

IMPLICATURE ANALYSIS IN *GOOSEUMP* MOVIE

Tito Dimas Atmawijaya

Pamulang University
titodimas100@gmail.com

Siti Suryani

Pamulang University
suryanis901@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper aimed to identify and analyze implicature which appeared in the Goosebump movie (2015). The implied meanings in the utterance were examined through the dialogues in the script of the movie. By using qualitative method, there were two types of implicature; conversational implicature and conventional implicature. This study was conducted based on Paul Grice's implicature theory (1975).

Keywords : *Conversation, Implicature, Implied Meaning*

INTRODUCTION

According to Cambridge Dictionary, conversation is talk between two or more people in which thoughts, feelings and ideas are expressed, questions are asked and answered or news and information are exchanged. This activity usually engages two parties; the speaker and the listener. In order to have a good conversation, both of them must do certain things. For example, the speaker give the information clearly. This means that the speaker is expected to be straightforward. On the other hand, the listener should listen with genuine interest. Those characteristics help them to converse successfully. Moreover there will be no misunderstanding occur.

Not all people, however, follow that rule in the conversation. There are sometimes speakers who tend to indirectly say what they want. By putting implied meaning behind their utterance, they still expect the listener to read the real meaning between their line. This is quite risky to create misunderstanding. Blakemore (1989) stated that the responsibility of the

occurrence of misunderstanding suggesting that the choice of the message on the part of the communicator has a role in the occurrence of misunderstanding. The more implicit the message, the more likely the misunderstanding is.

There is a study that addresses the issue of implied meaning. That is implicature in Pragmatics, the sub-branch of Linguistics. According to Paul Grice (1975), implicature is what the speaker means differ from what the sentences used. It is most likely term to describe what a speaker imply, suggest, or mean as distinct of what the speaker literally says. Therefore context in the implicature is considered as crucial. One small utterance can give a drastic change of meaning if it's applied in different context and situation.

Implicature is divided into two parts; conversational implicature and conventional implicature: (1) conversational implicature is the basic assumption in conversation in which participants are inferred. It means that, in order to achieve the objective of conversation, this assumptions should be true. The assumption that the speaker must be clear, informative, truthful, and relevant in the conversation is called as cooperative principle by Paul Grice. This type of implicature has four sub-types; generalized, particularized, scalar. According to Yule (1996), (1.1) Generalized implicature does not require specific context. For example :

A : Did you send the email to Os and Syn?

B : Ah, I sent it to Os.

It can be seen from the utterance that the speaker A send the email only to one person, not to the both of the people. Without the specific context, the implied meaning is still clear to see. The pattern is "b+c" becomes "b+not c". The other common pattern is using indefinite "a/an X + not speaker's". For example :

A : I found a letter.

It can be said that the letter which the speaker find is not his or her letter. On the other hand, (1.2) particularized implicature is the implied meaning that can be understood with a very specific context. For instance :

A : Do you want to hang out tonight?

B : I have a morning class tomorrow.

It can be seen that the speaker B answers no the question by implying it. Without knowing the specific context, the implied meaning will not be understood. The other sub-types of conversational implicature is scalar(1.3). It is the implied meaning on the scale that

is used in the utterance. For example :

A : Some of the boys are playing football.

Some is one of the scale word which shows the quantity. It means that not all of the boys are playing football. The other scale words are all, most, many, few, always, often, etc.

(2) Conventional Implicature is the implied meaning that is not focused with context but to the specific words that conveys additional meaning. Those words are :

(2.1) But : Contrast

For example : He is small but he eats a lot.

(2.2) Even : Contrary to the expectation

For example : They even laughed together at the mess they made.

(2.3) Yet : Expected to be different later.

For example : He is not here yet.

(2.4) And : In addition

For example : She takes a bath and eats breakfast.

Nevertheless, despite of the high-risk misunderstanding in the real life, implicature in the literature form, such as movie, has purposeful function. In comedy genre, for example, implicature can create humor aspect. Not only that, it makes the dialogue run dynamically. By putting texture to the dialogue, it makes the movie more interesting. Beside, it shows the uniqueness of the characters as well.

The chosen movie in this paper, *Goosebump* (2015), is one of the example of the movie which is using implicature as a tool to deliver the humor. Directed in 2015 by Rob Letterman and written by Darren Lanke, this movie is adapted from the same series, written up by R.L. Stine. The movie starts with the main character, Zach Cooper (Dylan Minnette), feeling upset about moving to the countryside. Then he meets a beautiful girl, Hannah, who lives next door. They become friends. Then Zach gets to know that Hannah has a very mysterious father who is turn out to be the infamous horror-series writer, R. L. Stine. When Zach visits Hannah's house, he accidentally open the book of Hannah's father. Various monsters and villains on the written book comes out. They become real. This movie is about the journey they make to save the world from those monsters and villain and bring back them to the fictional world.

Muhimmatul Khoiroh (2017) conducted a study entitled "The Analysis of Implicature in *Bridge to Terabithia* Movie". It was published in Digital Library UIN Sunan Kalijaga. This study aims to (1) describe the types of implicature and (2) explain how they are used by the main characters and. By applying Paul Grice's theory, this research finds two types of

implicature, conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Her study is similar with my study to the extent of the field study and the theory. However, some differences are to be found as well. (1) The object of her study is *Bridge to Terabithia* while my study is *Goosebump*. (2) Her analysis is associated with the principle of Islamic precept.

This paper uses the main data from the *Goosebump* movie. According to Ary (2010), "The research that deals with the data in the form of words or picture rather than number and statistic is called qualitative method". Beside, according to Creswell (2009), "Qualitative analysis is a means exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem". It can be said that the researcher of this paper gathered data from the script to understand how the implicature was used.

The data is collected and analyzed through the script of the *Goosebump* movie. According to Berg (2001), "Data are collected and the reflexively considered both as feedback to craft action and as information to understand a situation, resolve a problem, or to satisfy some sort of field experiment"

The paper focuses on the implicature which are implicitly said by the character on the movie of *Goosebump*. The researcher uses textual methodology to gather the data. McKee explains that "The method of textual analysis is the interpretations produced from the text. These interpretations are the process when we are encoding and decoding the signs in the unity of the text produced," (McKee, 2003). This paper is using the script of the movie as a way to understand implicature.

The steps collecting data are described bellow:

- A. The researcher watch the movie to get visual image.
- B. The researcher then read the script to understand better the movie.
- C. The researcher underline the dialogues of the script.

Data analysis is the review process, sorting, and grouping data in order to formulate working hypotheses and lifted it into conclusion or theories in the research findings, (Bakri, 2003: 162). In this paper, there are some steps in analyzing the data:

- A. Selecting the data which indicate the characteristic of implicature.
- B. Analyzing and classifying the dialogues into some types of implicature.
- C. Explaining the implied meaning from the selected dialogues.
- D. Concluding the analysis

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

1. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Context: Zach and his mother moved from New York to Detroit. His mother's job is vice

principal.

Zach: Madison, Delaware. Wow. *Mom, are you positive there weren't any other places looking for vice principals?*

That utterance clearly implies that the main character, Zach, is not feeling happy at all about moving to Detroit. It is implied from his utterance of asking another place which looking for vice principal. It can be seen that he rather moved to somewhere else than this place.

2. Generalized Conversational Implicature

Context: They arrived to their new house. Mom was trying to convince Zach to like the place.

Zach: I'm staying because I love you

Mom: Aw, I love you too.

Zach: And I looked into it. *Legally I can't live on my own until I'm 18.*

The utterance implies that Zach, whether he agree or not, stuck in this new place. Although he does not like this place, he is not old enough to live on his own. Therefore he has no other option. He must stay in this new place with his mother.

3. Particularized Implicature

Context: Zach met his Aunt, Lorraine. She gave him a special gift, a beaded hat with NY letters written on it.

Lorraine: It's limited edition, so you're not gonna see a lot of men wearing that hat.

Zach: *Yeah, no, I can't imagine anyone would be wearing it. It's so limited edition.*

The utterance indicates that the hat looks too awful no one even want to wear it. However, because Zach does not want to hurt his aunt's feeling, he just creates implicature saying it is so limited edition.

4. Scalar Implicature

Context: After wearing the hat, Zach went outside to unload his belonging from the moving truck.

Zach: *Um, I am gonna go unload some boxes now, and see you around.*

This utterance shows scalar implicature because there is scale of quantity such as some. It means he will unload the boxes but not all of them.

5. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Context: When he carried his box, he met a beautiful girl, Hannah, who lived right next door.

Hannah: How long was the drive from New York? No. I can just tell by the pretty hat that you have.

Zach: This is...This is actually a gift from my aunt

Hannah: *It's also a gift for me and everyone who gets to see you wearing it.*

This utterance implies that Hannah's opinion about the hat. She implicitly teases him by wearing the ugly hat.

6. Conventional Implicature

Context: After talking to Hannah, a man appeared from Hannah's house. He was Hannah's father. Zach was trying to be nice and introduce himself as new neighbour.

Zach: Hi. Hey, we're just moving in. *Just.. Just me and my mom.*

This is conventional implicature where the word 'and' in the utterance means as addition. Because those two are information that is joined to be one. The utterance indicates that Zach and his mother only who moved to the place.

7. Conversational Implicature

Context: Hannah's father, later turn out to be R.L. Stine, seemed intense. He is rudely warned Zach to stay out of his business.

Stine: You see that fence? Do you see the fence? Uh, yes. Stay on your side of it. *You stay away from my daughter, you stay away from me, and we won't have a problem.*

This is conversational implicature where the word 'and' indicates sequence. This shows q after p where Zach stays away from Stine's house then they will not have any problem between them.

8. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Context: While Zach was talking to the mysterious neighbour, his mother and Lorraine were talking in the dining room. They discussed about the death of Zach's father.

Lorraine: How are you doing?

Zach's mother: *Hopefully, a change of scenery will help*

This is particularized conversational implicature because this occurs in a very specific context. Aunt Lorraine is concerned about how Gale, Zach's mother, is coping up with her grief. Gale answers by implying that she is not alright but maybe, with moving to a different place, she will be alright. Just not yet.

9. Generalized Conversational Implicature

Context: Zach took out the trash. However he felt someone was watching him from the neighbour. That is fortunately Hannah.

Hannah : Did I scare you?

Zach : Pfft, no.

Hannah: Really? Because you jumped like 10 feet high, so...

Zach : *You know, I jump a lot. It's how I stay in such great shape.*

This is generalized conversational implicature because the special background knowledge is unnecessary. This utterance implies that although he's scared, he will not admit it. He is embarrassed to be that scared therefore he cover it with this implicature.

10. Scalar Implicature

Context: Zach and Hannah reached the passenger's car of the ferris wheel and talked about personal things.

Hannah: Are you always this sarcastic?

Zach: Always?

Hannah: No, that's a strong word.

Zach: *Not always. Usually.*

This is scalar implicature because value scale quantity occur in this utterance. Look at the word always. It indicates that Zach, most of the time, was being sarcastic. However, later Zach admitted that he is usually sarcastic. This implicates that he was sarcastic, but not all the time.

11. Conventional Implicature

Context: After the tour to abandoned park, Stine busted them on the spot Later Hannah argued with his father in their house Zach heard them all, including Hannah's scream. Zach went to Stine's house.

Stine: What? What?

Zach: *I heard a scream.* Is Hannah okay?

This is conversational implicature that involves any indefinite article. The pattern is a/an X +> not speaker's. This utterance implies that the scream that Zach hear is not his scream.

12. Conversational Implicature

Context : Zach went to Stine's house to check if Hannah was alright.

Stine: There was no scream. You didnt hear anything. *Get out of here or the last screan you*

hear will be your own.

Zach: No, wait, wait.

This is conversational implicature that occur in the utterance. This implies from the way Stine's threat for Zach to stay away because he is without doubts will use violence if Zach keep intruding his own business.

13. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Context: Zach called police to Hannah's house.

Gale: Hi, I'm so sorry. We haven't properly met. I'm Gale Cooper, your new neighbor. It's a beautiful home you have

Stine: Pleasure's mine. *Thank you so much for stopping by and bringing your delightful son.*

This is particularized conversational implicature because this is occur in a very specific context. When Zach brings the police after hearing Hannah's scream, Stine politely implies that Zach's behaviour is really unpleasant.

14. Conversational Implicature

Context: Zach called the only friend he had in this new town, Champ. He wanted to ask Champ to help him to save Hannah. However, Champ thought that they would go and there were girls to bring to the dance.

Zach: Well, there is one girl.

Champ: Oh! My man!

Zach: Shh!

Champ: What? What?

Zach: But she's locked in this house, and her dad's a psychopath.

Champ: *Does she have a friend?*

This is conversational implicature that involves any indefinite article. The pattern is a/an X not speaker's. This utterance implies that a friend he mentioned is not his friend or Zach's friend.

15. Generalized Conversational Implicature

Context: They were going to enter the bouse. They climbed the fence. Camp fell to the ground.

Zach: All right. Let's go. Come on.

Champ: Okay, okay. Dude, my dry-cleaning bill's gonna be ridiculous.

This is generalized conversational implicature because the special background knowledge is

unnecessary This utterance implies that Champ's new suit is dirty.

16. Conventional Implicature

Context: They were entering the house through the basement.

Zach: Okay, *stay here and watch the driveway.*

This is conventional implicature where the word 'and' in the utterance means as addition. Zach is giving two information that is joined to be one. The utterance indicate that Champ should stay in the basement and watch the driveway, just in case Stine come back.

17. Conversational Implicature

Context: They entered the house and came upstairs to find Hannah. However they heard strange noise

Zach: That's weird. It's like the noise is coming from this bookcase

Champ: *Well, it's an old house*

This is conversational implicature that involves indefinite article. The pattern is a/an X+ not speaker's. This utterance implies an old house that is mentioned is not Zach's house or Champ's house.

18. Conventional Implicature

Context: Zach compared R.L.Stine with Stephen King.

Stine: *I've sold way more books than him. Nobody ever talks about that!*

This is conventional implicature where the word 'but' indicates contrast. This implies that although he sell more copies of book than Stephen King, still Stephen King is way more popular than him.

19. Conventional Implicature

Context: Stine explained how and why the monsters he wrote became real.

Stine: Where do I begin? When I was younger, I suffered from terrible allergies that kept me indoors. And *all the kids threw rocks at my widow and called me names.* So I created my own friends.

This is conventional implicature where the word 'and' in the utterance means as addition. Because those two are information that is joined to be one, the utterance indicates that not only the kids calls Stine some nasty nickname, they also throw rock at his window.

20 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Context: They escaped from the monsters in Stine's house

Zach: Why couldn't you have written stories about rainbows and unicorns?

Stine: *Because that doesn't sell 400 million copies.*

This is particularized conversational implicature because this is occur in a very specific context. The utterance implied that story about rainbows and unicorn weren't as interesting as the story of monsters.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, some conclusions are drawn such as:

- A. There are total 20 data of implicatures. Those are divided into two types, 15 of conversational implicature and 5 conventional implicature.
- B. The useful purposes of implicature are found in the movie, such as:
 1. Implicature helps the character manage their relationship. By making implicature, the character can avoid unnecessary problem.
 2. Implicature shows the distinctive trait of character.
 3. Implicature adds interesting texture to the dialogues. By implying something, the dialogue will not be monotone.
 4. Implicature delivers the humor or comedy.

REFERENCES

- <https://www.google.com/amp/s/dictionary.cambridge.org/amp/english/conversation>
- Blakemore, D. *The Pragmatics of Style*. London: In Hickey, L. (ed.). 1989.
- Grice, H. Paul. *Logic and Conversation*. London: University of California. 1975.
- Yule, George. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University. 1996.
- Khoiroh, Muhimmatul. *The Analysis of Implicature in "Bridge to Terabithia" Movie*. Yogyakarta: State Islamic University Sunan Kalijaga. 2017.
- Ary, Donald. *Introduction to Research in Education*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning. 2010.
- Cresswell, John W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches 3th edition*. California: SAGE publication. Inc. 2009.
- Berg, Bruce L and Howard Lune. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. London : Pearson. 2001.
- Mckee, Alan. *Textual Analysis : A Beginner's Guide*. SAGE publication. Inc. 2003.
- Bakri, Masykuri. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Surabaya : Visipres Offest. 2003.