

TALAASH: CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE LYING WITHIN

Ice Sariyati

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung

email: icesariyati75@gmail.com

Absrtact: This study was aimed to analyze the types of clause, characteristics of speech act, as well as the implied intents in conversational implicature. This research used descriptive qualitative method by analyzing document and sources of the data were taken from English subtitle of one Bollywood movie entitled Talaash. From the data analysis the findings showed that the clause type of conversational implicature in one Bollywood movie entitled Talaash was dominated by declarative one and its characteristic of speech act was making a statement. On the other hand, the type of clause least found was exclamative one and its characteristic of speech act was making an exclamatory statement. Besides, the clause of declarative, closed interrogative, imperative and exclamative types were in line and not in line with their own characteristic of speech act. Meanwhile, the clause of open interrogative type was only found in line with its own characteristic of speech act. Based on the results of data analysis and its discussion, it can be drawn on conclusion that the conversational implicature is often found in the text of a literary work, especially in movie dialogue. It means that the readers or the audiences should understand it well in order not to misunderstand the conveyed meaning or intents so they can enjoy it with satisfaction.

Keywords: characteristics of speech acts, declarative, closed and open interrogative, imperative and exclamative clause types, implied intents,

INTRODUCTION

As quoted from the book of Blakemore (1992:1), many human activities involve communication at work, at public, at private, etc. By involving communication, the message, intention or aim in doing activities can easily be conveyed. Therefore, they conduct communication by various ways, such as by using symbols, gestures, written or spoken language.

Spoken language in communication seems to be most used in daily life, especially in conversation. Clark (1996:9)

states that: "Face-to-face conversation is the principal setting that doesn't require special skills. Reading and writing take years of schooling," It means that one of the motives for using this language in communication is no special skills needed. Meanwhile, people need to learn written language for years at school.

In conversation, ideally, the language used according to Grice (1986, as cited in Huang, 2007) must be effective and efficient to interact rationally in communication. This is for the reason that he proposes four cooperative principles in

conversation known as *maxims of conversation: Quality, Quantity, Relation and Manner*. In short, as explained by Levinson (1983), in conversation, apart from not giving wrong or uncertain information, the speaker must give enough information as required in strive or brevity and order, avoiding obscurity and ambiguity.

In reality, however, the four cooperative principles are not infrequently violated because of various reasons, such as to make the conversation more polite, intimate, fun and not rigid. Based on this issue, the writer tries to conduct a research dealing with the conversation not fulfilling those principles, in which the speaker says something by not saying it directly but by stating it implicitly or in pragmatics (study of language use), the term is called as conversational implicature.

Implicature, “a meaning conveyed but not explicitly stated” (Grundy, 2008:92), sometimes is not understood by the hearer or by the one to whom we talk. Therefore, this conversational implicature needs special intention and it is interesting to be studied. Thus, the topic in this research is conversational implicature and the writer chooses one Bollywood movie entitled *Talaash* as the object of the research.

In this case, Bollywood is a part of the large Indian film industry producing films in multiple languages (Wikipedia, 2013) and the choosing of Bollywood movie as the object of the research is because many Bollywood movies are popular almost all over the world like in Asia, Africa, America and even in Europe (Tempo, 2012). Meanwhile, the movie entitled *Talaash* is a 2012 Indian neo-noir psychological thriller film and the movie received a UA certificate from the Censor Board of India as well as it eventually grossed 1.74 billion (US\$28 million) worldwide (Wikipedia, 2015).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Pragmatics

Pragmatics, as a branch of linguistics [the study of the ins and outs of the language (Chaer, 2003)], is defined as the study of meaning systematically based on the use of language (Huang 2007: 2). More details, Levinson (1983) explains that pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and a context encoded in the structure of language as a basis for understanding the language. In line with this theory, pragmatics can be regarded as a study that examines the meaning intended by the language user in interaction influenced by the context or elements beyond the language (Yuwono, 2005: 9).



Based on the pragmatic definitions mentioned above, it can be concluded that pragmatics is the study of the use of language in communication, as proposed by Blakemore (1992:40) “actual linguistics performance – that is the way we use language.”

The main topics discussed in pragmatics, as stated by Huang (2007) include: presuppositions, deixis (meaning that refers to or designates), speech act and implicature (meaning implied).

Presupposition in the explanation of Huang (2007: 65) is stated: "presuppositions can be informally defined as an inference or proposition whose truth is taken for granted in the utterance of a sentence." This means that presupposition can be understood as an inference or a presumption that the truth should be believed without being previously investigated in a speech of a sentence, as in the following examples quoted from Junaiyah, and Arifin (2010: 16):

[Ketika sampai di terminal, A berkata]:

A: *Wah, aku ketinggalan bus ke Bogor, nih.*

[When arriving at the terminal, A said]:

A: Well, I missed the bus to Bogor.

According to their explanation, presupposition on the sentence is there was a bus that went to Bogor and the bus had already left when A did not reach the terminal.

Deixis that the term comes from the Greek meaning instructions, or references (Levinson, 1983), as the words of these, that, I, we and others is a process of rhetoric in which the meaning of the context will affect the word or expression (Hidayat and Widjanarko, 2008).

Speech act according to Thomas (1995: 51) is a term that is equally comprehended as illocutionary, i.e. speech act in which has a purpose for what the speech is spoken, for example, to request, command, offer or invite.

Implicature, as mentioned earlier, is the next major topic of pragmatics. Since this topic is becoming a problem in this study, the implicature will be discussed in depth in the next sub-chapter along with clause type and the characteristics of the speech act of the implicature.

Implikatur

Implicature, as written by Huang (2007), was triggered by an Oxford philosopher HP Grice, where the main idea was introduced at the William James' lectures at Harvard in 1967.



Grice's proposing about what is implied was motivated by two research fields where the first generally showed that in everyday conversation, people often conveyed more meaning than or different from what was linguistically encoded without causing misunderstanding (Feng, 2010: 18). The same source wrote other field study results underlying the indication that the usual logic of the conditioned truth was not be able to explain this phenomenon and consequently was not be able to provide an adequate explanation of the nature of general human verbal interaction.

Based on the above problems, implicature is variously defined by experts but with similar intention. Sperber & Wilson (1986: 182, in Hornsby, 2011: 143) define implicature as a matter or thing communicated but not stated explicitly. In other words, Grundi (2008) defines it as meaning delivered but not directly stated. Meanwhile, Brown & Yule (1983: 3, in Moeliono, 1999: 103) define it as something that is contained in the sign language captured by listeners or readers where the meaning is different from the conventional one.

Referring to the definition of implicature proposed above, it can simply be said that if there is a statement stated in which there is other intention to be understood by the recipient or by people

who want to communicate can be considered as implicature. For example as follows: A: "It's eleven o'clock." B: "Soon I go but my homework is unfinished."

A: "You 'll be late"

B: "there is a meeting at school for an hour."

A's speech did not intend to tell the hour, but ordered B to immediately go to school. Speaker B understood what the speaker A said. Next, B' speech did not intend to inform that there was going to be a meeting for an hour at school, but informed him that he would not be late.

Based on the theory proposed by Grice, implicature can be divided into conventional implicature and conversational implicatures (Huang, 2007; Birney, 2012).

Junaiyah and Arifin (2010: 12) describe the conventional implicature as implicature where all people generally understand or will understand the intention or meaning conveyed, thus the meaning 'lasts longer' although this kind of implicature is often considered to be less attractive. Further Yule (1996: 45) explains that this is not the implicature derived from violation of the principles of the conversation, and it does not neither appear in the conversation nor depend on the specific context for interpreting them. Here are some examples of conventional



implicature and their explanation in the book of Huang (2007: 54):

1. He is a Chinese; therefore he knows how to use chopsticks.
2. John is a poor man but he's honest.

In the first example, conventional implicature created by word *therefore* is because he is a Chinese, so it deserves just know how to use chopsticks. In the second example, conventional implicature is created by the words *but* that shows the contrast meaning between the information filled with information filling.

In the same source, it is written that the use of other words, such as: *even, also, actually, besides, however*, and others are also considered to give the meaning of conventional implicature.

On the other hand, conversational implicature, according to McNamara (2006: 58) is implicature which violates the principles of cooperative conversation and requires the listener to interpret the literal meaning of what is revealed by the background knowledge.

From the above theory, it can be concluded that the purpose of conversational implicature highly depends on context. This is also affirmed by Junaiyah and Arifin (2010: 12) that the context of the conversation determines the sense and meaning of this implicature.

Besides, they (on the same page) explain that:

"Conversational implicature only appears in the conversation act alone, temporary (during a conversation) and non-conventional (implied no direct relation with what is said)."

Furthermore, conversational implicature in general can be divided into two types, namely generalized conversational implicature in which the implicature does not require special context, and particularized conversational implicature or special conversational implicature in which the implicature requires a special context (Levinson, 1983).

In line with the above explanation, Yule (1996: 40) argues that generalized conversational implicature does not require special background knowledge to understand it. In contrast to the special conversational implicature, he says that it occurs in a specific context to be able to draw conclusions required to understand the purpose delivered.

For more details, the following will be presented examples of generalized conversational implicature (no. 1) and the special conversational implicatures (no. 2), quoted from the writings of Yule (1996: 41):

1. *I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence.*

In the example above, Yule explains that implicature, where the word 'a garden' and 'a child' mentioned do not belong to the speaker, is considered not to violate the principles of conversation if only the speaker told them more specific (i.e. more informative, following the maxim of quantity) by saying 'my garden' (my garden) and 'my child' (my son).

According to the same source, another example included in the general conversation implicature type is: when the speaker involves in any phrase with no specific article (an indefinite article).

2. Rick : *Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?*

Tom : *My parents are visiting.*

In the example of specific conversational implicature above, speech conversation of Tom violates the principle of cooperation, relevant maxim. In his speech, the intention delivered by Tom did not tell that his parents would come, but answered the question of Rick that he would not go to the party at that time because his parents would visit and he wanted to spend time with them.

Clause Types and Speech Act

The following will be presented theories of the clause types and speech act related to the research topic about particular conversational implicature that

is entirely quoted from the book of Huddleston & Pullum (2005: 159-160).

The philosophers use the term of speech act for things to do with a sentence of the language use - things like making statements, asking questions, submitting orders, or making exclamatory expressions. Associated with this speech act, English syntax distinguishes types of clause that are used to perform different types of speech act. The clause types are as follows:

- i Declarative (statement)
- ii. Closed interrogative (closed questions that only require the answer 'yes' or 'no')
- iii. Open interrogative (open question)
- iv. Exclamative
- v. Imperative (command)

Although the correspondence between the types of clause with speech act cannot be aligned, speech act has properties associated with these types of clause, as shown below:

Clause	Types
Characteristics of Speech Act:	
i. Declarative	- making a statement
ii. Closed interrogative	- asking a closed question
iii. Open interrogative	- asking an open question
iv. Exclamative	- making an exclamatory statement



v. Imperative - issuing a directive (including instruction, request, and so on)

contains implicature or intent conveyed implicitly.

Correlation above can be considered as a common definition of the types of clause. For example, the type of clause can be defined as construction of imperative clause that is used to give orders.

Based on the theory proposed by Huddleston & Pullum about the clause types and the characteristic of speech act mentioned above, we can conclude that if in the conversation, the type of clause used is not in line with the characteristic of speech act, it is certain to contain a conversation implicature or implied meaning. However, the types of clause that are in line with the nature of the speech act can also contain implicature meaning. It means that the meaning will depend on the context, speaker, listener and the circumstances at the time the conversation takes place.

However, these types of clause are not always the same as the characteristics of speech act. For example, the type of closed interrogative clause is not used to ask a closed question but to give an order (it is more polite), and the type of declarative clause is not used to make a statement but to give an order, as in the following illustration:

1. Can you close the door?
2. If you arrive late, you will be fired.

Type of clause in a sentence no. 1 is closed interrogative, but the characteristic of the speech act is generally understood as giving an order which implies asking to close the door. In other words, the sentence contains implicature or implied intent. Similarly, the clause type in a sentence no. 2 is a declarative, but the characteristic of speech act is generally understood as giving order not to arrive late. This also means that the sentence

METHODOLOGY

The design in this research used descriptive qualitative research method by analyzing the documents. This type of method is very appropriate for this study because, according to Fraenkel and Wallen (1996) this method is descriptive analysis to analyze the data that can be obtained from the document. In addition, the source of the data obtained from interviews, observations, and review of documents is a source of the most common data collection in qualitative research (Creswell, 2009b; Locke, Silverman, & Spirduso, 2010; Marshall & Rossman, 1999, in Thomas, Nelson, Silverman, 2011: 357).

Meanwhile, source of data for this study was obtained from documents in the



form of English subtitle of a dialogue conversation in one Bollywood movie entitled Talaash, in which the movie and its English subtitles (translation) were downloaded from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OrNYcnZ-XZw> and www.moviesubtitles.org/movie-8701.html.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the data analysis, the most found clause types are declarative, 26 (46%) and closed interrogative, 11 (20%). Next, there are imperative, 9 (16%), open interrogative, 7 (13%). and the least found one is exclamative, 3 (5%). In other side, the most found characteristics of speech act are making a statement, 30 (54%) and issuing a directive, 14 (25%). Next, there are asking a closed question, 6 (11%) and asking an open question, 4 (7%) and the least found one is making an exclamatory statement, 2(4%).

Clause type of Declarative

Clause type of declarative found in the research findings is commonly in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic of speech act for this clause type is making a statement as shown by some samples of data below:

Data number 1.

- Devrath: “Good morning, Sir.
Devrath Kulkarni.”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is

declarative because it is in the form of statement. The characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *Let me introduce myself. My name is Devrath Kulkarni.*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Declarative → making a statement

Data number 2.

- Devrath: “Another witness.”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is declarative because it is in the form of statement. The characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *He is another witness.*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Declarative → making a statement

Data number 4.

- Mr Kapoor’s Wife: “I don’t get it.”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is declarative because it is in the form of statement. The characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *I don’t understand.*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Declarative → making a statement

Data number 8.



- Suri: “Inspector Shekhawat ...”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is declarative because it is in the form of statement. The characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *Inspector Shekhawat is speaking..* Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Declarative → making a statement

Clause type of declarative found in the research findings is sometimes not in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic of speech act for this clause type is making a statement. However, because the implicit intent conveyed is not making a statement, the characteristic of speech act for this type becomes not making a statement as shown by some samples of data below:

Data number 12.

- Frenny Mistry: “I would love some tea.”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is declarative because it is in the form of statement. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Give me some tea please!.*

Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Declarative >< issuing a directive

Data number 23.

- Shashi: “If you ever say a word about this, I will break your face.”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is declarative because it is in the form of statement. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Never tell anybody about this!.* Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Declarative >< issuing a directive

Data number 53.

- Tehmur: “That a nice bag.”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is declarative because it is in the form of statement. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Give me that bag!.* Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Declarative >< issuing a directive

Clause Type of Closed Interrogative

Clause type of closed interrogative found in the research findings is

commonly in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic of speech act for this clause type is asking a closed question as shown by some samples of data below:

Data number 3.

- Mr Kapoor's Wife: "What happened to Ramu, our driver? *Is he ...?*"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is closed interrogative because it is in the form of closed question. The characteristic of speech act for this type is asking a closed question as the implicit intent conveyed is *Is he dead?*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative → asking a closed question

Data number 7.

- Shashi: "Get it?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is closed interrogative because it is in the form of closed question. The characteristic of speech act for this type is asking a closed question as the implicit intent conveyed is *Do you understand?*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative → asking a closed question

Data number 13.

- Roshni: "Milk and sugar?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is closed interrogative because it is in the form of closed question. The characteristic of speech act for this type is asking a closed question as the implicit intent conveyed is *Would you like some milk and sugar in your tea?*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative → asking a closed question

Data number 16.

- Nirmala: "Did the cops hit you on your head?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is closed interrogative because it is in the form of closed question. The characteristic of speech act for this type is asking a closed question as the implicit intent conveyed is *Do you realize what you say?*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative → asking a closed question

Clause type of closed interrogative found in the research findings is sometimes not in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic of speech act for this clause type is asking a closed question. However, because the implicit intent conveyed is not asking a closed question, the characteristic



of speech act for this type becomes not asking a closed question as shown by some samples of data below:

Data number 14

- Roshni: “Karan Loved to be in water. Did he have to drown and die?”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is closed interrogative because it is in the form of closed question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is asking an open question as the implicit intent conveyed is *Why did he have to drown and die?*. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative >< asking an open question

Data number 31

- Rosie: “Are you crazy?”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is closed interrogative because it is in the form of closed question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *You are kidding*. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative >< making a statement

Data number 33

- Tehmur: “You think, I am an idiot?”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is closed interrogative because it is in the form of closed question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *I am not an idiot*.. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative >< making a statement

Data number 40

- Roshni: “Is your wife okay that you never come home?”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is closed interrogative because it is in the form of closed question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *Your wife of course will certainly be unpleasant too*.. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative >< making a statement

Clause Type of Open Interrogative

Clause type of open interrogative found in the research findings is less than half in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic of

speech act for this clause type is asking an open question as shown by samples of data below:

Data number 19.

- Suri: "Who wants red?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is open interrogative because it is in the form of open question. The characteristic of speech act for this type is asking an open question as the implicit intent conveyed is *Who wants red pawn?*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Open interrogative → asking an open question

Data number 20.

- Tehmur: "What's with the long faces, guys?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is open interrogative because it is in the form of open question. The characteristic of speech act for this type is asking an open question as the implicit intent conveyed is *What happened?*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Open interrogative → asking an open question

Clause type of open interrogative found in the research findings is more than half not in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic

of speech act for this clause type is asking an open question. However, because the implicit intent conveyed is not asking an open question, the characteristic of speech act for this type becomes not asking an open question as shown by samples of data below:

Data number 10

Data number 5.

- Shashi: "You have only one good leg, how about I break that too?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is open interrogative because it is in the form of open question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *I forbid you to ask anything..*. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative >< issuing a directive

- Shashi: "Where you off to, Nirmala?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is open interrogative because it is in the form of open question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *You'd better stay here instead of going to work..*. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.



Closed interrogative >< issuing a directive

Data number 15

- Rosie: "Where do you think?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is open interrogative because it is in the form of open question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *You yourself know..*. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative >< making a statement

Data number 38

- Suri: "What are you doing here?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is open interrogative because it is in the form of open question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *What you do here is useless..*. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative >< making a statement

Data number 47

- Madam: "Where do you think you are going?"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is open interrogative because it is in the form of open question. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Don't go away!*. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Closed interrogative >< issuing a directive

Clause Type of Imperative

Clause type of imperative found in the research findings is all in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic of speech act for this clause type is asking an open question as shown by some samples of data below:

Data number 6.

- Shashi: "Never repeat what I say to you in front of others!"

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is imperative because it is in the form of directive. The characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Don't tell anybody what I have said to you..*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Imperative → issuing a directive

Data number 11.



- Tehmur: “*Don’t listen to him! You look really nice.*”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is imperative because it is in the form of directive. The characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Never make his remarks hurt your heart!*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Imperative → issuing a directive

Data number 17.

- Nirmala: “Stop building these castles in the air!”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is imperative because it is in the form of directive. The characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Do not daydream!*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Imperative → issuing a directive

Data number 18.

- Nirmala: “Stay away from Shashi’s rackets if you want to stay alive!”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is imperative because it is in the form of directive. The characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Do not*

oppose Shashi if you still want to survive!. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Imperative → issuing a directive

Data number 48.

- Madam: “Go, stop her!”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is imperative because it is in the form of directive. The characteristic of speech act for this type is issuing a directive as the implicit intent conveyed is *Don’t let her go!*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Imperative → issuing a directive

Clause Type of Exclamative

Clause type of exclamative found in the research findings is two in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic of speech act for this clause type is making an exclamatory statement

as shown by samples of data below:

Data number 21.

- Tehmur: “What rubbish!”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is exclamative because it is in the form of exclamatory statement. The characteristic of speech act for this type is making an exclamatory statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *What*



nonsense!. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Exclamaative → making an exclamatory statement

Data number 52.

- Tehmur: “Hai, darling!”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is exclamative because it is in the form of exclamatory statement. The characteristic of speech act for this type is making an exclamatory statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *Hai, you! The one who will give me a fortune!*. Hence the clause type is in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Exclamaative → making an exclamatory statement

Clause type of exclamative found in the research findings is only one not in line with the characteristic of speech act, in which the characteristic of speech act for this clause type is making an exclamatory statement. However, because the implicit intent conveyed is not making an exclamatory statement, the characteristic of speech act for this type becomes not making an exclamatory statement as shown by a sample of data below:

Data number 55.

- Babu Tipnis: “Sanjay Kejriwal!”

Clause type of this particularized conversational implicature is exclamative because it is in the form of exclamatory statement. However, the characteristic of speech act for this type is making a statement as the implicit intent conveyed is *Sanjay Kejriwal hired me..*. Hence the clause type is not in line with its characteristic of speech act.

Exclamative >< making a statement.

CONCLUSION

From the findings of the study, the type clause of conversational implicature in one Bollywood film entitled Talaash was dominated by declarative and its characteristic of speech act was making a statement. Meanwhile, the type of clause least found was exclamative and its characteristic of speech act was making an exclamatory statement.

Clause types of declarative, closed interrogative, imperative and exclamative were in line and not in line with their own characteristic of speech act. Meanwhile, the clause type of open interrogative was only found in line with its characteristic of speech act.



Based on the results of research, discussion and analysis of the data, it can be concluded that the conversational implicature is often found in the text of a literary work, especially in movie dialogue. It means that the readers or the audiences should understand it well in order not to misunderstand meaning or intent conveyed so they can enjoy it with satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Birney, B. J. (2012). Introduction to pragmatics, *Volume 38 dari Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Blakemore, D. (1992). *Understanding utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chaer, A. (2003). *Linguistik umum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge University press.
- I. Cresswell, J. W. (2008, p. 1). *Educational research: Planing, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Third edition, Upper Saddle Creek, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Feng, G. (2010). *A theory of conventional implicature and pragmatic markers in Chinese*. BRILL.
- Fraenkel J. R., & Wallen N. E. (1996). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraww-Hill, Inc.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing pragmatics*. London: Hodder education.
- II. Hidayat, K. dan Widjanarko, P. (2008). *Reinventing Indonesia: menemukan kembali masa depan bangsa*. PT Mizan Publika.
- Hornsby, D. (2011). *Interfaces in language 2*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: University Press.
- Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. K. (2005). *A student's introduction to English grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Junaiyah, H. M., Arifin, E. Z.(2010). *Keutuhan wacana*. Grasindo.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983: 5-34). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- McNamara, T. (2006). *Language testing: The social dimension*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Moeliono, A. M. dkk. (1999). *Telaah bahasa dan sastra*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Tempo. (2012). *Asal Muasal Nama Bollywood*. Retrieved May 17, 2014 from <http://www.tempo.co/read/news/2012/12/08/111446690>.
- III. Thomas, J. (1995: 51). *Meaning in interaction*. Longman Group Limited.
- IV. Thomas, J. R., Nelson, J. K., & Silverman, S. J. (2011). *Research methods in physical activity, sixth edition*. Human Kinetics.
- V. Wikipedia. (2013). *Bollywood*. Retrieved May 17, 2014 from <http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bollywood>.
- VI. Wikipedia, (2015). *Talaash: The Answer Lies Within*. Retrieved June 27,2015 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talaash:_The_Answer_Lies_Within
- Youtube. (2013). *Talaash*. Retrieved June 28, 2015 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QrNYcnZ-XZw>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- VII. Yuwono, U. (2005). *Pesona bahasa: langkah awal memahami linguistik*. Multimedia RMT Lauder.