

CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN THE GREEN BOOK MOVIE

FITRAH HIDAYATI¹, MURNI MAHMUD^{2*}

Universitas Negeri Makassar

*Corresponding Email: murnimahmud@unm.ac.id

Abstract

This study was aimed at accomplishing two objectives: (1) to identify the types of conversational implicature found in the Green Book movie and (2) to discover the functions of each conversational implicature found in the main characters' dialogue in the Green Book movie. The data in this study were taken from dialogue of the main characters in the Green Book movie 2018. The researchers used a qualitative method to analyze the data and to find out the types of conversational implicature. The researchers used conversational implicature theory by Paul Grice, and used the theory of Roman Jakobson to find out the function of implicature. The result of this study indicates the process of identifying conversational implicature, the type of implicature, and the function. The types of implicature that occur are generalized and particularized. There are 19 cases identifying conversational implicature: 12 data identifying generalized conversational implicature, and 7 data identifying particularized conversational implicature. Implicatures in this movie have four types of language function named metalinguistic, conative, emotive, and referential. First, the kind of conversational implicature commonly occurs in the Green Book movie is Generalized Conversational Implicature because it is used in daily conversation so the listeners do not need specific knowledge to interpret the meaning. And then, there are two kinds of language function that are dominant found in this study, which are the conative and the referential. It showed the implicature that implied by the main character in the movie are concerned with (1) influencing the behavior of the addressee or convey the speaker's commands, (2) providing the actual information based on the situation in the movie.

Keywords: Pragmatics, conversational implicature, movie

INTRODUCTION

A language is a communication tool that forms sound symbols produced by human speech tools to interact with people in society. Chomsky (2006), in his journal, states when people approach what some could refer to as the human essence, the unique aspect of the mind, when they study human language (p.88). In the other language statement, Lunenburg (2010) states in his journal that transmitting common knowledge from one person to another is the process of communication (p.10). Therefore, language gets serious attention because sometimes people tell something that has hidden meaning when they are in speech, and one of them tells something that has hidden meaning. Other than that, the difference in understanding can trigger different intent and cause conversation imbalance and perplexity.

To communicate every day, people use the language to provide any information to the hearers. Hence, the hearers must understand what the speaker referred to in the sentence. In every aspect of the conversation, whether in a formal or informal situation, speakers always try to express their words by using various ways to utter what they want to say. One of them is people speak the language with explicit or implicit meaning. So, the purpose can be conveyed if hearers can understand the purpose of their speech based on the situational and conditional context because the messages are not only expressed but also implied. In this case, the theory of implicit meaning is Conversational implicature.

In this study, the researchers focused on conversational implicature that was found in the Green Book movie. The data was taken from the main characters' dialogue in the movie. The implicatures found in the conversation analyzed by using the theory by H.

Paul Grice. Implicature is one of the interesting topics to discuss nowadays as encountered by anyone and anywhere. Implicature appears in many literary works. One of the literary works is in the Green Book movie. The Green Book movie is a new movie released in 2018 in America. The researchers did not find the research about this movie. Meanwhile, conversational implicature has been analyzed and discussed in some research. There have been many kinds of research in this field of conversational implicature.

The first research is entitled "*Conversational Implicature in Undisputed Movie*" thesis by Johan Andika Ferdiansa (2019). To accomplish his research, he used the theory by Grice to classify the types of conversational implicature. The research focuses on discovering the types of conversational implicature and how the speaker violated the maxims when uttering the sentence. In conclusion, the writer found some data of implicatures that used to make the utterances impolite. Furthermore, usage of the violated maxim in speech is to make utterances interesting and fun because it has its language style in conversation.

The second research is "*Conversational Implicature in Beauty and the Beast Movie*", a research by Ratu Yayanglilis (2020). The researchers used the theory of Grice (1975) to discover the implicature in the movie, and used the supporting theory of Searle (1975) to determine the function of implicature. In conclusion, conversational implicature is important in our life, because it can imply satire or praise.

The other research is also about conversational implicature, with the title "*Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue of Euro Trip Movie*" by Miftahul Huda. The problem statements in his study are to (1) recognize the conversational implicature that appears in the dialogue from the movie Euro-Trip, (2) specify the kind of each conversational implicature, and (3) specify the purpose of each data. The main goal of his research is to understand how speakers flout the rules. Because disobeying maxims is a very effective approach to induce a recipient to infer anything and find an implicature or inferred meaning (Huda, 2013).

The researchers determined that the three studies above have the same issue to study and employ the same theory of implicature by Grice based on some research on conversational implicature as indicated above. Also indicates almost all have the same research problem. The Green Book movie is inspired by a true story set in 1962 in New York City. The film was written by Peter Farrelly, Brian Hayes Currie, and Nick Vallelonga (Vallelonga's son). As additional information, Peter Farrelly directed this movie which was released in 2018. Numerous awards and nominations were given to it. It received five nominations for the 2019 Oscars at the 91st Academy Awards, including Best Original Screenplay, Best Picture, Best Film, Best Actor, and Best Supporting Actor for Mahershala Ali. The film also received the Best Motion Picture Golden Globe Award. The American Film Institute later named the movie Green Book as one of the best of 2018.

After watching the movie, the researchers were interested in analyzing the movie. The main topic of the story is about a friendship between the black man and the white man, Donald Shirley, and Tony Vallelonga (Tony Lip) as the main characters of the movie. The movie describes Mr. Shirley's life as a black jazz musician who has so many concerts in some cities, and Mr. Shirley appoints Tony as his tour driver. In short, at the end of the movie, they are getting close, especially for Tony Lip, who is racist at first.

The researchers focused on the movie conversation and how they talk. She finds out the implicature among the main characters' conversation, those are: Frank Vallelonga "Tony Lip" and Don Shirley because there are many conversations among the main

characters. Also, this study will be the first research in analyzing Conversational Implicature in the Green Book movie. Considering the description above, the researchers are interested in investigating Implicature in the Green Book movie under the title "Conversational Implicature in the Green Book Movie" using the Pragmatics approach.

Review of Related Literature

Pragmatics

The area of linguistics called pragmatics studies the aspects of language's structure that communicate information between speakers and listeners. The study of meaning as it is conveyed by a speaker and understood by a listener is the focus of pragmatics (Fauziah, 2016). This type of research certainly involves the perception of what the speaker means by a specific context and how the context affects what the speaker says are undoubtedly involved in this type of inquiry. It requires attention on how the speaker maintains what they want to say in relation to who they are speaking to, where they are speaking, when they are speaking, and under any circumstances.

According to Yule (2006), "pragmatics is the study of what speakers mean, or speaker meaning" (Yule, 2006). Additionally, he added that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning, which examines how the context affects what is said as well as how people's intentions can be inferred from their words in the sentence situation.

Pragmatics is the study of language use. Pragmatics, in particular, considers the relationship between linguistic meaning and speaker meaning. Also, it studies human interpretation of language, how speakers use and understand utterances, and how the structure of language influences the speaker and the hearer.

According to Crystal in Mahmud (2017), pragmatics is the study of factors that influence our language choices in social interactions and how these choices affect other individuals. With the three basic issues of meaning, context, and communication (p.31)

Implicature

In social interaction, whether in a formal or informal situation, people usually violate the cooperative principles to create other styles of expressing their ideas. However, they always do not obey the cooperative principle in conversation. There are times when the speaker says something but has a different meaning from the sentence. It is mentioned as an implicature.

Implicature is characterized simply as whatever is communicated by people; the sentence's meaning is not part of what is said. It has an implied meaning. Haugh states (2002) "Grice applies the idea to situations where the speaker's intention goes beyond what is indicated by a specific word" (p.117). Based on the statement above, it is also defined as an activity where the speaker is expecting the meaning of an utterance even though it is not literally expressed. For example, A: *What flavor is it? (Pointing to the ice cream)*, B: *(does not respond. Offering ice cream to the speaker (A))*. In this case, speaker A thinks hearer B would like to taste the ice cream, but actually, B does not say that he would like to taste it. But in fact, A wants to try some of his friend's ice cream. This kind of conversation is termed by Grice as an implicature. Michael (2002) claims that Grice initially coined the term implicature to set it apart from the concept of implication as it is used in logic and semantics.

An implicature is an utterance that conveys meaning beyond its proposition. Whenever we use an implicature, it is like we can conclude from what is said. With implicature, we can create meanings by saying something else. According to Johan's

said(2019) based on his research, implicature is the term for when a speaker intentionally breaks the maxims in everyday conversation for a specific cause, such as humor or sarcasm (p.13). The way a speaker says something (or even doesn't say something, depending on the situation), according to Michael, may also provide support to the concept of implicature (p.130). Here is an example of implicature: *John: "Are you going to Jane's wedding party? Anna: I have to go to work"* The statement above of Anna's utterance, "I have to work," might have two assumptions, which are (1) she will not go to Jane's wedding or (2) she will go to Jane's wedding but she will come late. As a result, it is intended to be an implicature that has a proposition.

Conventional Implicature

Grice divided implicature into two parts, which are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. He never conducted a detailed investigation of conventional implicature and just briefly discussed it. So this sort of implicature lacks a particular explanation for conventional implicature (Kroeger, 2019). It is different from conversational implicature. Conventional implicature does not take place in conversational and does not require a specific setting to be understood. In conventional implicature, the word itself provides the meaning of the sentence. In other words, the implied meaning is indirectly known by the hearer.

Conversational Implicature

This type of implicature is a statement that might be implied and intended by the speaker, and it has a different meaning from what is said. According to Grice conversational implicature is one of pragmatics' most crucial topics to be discussed. According to Wang (2011) "*conversational implicature is a particular context of situations in which the perceived meaning goes beyond the literal meaning*" (p.1163). Therefore, in everyday language use, the conversational implicature that is implied in conversation is left unspoken.

Conversational implicature is the scope of pragmatics using the Gricean Cooperative principle. It involves the cooperative principle; under the assumption that speakers want to cooperate, we tend to conclude from what is said (Phoneme, 2013). Contrary to entailments and presuppositions, Conversational implicature is a pragmatic conclusion derived from the context and understanding that conventions are followed in the discussion rather than from a specific word or phrase in an utterance. Herbert Paul Grice is known for developing the theory of conversational implicatures. He noted that what actually occurs during conversations frequently goes beyond what is spoken, and that this additional meaning might be described as secure and predictable. There is a difference between what is said and what is stated.

The implicature that has resulted from violating the cooperative principle is conversational implicature. Hence, to understand the meaning of conversational implicature, we need to understand the context and situation where it is happening. Moreover, According to Sari (2007), "*conversational implicature indicates an implied meaning that can only be inferred by participants who understand the context*". There are two different types of conversational implication. They are: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized conversational implicature is the first type of conversational implicature in which the listener does not require specific knowledge about the context because it does

not depend on specific features of the context and uses the expression in ordinary contexts. In other words, the kind of conversational implicature conveys an implicit meaning without explicitly mentioning a particular conversational context. As a result, the listener does not take longer to interpret the additional meaning conveyed.

Levinson (2000, p. 181) claims that generalized conversational implicatures appear without the use of particular knowledge of specific context. In line with this, Fauziah (2016) argues that generalized conversational implicature is a type of conversational implicature that has an understandable meaning because it does not require particular knowledge when uttered.

Levinson argues that words that refer to scales and non-maximal degree modifiers are the most commonly discussed types of generalized conversational implicature. That is why this kind of implicature is frequently referred to as a scalar implicature. In addition to using quantitative data, scalar implicatures are another technique to portray quantities. An example of a scalar implicature is (1) *the water is warm*. The implication is that *the water is not hot*. The explanation in example (1) is *warm* and includes the words that identify it as a scale of temperature. The other scale temperatures are seldom, often, always, and so on. Therefore, the statement is identified as the maxim of quantity because the word "warm" implies *not hot (or cold/frigid, etc.)*.

Generalized Conversational Implicature

Grice in the book Kroeger (2019) this type of conversational implicature means that the intended conclusion depends on certain features of the particular context of the utterance. Which has no intelligible meaning because it is in a certain knowledge when the sentence is spoken. In other words, the second type of conversational implicature also has implicit meaning and uses certain context in conversation. Thus, sometimes the listener needs more time to interpret the implied meaning. The example of particularized conversational implicature:

Particularized implicature is based on a very special context, so the information that is known must be assumed. Therefore, the speaker and the hearer must have the same perception of implicature in the sentence that was uttered by the speaker. Another example cited in Fitriyani (p.158) is: *Wife: "Why do you want to reread it?" Husband: "Not really, but today's newspaper was read by a little boss."*

In the example above, the particularized conversational implicature exists in the sentence "*Not really, but today's newspaper was read by a little boss.*" The phrase "a little boss" indicates the wife and husband's child. While in conversation, the speaker and the hearer understand what a little boss means. So the sentence included a particular conversational implicature.

Generalized Conversational Implicature

A significant component of Grice's conversational implicature theory is the cooperative principle. The participants must cooperate with one another in order for the talk to be successful. If we violate the cooperative principle as a guide to direct how we communicate, it will result in implication. Ferdiansa (2019) stated the cooperative principle is a principle of conversation that people in communication should obey the cooperative principle to have appropriate conversation. In other words, to make the relevant conversation the participants must correlate each other.

According to Mahmud (2017) the principle of cooperation was proposed by Grice as a shared assumption by the partners in a conversation that they will collaborate with one another for the purpose of their conversation by adhering to specific conversational

maxims (p.93). It means in conversation; the speaker and the receiver will maintain maxim for the purpose of conversation.

In order for effective communication to take place within the society without errors in communication, these maxims must be followed. In actuality, people occasionally violate maxims. The cooperative principle gives out certain fundamental principles for conversation. It has influence over the conversation's participants. As a result, the talk moved along in a polite and kind way. Four maxims are used to explain how this discourse works. Grice divided cooperative principles into four sub-principles or maxims, which support these principles. They are: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner.

Wang (2011), claims that a maxim is essentially a theory about how people use language (p.1163). Conversational maxims can be divided into four categories: quality, quantity, relation, and manner.

a. Maxim of Quantity

Maxim quantity relates to the quantity of information to be informative:

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

b. Maxim of Quality

1. Do not say what you believe to be false
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

c. Maxim of Relation

The point is, be relevant, there's no interruption when people are communicating.

d. Maxim of Manner

1. Avoid obscurity of expression
2. Avoid ambiguity
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly

Violation of Maxims

There are times when a speaker fails to add further significance to a maxim in discussion. He purposely violates the rules in terms of appearance. In order to call the listener's attention to a particular conclusion, the speaker deviates from the maxim. According to Grice (1975, p. 49), maxims can be disobeyed in a number of different ways. They might violate one maxim or possibly all of them. In Ferdiansa's thesis (2019), there are four ways to violate maxims. First, the utterance can intentionally violate the maxims. So, the conversation can be an interlocutor in some cases. Second, the narrative can violate the principle of cooperation. Speakers can indicate that they will not use the cooperative principle. The third is the clashes that the interlocutor may face in a conversation. The last one is that the speaker can violate the maxims.

Regarding the statements above, here is an easy example of violating the maxim: "*honey you know what time it is?*" "*Yes.*" The context is the speaker asking about time, and he wants to know about it. But the listener does not respond to the question with an appropriate answer. Which is less information than is required. In this case, the statement includes a violation of maxim quantity. Based on the cooperative principle (Yule 2006) He provided less information about the speaker's question.

Grice (1975) draws the conclusion that the cooperative speaking principle applies: they should be honest and avoid saying anything that does not have enough support

(quality maxim), relevant (relationship maxim), avoid ambiguity of expression, be brief, and orderly. They should also avoid providing less or more information than is necessary for the purpose of the current exchange (means maxim). Wang (2011) provides the following examples violation maxims:

Function of Language

Language must exist in all kinds of functions. Messages are sent and received between people via language, which is essentially the function of language, also known as the function of speech. Roman Jakobson (1960) defined six language functions on the basis of this, which can be characterized by the act of effective verbal communication as follows:

1. The Metalinguistic Function

The metalinguistic function means commenting on the language itself. When a speaker and listener need to confirm that they are speaking and listening in the same code or when language is used to discuss language, it is employed. It aims to communicate the code analysis. The situation where the participants ask for unclear information to make it clear.

2. The Conative Function

The conative function is a language function that is related to influencing the behavior of the interlocutor and it is related to persuasion. For example, "Let's get out of here!" This function's fundamental form can be used to issue requests, commands, orders, suggestions, advice, permissions, wishes, or instructions. The conative function aims to convey the speaker's commands.

3. The Emotive function

The speaker's attitude, status, and emotional condition are the main subjects of the emotion function's attention on the speaker. This emotive function or it can be called an expressive function aims to convey emotions or expressions of the interlocutor. Also, this function appears when we want to express our feelings, even though someone is not speaking to provide a piece of information. For example, an interjection is a word or phrase used to express sudden surprise, pleasure, or annoyance, such as wow, incredible, I am sorry to hear that, etc. (Hasan: 2018)

4. The Referential Function

The referential function means providing any information at all. This function focuses on the situation, context, object, or mental state. These sentences have a truth value: The actual condition that happens in real life, either true or false. A specific description and deictic terms, such as "*The autumn leaves have all fallen now*," can be used to describe the referential function. (Hasan, 2018). Hence, this referential function aims to convey information.

5. The Phatic Function

This function involves showing empathy and sympathy with others. Its main purpose is to pull/build, extend, check, confirm or terminate these connections. This function is found in the introduction, and writing speeches with closings like "*Dear Sir/Madam, Your Faithfully*" also performs that function. Expressing empathy and sympathy with others is part of this function.

6. The Poetic Function

The poetic function is often referred to as the aesthetic function. This task concentrates on the message and the manner in which it is communicated. This indicates that the message might be enhanced by rhetorical devices or "flowery"

language. This function is commonly used in novels, the story, the poetry, the fables, the legends, and also in the movie.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

A qualitative descriptive method was chosen as the research design in this study. That is the information produced in the form of statements or words. Mack (2005. p.1) states "*Qualitative research is particularly effective in acquiring culturally unique information about certain population beliefs, views, behaviors, and social circumstances,*" It is also defined as qualitative to ask broad research questions designed to interpret, explore, or understand, and the data resulting is in narrative form.

Data Sources

The data sources are divided into two, namely primary data and secondary data. The Object of the study is the Green Book movie which has a duration of about two hours and ten minutes. According to Grice and Jacobson's theory, which is employed by the main character, the descriptive approach is used to resolve research issues. Secondary data is derived from sources other than the primary source, such as books, and literary works.

Procedures of Data Collection

To collect the data in this research is based on the steps, they are:

1. Watching the Green Book movie several times.
2. Making the dialogue transcript of the Green Book movie.
3. Downloading the English subtitle of the movie The Green Book.
4. Identifying utterances of the main characters Tony Lip and Don Shirley in dialogue in the Green Book movie.
5. Selected the utterances identified into conversational implicature.
6. Classify the types of conversational implicature, then describe the language function of each implicature.

Procedures of Data Collection

In analyzing data, the researchers used descriptive qualitative analysis. Miles, Hubberman, & Saldana (2014) conclude that doing the research part of analyzing the data is very important because it is a strategy to discover the results. Data analysis of the qualitative method is divided into several parts;

1. Data Condensation
As a component of analysis, data matching refers to the selection., concentration, simplification, abstraction, and transformation of data that appears in the textual field note or transcriptions.
2. Data Display
Hubberman, Miles, and Saldana (2014) "*When displaying qualitative data, one must decide which information should be entered into each cell and in what format, as well as how the rows and columns of the matrix should look.*" (p.13).
3. Conclusion Drawing and Verification
Concluding a drawing or the outcome of analysis, the researchers begins to define what is meant by noticing regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, causal pathways, and argument as soon as data collecting begins.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The types of conversational implicature used in the Green Book movie

Generalized Conversational Implicature

Data 1

Dolores : "Are you crazy? you lost fifty dollars?!"

Tony : "**Dolores, please. I ate twenty-six**".

Context of the situation: the conversation above occurs when Tony shows some money to Dolores, his wife. He got the money from the bet with Paulie. Firstly, Dolores thinks Tony lost the bet when he said "he could eat more hot dogs than me. He knocked off twenty-four" but Tony immediately shows the money and then says *I ate twenty-six*. So it makes Dolores happy and smile.

Analysis: The utterance above *I ate twenty-six* indicates implicature which means He eats more hot dogs than Paulie. He is the winner of the bet and gets money. **(1)** To understand the sentence Dolores does not require any special knowledge because she directly understands the meaning of the sentence. Thus, it is included in generalized conversational implicature. **(2)** The function in this sentence is referential because the speaker conveys true information to the audience based on the context.

Data 2

Tony : "A molar. Like a shark tooth? Or maybe a tiger's maybe?"

Dr. Shirley : "**It was a gift.**"

Context of the situation: in this section Tony Lip and Dr. Shirley meet for the first time in Carnegie Hall of cinema. Dr. Shirley is interviewing to hire a driver and Lip is the interviewee. The room is filled with unique statues and all kinds of fancy crap.

Analysis: Dr. Shirley conveys additional meaning via implicature. *It was a gift*. Tony lip asks about what kind of necklace is. He says the necklace is like a molar and Shirley's reply does not give an appropriate answer. So, the sentence violates the maxim: be brief. That means Tony thinks the necklace is a molar or something else. **(1)** Thus, it is included in generalized implicature because Tony Lip does not require special knowledge to understand the meaning. **(2)** Thus, this conversation is classified as a referential function because the speaker gives the information.

Data 3

Dr. Shirley : "a hundred dollars a week, plus room and board. But let me be crystal clear. I'm not just hiring a chauffeur. I need someone who can handle my itinerary. be a personal assistant. I need a valet. I need someone who can launder my clothes, shine my shoes."

Tony : "**Good luck, Doc.**"

Context of the situation: the conversation above occurred when Dr. Shirley explains the details of the job to his driver. Unfortunately, the explanation makes Tony Lip feel uncomfortable and determined to reject the job.

Analysis: The sentence above *Good luck, Doc* contains implicature which means Tony refuses to be Dr. Shirley's Driver, and suggests finding another one who can arrange him from A-Z. In this case, **(1)** because the listener does not require special knowledge to comprehend the meaning, it is categorized as generalized implicature. **(2)** Thus, it is classified as a Conative function because the speaker gives advice and demands the listener do something.

Data 4

Dr. Shirley : *"Keep going as long as you can Tony"*

Tony : *"I can't keep my eyes open, I'm getting hypnotized here. I think my brain is gonna explode."*

Context in the situation: Lip concentrates on the road and repeatedly hears the weather estimation news on the radio. They are continuing on the road to go back to their home, but the weather seems not suitable to continue the trip.

Analysis: Based on the context above, the sentence implies that *I think my brain is gonna explode*, which means Tony felt dizzy and had difficulty focusing on the road because of the weather. **(1)** Thus, the words spoken by Tony have an implicature that is included in generalized conversational implicature. **(2)** The function in this sentence is the conative function because the sentence expresses the speaker's emotions. And the speaker has also followed with high intonation. That is why this sentence is categorized as an emotive function.

Data 5

Graham Kindell : *"oh well I apologize, but these are long-standing traditions, club rules. I'm sure you understand."*

Dr. Shirley : *"No. I don't. Why can't I eat here when I'll be entertaining your guests on that stage in 45 minutes?"*

Context of the situation: the dialogue occurs when Dr. Shirley meets the restaurant manager, Graham Kindell. Shirley does not allow him to get in the lounge for dinner.

Analysis: The statement *"No. I do not"* means Dr. Shirley wants further information/explanation. This word has a violation of maxim relation: there is no interrupt. **(1)** So, Shirley instructs the manager that he does not understand the manager's words even though he is aware that he is black. Thus, this extract included generalized conversational implicature. **(2)** The function in this sentence is a metalinguistic function because the speaker wants more explanation/information to make it clear.

Particularized Conversational Implicature

There are 7 data included of particularized conversational implicature. Which each of them identified has a language function. All of the following data have 4 data of conative function, and 3 data of referential function. The result showed that in this type of implicature the language function of conative is the dominant case.

Data 4

Tony : *"okay. Here is the deal. I got no problem being on the road with you. But I ain't no butler, I ain't ironing shirts, and I'm not polishing nobody's shoes...Or go hire the little Chink that just pranced out of here and see how far you get."*

Context of the situation: the conversation between Dr. Shirley and Tony took place in Shirley's home. He explained what to do when someone becomes his driver.

Analysis: the extract above *"see how far you get"*, the speaker implies that Shirley will not be safe during the trip. **(1)** To understand the conversation above, Shirley requires

special knowledge to understand the meaning, and he knows that he is a black person and Tony is a white. Thus, the phrase is included in the particularized conversational implicature. **(2)** the function in this sentence is the referential function because the sentence provides information to the hearers.

Data 5

Bartender Bobby : *"Mister Tony. Augie asking about you."*

Customer : ***"Come on, I'm dying of thirst over here!"***

Context of the situation: the extract above occurs at minute 18.50 at Joe & Joe's restaurant bar. During the conversation between Tony and Bobby, a man interrupts them.

Analysis: The extract above identified as an implicature. I'm dying of thirst, which means Customer wants more than a cup of alcohol. Based on the situation, the customer will not die because he has already drunk alcohol before. **(1)** Because Bobby and Tony have a specific understanding of the sentence, it is classified as particularized conversational implicature. **(2)** The function in this sentence is conative function because it influences the listener to do something.

The function of conversational implicature used in Green Book movie 2018

The conative

The basic form of this function can be used to issue commands, orders, demands, advice, requests, recommendations, invitations, permissions, wishes, or instructions. The conative function aims to convey the speaker's commands. This function was found in 10 cases (data 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19). For instance, in data 8 *"Good night, Tony."* Showed the kind of Conative function because the speaker gives advice and demands the listener do something.

The emotive

This function aims to convey the addresser's emotion or expression. This function was found in only 1 case in the extract 9 namely; *"I think my brain is gonna explode"*. This sentence is a conative function because the sentence expresses the speaker's emotions. And the speaker has also followed with high intonation.

The referential

This function aims to convey information. The sentences have a truth value: The actual condition that happens in real life, either true or false. This function was found in 8 cases such as in data 16 *"You wouldn't last a week with him"* means Tony will not take the job because he would feel uncomfortable around Shirley. Tony does not like Dr. Shirley because he is a black person. This sentence showed a referential because the sentence involves the truth of something and explains the actual condition that happened in real life in America in 1965.

The metalinguistic

This function aims to communicate the code analysis. Which people are asking again for unclear information to make it clear or need some information. This function was found in 2 cases (data 10 and 11.). Namely; *"no, I don't understand,"* and *"your left ass weighs two sixty"*. These sentences showed the metalinguistic function because they focused on the

code analysis by asking the question to get the listener's condition and implies that the speaker wants some information.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researchers conclude that two types of conversational implicature can be found in the Green Book movie 2018: generalized conversational implicature and personalized conversational implicature. The researchers found 12 data of Generalized conversational implicature and 7 data of Particularized conversational implicature. The data concluded that generalized conversational implicature is the dominant found in the movie because those sentences are used in daily conversation, whether in a formal or informal context.

There are four functions of conversational implicature in the Green Book Conversation, and all of those were used in the conversation. This study used the language function proposed by Roman Jakobson to analyze the function of implicature: 8 data conative function, 2 data metalinguistic, 1 data emotive function, and 8 data referential function. It can be shown that the language function of Conative and Referential are the dominant found in the movie green book movie. It showed that the conversation more influenced the speaker to do something and give information based on the situation in life.

Conversational Implicature because it is used in daily conversation so the listeners do not need specific knowledge to interpret the meaning. And then, there are two kinds of language function that are the dominant that are found in this study, which are the conative and the referential. It showed the implicature that implied by the main character in the movie are concerned with (1) influencing the behavior of the addressee or convey the speaker's commands, (2) providing the actual information based on the situation in the movie.

REFERENCES

- Ansori, A. (2021). *An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in the "Maleficent 2; Mistress of Evil"*. Islamic State University of Raden Intan Lampung.
- Barus, D. A. (2018). *Conversational Implicature in Fantasy Romantic Comedy's Film the Invention of Lying*. University of Sumatera Utara Medan.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and Mind* (Third Edition ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauziah, N. A. (2016). *Conversational Implicature on the Chew Talk Show*. Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University, Malang.
- Ferdiansa, J. A. (2019). *Conversational Implicature in Undisputed Movie*. State Islamic University Sunan Ampel, Surabaya.
- Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*, in P. Cole and J.L Morgan eds, *Syntax and Semantics*. vol.3. New York. Academic Press.
- Haugh, M. (2002). The Intuitive Basis of Implicature: Relevance Theoretic Implicitness Versus Gricean Implying. *International Pragmatics Association*, vol.12(2), pp.117-134. doi: 10.1075/prag.12.2.01hau
- Hasan, A., & Jabbar, A. (2018). *Functions of Language*. University of Qadisiya.
- Hidayati, F., & Indarti, Y. (2013). An Analysis of the Violation of Maxims in Malam Minggu Miko Situation Comedy. *Anglicist*, Vol. 02(01), 35-40.
- Huda, M. (2013). *Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue of Euro Trip Movie*. University of Brawijaya, Brawijaya.

- Jakobson, R. (1960). *Concluding Statement: Linguistics and Poetics, in Style in Language*, T. Sebeok, Ed. Cambridge: MIT Press,
- Kanaza, F. U. (2020). *A Language Function: the Analysis of Conative Function in Meghan Markle's Speech*. UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.
- Kroeger, P. R. (2019). *Analyzing Meaning: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics. Second corrected and slightly revised edition*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2000). Presumptive Meaning: the Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature. *Linguistics, Vol.40* (01), 181-185.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). Communication: The Process, Barriers, and Improving Effectiveness. *Schooling, vol.1*, 1-11.
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., m.Macqueen, k., Guest, G., & Namely, E. (2005). *Qualitative Research Method: A Data Collector's Field Guide*. USA: Family Health International.
- Mahmud, M. (2017). *Doing Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Yogyakarta: Phoenix.
- Mandarani, V. (2017). Understanding the Meaning of Speaking by Conversational Implicature. *Journal Advances in Social Science, Education, and Humanities Research, Vol.125*, 223-225.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: Second Edition*. London: Metu Library.
- Nanda, S., Sukyadi, D., & Sudarsono, M. I. (2012). Conversational Implicature of the Presenters in Take Me Out Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.2*(No. 2), p. 123.
- Phloneme. (2013, May 3). Implicature. Retrieved Oct 28, 2019, from https://youtu.be/yUs8GAi_cIw
- Plato. (2016). Implicature. In S. University (Ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford University: Metaphysics Research Lab.
- Prihatini, Y. W. (2018). *Conversational Implicatures in The Foreigner Movie*. Alauddin State Islamic University of Makassar.
- Sari, F. (2007). *An Analysis of Implicatures in Request Expressions in Drama Entitled a Raisin in the Sun by Lorraine Hansberry (Based on Pragmatics Approach*. Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *language and Society, Vol.5*(1), pp,1-23.
- Septiamaylofa, R. Y. (2020). *Conversational Implicature in Beauty and the Beast Movie*. State Islamic University Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi.
- Wang, H. (2011). Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension. *Journal of Language of Teaching and Research, Vol.2*(5), pp. 1162-1167.
- Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language* (3rd edition ed.). New york: Cambridge University Press.