chapter 11. *Descriptive and interpretive approaches to qualitative research*, 147-159.

Fulford, R. (1999). *Robert Fulford's column about irony.* Retrieved from http://www.robertfulford.com

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics*, *3*, 41-58.

Khandkar, S. H. (n.d.) *Open coding*. Retrieved from http://pages.cpsc.ucalgary.ca/~saul/wiki/uploads/CPSC681/open-coding.pdf

Kondowe, W., Ngwira, F. F., & Madula, P. (2014). Linguistic analysis of Malawi political newspaper cartoons on President Joyce Banda: Towards Grice's conversational implicature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *4*(7), 40-51.

Le, T. H. (2013). *An investigation into implicatures in Romeo and Juliet by William Shakespeare* (Master's thesis). Vietnam: University of Danang.

Lestari. (2013). *The analysis of conversational implicature on the movie script of Despicable Me: Graduating paper*. State Institute for Islamic Studies (STAIN) Salatiga.

Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics an introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Meyer, C. F. (2009). *Introducing English linguistics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Prachanant, N. (2006). *Pragmatic transfer in responses to complaints by EFL learners in the hotel business* (Doctoral dissertation). Thailand: Suranaree University of Technology.

Savetamalya, S. (2011). *Conversational implicature in the column Laugh! It's the best medicine in reader's digest: Pragmatic study*. Thailand: Chiang Mai University.

Vo, T. T. T. (2011). *A study of conversational implicatures in Titanic film* (Master's thesis). University of Danang, Vietnam.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. In Widdowson H.G. (Ed.), *Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. (2010). *A study of language.* New York: Cambridge university press.