

IMPLICATURES IN ALFATAH NANDO'S SHORT MOVIE *TERLANJUR MENCINTA*

Idha Nurhamidah, Liliek Soepriatmadji, Sugeng Purwanto

Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Universitas Stikubank Semarang

idhanurhamidah@unissula.ac.id, liliek_soepriatmadji@edu.unisbank.ac.id, sugeng_purwanto@edu.unisbank.ac.id

Abstract

YouTube has been flooded with contents within a movie genre, mostly the products by junior creators. It is therefore important to appreciate their works to maintain their creativities and innovations. Positive responses to such literary works are also required to improve their quality writing. The current study was aimed at identifying and at the same time construing the implicatures found in each act of the movie entitled *Terlanjur Mencinta* directed by Alfatah Nando. George Yule's pragmatic theory (1996) was used in relation to implicatures caused by conversational maxims (Grice, 1975) supported by linguistic evidence-based contextual interpretation, namely utterances and stage directions. Findings show that generalized conversational implicatures were identified, namely 12 implicatures in which 42% was due to violation of manner maxim, 33% attributed to that of relation maxim, 17% due to that of quantity maxim, and 8% due to that of quality maxim. In addition, 4 conventional implicatures were found in the monologue. The study concludes that the implicatures can be easily understood through the contexts of situations. It is recommended that future researchers can formulate the ideal proportion and distribution of implicatures in a particular text in terms of quality, employing comparative rhetoric and a special research instrument.

Keywords: *pragmatics, implicature, conversational maxims, short movie, YouTube creator*

I INTRODUCTION

Language is used to make meanings to be understood by interlocutors, in such a way to create linguistic interactions, enabling communication to occur for special purposes, in relation to the development of culture, civilization, technology, etc. (Cai et al., 2021; Olmstead et al., 2021). In other words, any line of human activities cannot be separated from the use of language, be it written or spoken.

However, communication does not always succeed in its mission as expected by language users. There are possible language barriers related to activities of communication, for example, the use of grammatical complexity, technical vocabulary (registers), strange intonation due to the influence of a particular linguistic background, and many more (Lodge, 2021). This has triggered language users to realize the importance of pragmatic knowledge to construe both implicit and explicit utterances (Isanova, 2021; McConachy & Liddicoat, 2021). Generally speaking, language users find it easy to understand explicit meanings of particular utterances, especially with respect to the use of denotative and idiomatic expressions or publicly-known connotations. As for implicit meanings, it is not always the case. Problems may be encountered, especially by those with least pragmatic knowledge so as to cause misunderstanding (due to local cultures), up to a severe point of social unrest caused by misunderstanding in the use of language.

High prevalence of contents in YouTube within the genre of movie produced by junior creator is a positive phenomenon of creativity and innovation that has to be appreciated (Pires et al., 2021; Seo & Jung, 2021). The concrete form of appreciation is by subscribing, viewing, and commenting or sharing the channel. Responses (hereinafter referred to as literary criticism) to such literary works should also be undertaken to improve quality and beauty. Peer evaluations performed among creators and or viewers, including literary critics may create natural selection which positively improves the movie world of unlimited scopes across the globe. Short movies produced in YouTube by Indonesian Creator as manifestation of the channel dynamics have confidently employed the local languages. More surprisingly, subtitle services according to the proposed languages have been available to bridge the gap of understanding between creators and viewers of particular YouTube channels.

The current study was aimed at identifying and construing the implicatures found in each act of a short movie entitled *Terlanjur mencinta* directed by Alfatah Nando. Other issues related to comprehensibility of the plot, conflicts, and moral values were also discussed to justify that language is mostly pragmatically used, implying that meanings are implicitly expressed.

I MATERIALS AND METHODS

I.1 Theoretical Highlights

Implicature or implicit meaning can be identified in an utterance and is therefore a logical consequence of language use (Betti & Khalaf, 2021; Meyer & Feiman, 2021; Qin & van Compernelle, 2021; Sbisà, 2021; Terkourafi et al., 2021). Even implicit meaning has to be used in response to culture.

Conversational implicature is a sort of pragmatic implication that may occur due to violation of cooperative principles (Li, 2021; Yudith et al., 2021). Pragmatic Theory (Yule, 1996) proposed two types of implicatures, namely 'Hedges', 'Conversational Implicature' and 'Scalar Implicature occurring due to violation of conversational maxims consisting of quantity, relation (relevance) and manner maxims (Kurniadi, 2021; D. Lestari & Firdaus, 2021; Nahak & Bram, 2021). Yule also states that there is another type of implicature called 'Conversational Implicature' in which its occurrence is not caused by violation of conversational maxims. This can be found in monologues, such as speeches or stand-up comedies or non-verbal expressions such as talking to one's self.

In the research on a movie entitled *Laskar Pelangi* directed by Riri Riza, for example, nine types of implicatures were found, consisting of four violations of relevance maxim, three violations of quantity maxim, and the other two violations belonging to maxim of manner and maxim of quality. The research findings were informally presented focusing on the process of occurrence of implicatures due to cooperative principles of conversation (Yulianti & Utomo, 2020). Meanwhile, another research on implicature was performed, involving people in a market to identify types of conversational implicatures made by sellers and buyers, namely (1) accepting as demanded by need for something, (2) rejecting due to high prices, and (3) bargaining due to the high offer of price. The implicatures occurred in indirect expressions caused by conditional, situational and linguistic factors. The findings indicated that implicatures were mostly dominated by acceptance dominated and least by bargaining (Maydolina et al., 2020)

The use of implicature is also related to presumption (something foregrounding an utterance) as evidenced in the research (Mansyur, 2020) on a signing open debate by candidates of governors of West Java Province in 2018-2023. Meanings were interpreted based on presumptions and implicatures occurring in the debate speech events. The findings indicated that, in general, conversational implicatures consisted of conventional implicatures (62.16%) and conversational implicatures (22.98%), while presumptions of 14.86%. The types of implicatures included ordering, expelling, showing hates, flattering (persuading), sighing, avoiding, and mocking. However, the occurrence of implicature is not always initiated by presumption. Therefore, in such a study, the percentage of occurrence of implicatures should have been separately performed apart from the occurrence of presumptions as both were of no cause-and-effect factors. When both were observed, it would be better limited to comparative frequency counts based on which interpretation could be made.

In respect to the novelty of this study, the previous researches as described above have not addressed any issues related to implicatures of monologues and dialogues in a short movie to form a particular discourse with a particular target audience, as well as involving special techniques for the audience to enjoy a movie in a short period of time. This study contributes a new linguistic repertoire in terms of (1) application of pragmatics in a literary work employing a total sampling. The point was to identify the occurrence of implicatures in a literary work within a short period of time, yet yielding a lot of implicit expressions or utterances. In addition, (2) presumption and implicatures were separately presented for more comprehensive understanding of a literary work.

I.2 Method

The current study is descriptive, qualitative and interpretative in nature. The data were taken from a short movie entitled *Terlanjur Mencinta* [Already in Love]. The movie is directed by Alfatah Nando, produced by Padi Entertainment in 2020 with 20.2k subscribers and has been viewed by 369,209 viewers. The movie is supported by a famous sound track of the same song title (*Terlanjur Mencinta*). The movie was produced in time of Covid-19 Pandemic showing creativity of junior artist maximizing the government policy of Work from home (WfH). Upon watching the movie, researcher team have found possible implicatures worth analysing as they may yield significant pragmatic findings in the use of language.

The movie consists of five acts. Each act was analysed employing Theory of Conversational Maxims (Grice, 1975) such as used in researches to identify the violations of conversational maxims (N. G. Lestari & Helmie, 2020; Wahyuniyanto et al., 2020) in dialogues and monologues. Meanwhile, Pragmatic Theory (Yule, 1996) were used to describe the implicatures based of violations of

conversational maxims. Implicatures were interpreted to reveal the intended meanings through contexts and co-texts. The results of analyses were tabulated for further discussion on which to draw conclusion and recommendation.

II RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

II.1 Findings

As in a short story which can be enjoyed in one sitting, a short movie only needs 5-15 minutes to watch in order to comprehend the whole story. The essence of the two genres of such literary works is that both can present reflections or contemplation on the part of the audience (readers and lookers-on). For this, due to the limited time, the plot was made short, dealing only one conflict or viewed from one angle of look. This has enabled implicatures to occur along each utterance either in monologues or monologues.

An 8 minute-and 29 second movie *Terlanjur Mencinta* presents various implicatures in monologues (conventional implicatures) and dialogues (implicatures based on violation of conversational maxims). To help non-Indonesian readers to have a full understanding of the story, team of researchers of this study provided English translation of the dialogue, monologue and narrative. This was done through a Forum Group Discussion (FGD).

II.1.1 Act 1

<Overheard in a well-designed apartment complex in a city, voices of two women talking in mobile phones, each is talking right from her own dwelling place, shot one after another>

- (1) Ra : “*Fin, pokoknya lho harus jadi tinggal di apartemen gue.*”
[Fin, you have to live with me in my apartment, no choice]
- (2) Fina : “*Ah, iya Ra. Bawel loe.*”
[Ok, Ra, such a talkative]
<Wagging her hand over the mobile phone screen. Turning herself to a white car approaching the house next door>
- (3) Ra : “*Ya lagian, emangnya loe ngga BT tinggal di rumah segede itu sendirian*”
[Don't you feel lonely to live in such a big house, alone?]
- (4) Fina : <Not answering, still focusing on the white car>
- (5) Ra : “*HALLO...! <Shouting> Fin...? Masih di sana?! Fin...?*”
[Fin? Are you there?! Fin?]
- (6) Fina : <Still focusing on the white car, there is a man getting off the car. Slowly, she is approaching the man>
“*Ra...Ra...Ra, bentar ya..., dah dulu ya dada-dada*”
[Ra...Ra...Ra, wait. ya bye bye for now]
- (7) Ra : “*Eh, tunggu dulu masih mau ngomong nih...*”
[Eh, wait. Wanna talk more]

In the phone dialogue above, there occurs a violation of conversational maxim, namely (2) Fina violates maxim of quality, by giving an attribute *Bawel* [Talkative] to Ra. Besides, Fina is not enthusiastic in response to Ra's demand; this can be seen physically from Fina's behaviour, wagging her hand over the screen of her mobile phone, and turning herself to a white car approaching the house next door.

However, Ra understands Fina, namely agreeing to live together, and does not care for the attribute *Bawel* as said by Fina, and yet focusing more on the importance of living together with the follow-up response (3) “*Ya, lagian, emangnya loe ngga BT tinggal di rumah segede itu sendirian.*”

Again in (4), Fina violates maxim of manner by not giving a follow-up response. After (5) Ra says *HALLO*, in a loud voice and “*Fin? Masih di sana?! Fin?*” finally, (6) Fina responds, but she responds by violating maxim of relevance, saying “*Ra...Ra...Ra, bentar ya..., dah dulu ya dada-dada.*” (7) Ra quickly shouts, “*Eh, tunggu dulu masih mau ngomong nih...*” but the telephone has disconnected, at the same time showing violation of maxim of behavioural manner by Fina, disconnecting the phones.

Implicature-1 (due to violation of quality maxim) occurs when Fina give an attribute *Bawel loe* implicitly meaning that “As a matter of fact, Fina does not really like to receive a call from Ra who always wants to convince that they will live together.”

Implicature-2 (due to violation of relation maxim) occurs when Fina ends the phone as “*Ra...Ra...Ra, bentar ya..., dah dulu ya dada-dada*” implicitly meaning that “I don't wanna talk with you any

more” and simply cutting off the phone. Regarding Fina’s violation of manner maxim, no implicit meaning can be identified. It is assumed that Ra understands the situation.

II.1.2 Act 2

- (1) Fina : <Approaching a man, busy bringing a trunk, a back-bag and a guitar>
 “E... rumah ini kan kosong...ngapain loe di sini?”
 [No body lives in the house. What on earth are you here for?]
- (2) Bara : “E... gue yang nempatin rumah ini sekarang”
 [E...me living in the house now!]
- (3) Fina : “O... <talking with herself>
- (4) Bara : “Oi!” <surprising Fina who is talking with herself>
- (5) Fina : “Eh ...iya”
 [Eh, yeah]
- (6) Bara : “Nama gue Bara”
 [My name’s Bara]
- (7) Fina : “Fina. Gue yang tinggal di ..
 <pointing at her house> .. situ”
 [Fina. I live over there]
- (8) Bara : “O..., kita tetangga donk sekarang?”
 [Oh, we are neighbors, then]
- (8) Fina : “Iya, kebetulan... tetangga”
 [A coincidence ... we are!]
- (10) Bara : “O... yaudah, gue balik bebenah barang gue ya?”
 [Well, let me get things done, right?]
- (11) Fina : “Bye Bara.”
 <Returning home>
- (12) Bara : “Bye Fina”

In the above dialogue, (2) Bara violates maxim of relevance to Fina’s question “Ngapain loe di sini?” In (4) Bara breaks Fina’s day-dreaming in (3), and (5) Fina manages to get herself back, saying “Eh..iya”.

In (7) Fina violates maxim of quantity, giving unnecessary information, though finally (8) Bara can get Fina’s information. In (10) Bara diverts his talk, and (11, 12) they say *bye* to each other.

Implicature-1 is due to violation of relevance maxim. Bara’s response actually means “Look! Today, I am moving in this house.” Fina’s violation of quantity maxim has caused Bara to conclude that they are neighbours as implicature-2

Fina’s Monologue: “Bara, anaknya OK juga. Ah, masak baru kenal gue langsung tertarik sih sama dia? Ini kali ya, yang namanya jatuh cinta pada pandangan pertama. Ehm. <occasionally winking at Bara who is entering his house>
 [Bara, such a nice kid! Ah, isn’t it logical for me—as newly introduced—to be interested in him? Is it probably what is called love at the first sight. Ehm]

In this monologue, a conventional implicature occurs. Fina is talking with herself (1) making judgment about a newly-known individual, asking herself and concluding by herself, ending in an *Ehm* sound—full of meanings.

II.1.3 Act 3

<Morning! Fina is doing sport exercises>.

- (1) Fina : “Selamat Pagi tetangga baru...!”
 [G’Morning, new neighbor..!]
- (2) Bara : “Selamat Pagi, Fina!”
 [Good Morning, Fina!]
- (3) Fina : <Approaching Bara who is ready for cycling>
 “Trendy juga ya loe anaknya, mentang-mentang sekarang lagi musim sepeda, loe malah ikut-ikutan”
 [Such a trendy boy you are, coz of cycling season, you are just following it]
- (4) Bara : “Ngeselin juga loe ya? Ya, walaupun di rumah aja kan gue harus tetep sehat. Maka gue sepedaan.”
 [A naughty girl, aren’t you? Well, despite just staying at home, I have to be healthy. Thus, cycling!]
- (5) Fina : “Terserah deh...”

- (6) Bara : [All up to you]
: <Dragging his bicycle, rides on>
“*Loe kan tetangga gue satu-satunya nih, itung-itung gue selamat, bantuin gue juga beres-beres di rumah ya?*”
[You are the only neighbour, as a day of blessing, help me make over the house, will ya?]
- (7) Fina : “*Bisa aja loe*” <tapping Bara’s back>
[What a tricky of you]
- (8) Bara : “*Bye Fina*” <cycling>
- (9) Fina : “*Pokoknya gue gak mau tahu ya, kalau gue beresin rumah loe, loe harus beliin gue kopi*”
[No matter how you do it, if I clean your house, you must buy me coffee]
- (10) Bara : “*Ga denger...*”
[Can’t hear ya]
- (11) Fina : “*Iih.. Bara.*” <smiling>
[Shit!]

In (4) Bara violates maxim of relation, responding to Fina’s comment by saying “*Ngeselin juga loe ya?*” expressed jokingly so as not to cause misunderstanding Bara continues with logical argument on Fina’s comments. This further confirms that the setting of this movie is during Covid-19 pandemic expressed in (4) “... *Ya, walaupun di rumah aja kan gue harus tetep sehat. Maka gue sepedaan.*”

In (5) Fina violates maxim of manner by commenting “*Terserah deh..*” In addition, in (7) Fina violates maxim of manner, in agreeing to clean Bara’s house. Both in (5) and (7) Fina uses joking expression and not to cause miscommunication.

In (10) Bara violates maxim of manner by responding “*Ga denger*” promisingly expressed but can be ambiguous, too.

Implicature-1 due to violation of relevance maxim is expressed in “*Ngeselin juga loe ya?*” but as romantically expressed, it may mean “Oh, honey.”

Due to violation of maxim of manner, implicature-2 does occur, indirect praising, meaning “You are ...quite logical”. Implicature-3 occurs due to violation of maxim of manner. An utterance “*Bisa aja loe*” behaviourally justified by tapping Bara’s back. It may mean “Ok. I’ll take care”.

Due to violation of maxim of manner, implicature-4 does occur, with ambiguous meaning but expressed romantically, possibly means “OK., no worries,” despite the fact that, semantically, an utterance “*Gak denger*” actually means “I am sure what you are asking for, I can’t hear it clearly”.

II.1.4 Act 4

- (1) Fina : “*Assalamu’alaikum, Bara!*” <knocking at the door>
- (2) Bara : <Opening the door> “*Mana sini tangan loe?*”
[Your hands, please] <spraying disinfectant over Fina’s both hands>
- (3) Fina : <give her hand> “*Ga sekalian cek suhu*”
[Why not check the temperature], <a bit of smiling, then coming in> “*Jadi gue musti ngapain nih?*”
[So, what shall I do?]
- (4) Bara : <Giving her cleaning tools> “*Ready?*”
- (5) Fina : <Nodding> <Both are then cleaning the house. When completed, Fina is offered coffee. Bara puts his mobile phone (HP) on the table>
- (6) Bara : “*Kopinya..*”
[Coffee, please...]
- (7) Fina : “*Thank you*”

In (2) violation of relation/relevance maxim occurs due to the fact Bara does not answer Fina’s greeting. Instead, he asks for Fina’s hands “*Mana sini tangan loe*” which, at the same time, indicates that the setting of the movie is during Covid-19 and this is further strengthened in (3).

Another violation of relation maxim in which Bara does not answer Fina’s question. Instead, he gives cleaning tools along with a question “*Ready?*”. Fina answers by nodding.

<Bara plays the guitar. Fina enjoys Bara’s playing the guitar while have coffee>.

Fina’s Monologue: “*Sekarang aku percaya adanya cinta pada pandangan pertama. Aku percaya saat adanya pertemuan itu. Aku tidak tahu kau menyadarainya atau tidak. Mungkin terlalu cepat atau begitu singkat. Perasaanku seketika bergebu. Yang membuatku jatuh pada tatapan mata saat bertemu.*”

[Now, I believe in love at the first sight. I believe in that special meeting. I don't know if you realize it or not. Possibly it is just too fast or too short. I have a sudden strange feeling, that makes me fall in love at the first meeting]

Conventional Implicature is to stress information on one's self despite the presence of doubts "*Aku tidak tahu kau menyadarinya atau tidak*" but Fina reaffirms herself that love at the first sight does exist, and it happens to her.

<Bara stops playing the guitar, then enters his room. When Bara is inside his room, Bara's mobile phone rings. Fina wants to know who is calling. Her face turns blue as she catches a sign of love (heart) in the notification bar. Fina leaves Bara's house without any words>.

Fina's Monologue: "Perasaan yang baru saja bergebu riang, kini berseteru kehilangan ruang. Ah...bodoh!"
[My happiness is over—no more space for it. Ah, who the hell cares!]

The first Conventional Implicature occurs as Fina gets mad with herself as expressed in the above monologue in response to the context.

II.1.5 Act 5

<The bell in Fina's house ringing. Fina is near the door. Knowing who is coming behind the window glass, she is full of doubts>

Fina's onologue: "*Pikiranku berkata untuk meninggalkannya, namun hati ini meminta untuk terus bersamanya. Perasaanku sudah terlanjur tumbuh. Sekarang hanya ada dua pilihan; meyakinkannya untuk bersama atau menghindar darinya.*

[I think I must leave him, but I wanna go on being with him. I've grown that type of feeling (being in love). Now there are only two choices—convincing to be together, or to avoid him]

The second Conventional implicature occurs when Fina is faced with two choices—being together or leaving him.

- (1) Fina : <Opening the door> "Bara."
- (2) Bara : <At first behind the door, then turns around> "Hai!" [Hi]
- (3) Fina : "Hai!" [Hi]
- (4) Bara : "Boleh aku masuk?" [May I come in]
- (5) Fina : <signalling agreement>
- (6) Bara : <Entering>

The dialogue between Fina and Bara feels awkward and formal, no more romantic joking. In (5) Fina can be categorized as violating maxim of quality, because she does not answer Bara's question—simply giving a signal of agreement. Bara is then entering Fina's without any words, just obeying Fina's gesture.

Implicature occurs due to violation of quality maxim, namely Fina only signals out agreement for Bara to enter the house without any words. However, it is mostly possible that she might say "Please do come in.." Such signalling can also be categorized as non-verbal implicature. It proves that Bara enters Fina's house too.

Fina's Monologue: "*Terkadang, aku hanya ingin perasaan ini berada pada tempatnya, pada rumah yang seharusnya, yaitu dirimu. Aku tidak peduli. Aku hanya ingin perasaan ingin memeluk harap sebelum semuanya menjadi hambar dan hilang tak berlatar. Bara, rasanya aku kini terjatuh dalam keindahan yang membuatku tak sanggup untuk menjauh darimu. Entah sampai kapan aku akan terus terlarut dan terlena dalam bisikan cinta yang membuatku buta. Aku ingin terus berada di sampingmu, tak peduli siapa yang ada di hatimu. Karena perasannku sudah 'terlanjur mencinta'.*

[At times, I just wanna put my feeling in its place, in the must-house, that is in you. I don't care. I just wanna hope before things are over, fading away, nothing left behind. Bara, I feel that I have fallen in a beauty that makes me unable to get separated from you. I don't how long it will last in a whisper of love that makes me blind. I wanna be with you always. I don't care who the hell is in your heart. For, I am already in love]

In the above monologue, conventional Implicature occurs when Fina reflects herself. She has already fallen in love with Bara; she does not care if her love is like clapping with one hand; she is already in love.

<Fina is looking at herself from her mobile phone screen, ready to meet Bara, but then feels jealous to find Bara ready to go with another woman/ girl, probably his girlfriend.>
 <Bara drive out of the housing complex.>

Thus, according to the above context, this short movie makes use of open ending in the sense that the audience is given freedom to continue the story. Possibly, there are two ways to continue the story. First, the girl in Bara's car is his girlfriend, implying that Fina fails to get Bara's love. Secondly, the girl is actually Bara's sister; the conflict can therefore be relieved.

II.2 Discussion

Table 1 below indicates the occurrence of generalized conversational implicatures due to violation of conversational maxims.

Act	Maxim Violation						Implicature					
	Quantity		Quality		Relation		Manner		Generalized	%	Conventional	
	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%				
1	1		-		1		2		4		-	
2	1		-		1		-		2		1	
3	-		-		1		3		4		-	
4	-		-		1		-		1		1	
5	-		1		-		-		1		2	
Σ	2	17%	1	8%	4	33%	5	42%	12	75%	4	25%

Table 1 Implicatures in a Short Movie "Terlanjur Mencinta"

Table 1 above indicates that violation of manner maxim dominates (42%) but without causing misunderstanding. This implies that the short movie entitled *Terlanjur Mencinta* directed by Alfatah Nando has been framed in a casual and informal setting. Such findings are also confirmed by violation of relation maxim (33%). This short movie is very suitable for young audience to add a wider horizon of look regarding various kinds of love behaviours.

Fortunately, implicatures due to violations of conversational maxims do not necessarily cause misunderstandings. Instead, they give more flavours to the Jakarta dialect which, to some extent, has become a preferred lingua franca among young generation. Fina as the main actress shows her over aggressiveness toward an unknown man (Bara). She is willing to approach a man, symbolizing young millennial individuals (generation) regarding women to men romantic behaviours. Such social behaviours might not be performed in movies produced in older time in which the setting of time and place would very much influence the actors and actress as framed by the director in compliance with the costumes and the use of language in early (old) generation.

Such violations of conversational maxims do not hinder communication, even have become a new trend as "wrongly acceptable forms of language use" especially regarding the use of Betawi (Jakarta) dialect. This further confirms that language use is evaluative in nature, changing from one paradigm to another. Therefore, it is possible that such a dialect of Betawi will be used by young people all over Indonesia, especially those watching the movie. This is also supported by the fact that most of the Indonesian movies make use of Betawi dialect instead of the formal Indonesian language.

Language as used in movies tends to be replicated by the audience even though they do not live in the same area as the settings to which movies are assigned. There is such an increasing feeling of prestige when an individual manages to use a language similar to that used by his or her favourite movie stars. Implicatures resulting from violations of conversational maxims, when used repeatedly, will

become “wrongly acceptable” and be considered “a new trade mark” in the use of language with reference to discursive practices in particular communities

Research findings on language have recommended the use of language in good, correct and acceptable ways but in practice it turns out to be otherwise. In other words, the use of language is very much determined by contexts and special registers, and it is all possible that language users, sooner or later, will abandon the use of formal grammar and vocabulary items as compiled in formal dictionaries. Therefore, the study of language shall develop around pragmatic theories as vast as possible to accommodate the changing paradigms in the use of language from time to time. In short, the use of language is never prescriptive but descriptive.

In Act 1 of the short movie *Terlanjur Mencinta*, violation of quality maxim occurs as performed by Fina negatively attributing “...*Bawel loe*”. It is actually due to the presumption that there has been a talk of agreement that Fina has agreed to live with Ra and the telephone conversation is done in a casual and informal situation. This also includes when Fina violates maxim of relevance by cutting off telephone connection due to the arrival of a handsome man and Fina wants to say ‘Hi’. She is pretty sure that Ra will not get mad with Fina’s behaviour as they are close friends.

Fina’s question in Act 2 “*E... rumah ini kan kosong...ngapain loe di sini?*” is probably based on presumption that the house is empty; no body to live in it. Fina wants to know why a handsome man is coming. The man’s arrival in a car gives more presumption that the man belongs to the have so that Fina is eager to know more about him. This is a behavioural phenomenon of a modern woman who has no shame to start introducing herself to a rich and handsome man. Therefore, the man (Bara) acts accordingly to violate conversational maxim of relevance. However, Bara conventionally introduces his name as Bara, and is welcomed by Fina as saying her name “Fina”.

Violation of conversational maxim in Act 3 is based on presumption that there is an obligatory theme of Covid-19 pandemic by not answering Fina’s greeting, but asking for her two hands “*Mana tangan loe*” over which Bara sprays disinfectant. Fina further assures why not take the temperature “*Gak sekalian cek suhu.*” This is meant to participate in the campaign for health protocol for any visitor to the house. Even though this study has no evaluative capacity on the movie, it can be concluded that the movie was well-created to help the government fight against the pandemic.

The awkward and formal action in Act 5 is caused by Fina’s over jealousy on the woman who went in one car with Bara. The conversational maxim is violated by giving gesture to Bara’s permission (question). Fina is eager to love regardless of whatever happens, in line with the movie title *Terlanjur Mencinta* [Already in Love]. In this case, it can be assured that Fina will cancel to live with Ra (Act 1), who is famous for being talkative and Fina does not like living with Ra. Moreover, now, Fina has a handsome and rich neighbour like Bara. This strengthens pre-assumption that Fina will cancel her plan to live with Ra.

Keeping in mind that this short movie is open-ending in nature, it is possible that presumptions change. This happens when the girl in one car with Bara turns to be his girlfriend. Fina breaks her heart and finds it impossible to get healed, so moving to live with Ra is the best way to forget Bara.

III CONCLUSION

The use of Pragmatic Theory (George Yule) to investigate implicatures due to violation of conversational maxims (Grice 1975) as supported in studies (N. G. Lestari & Helmie, 2020; Wahyunianto et al., 2020) which may be found in conversations is still relevant. Likewise, the current study, employing the said theory, managed to explore the implicatures in a short movie entitled *Terlanjur Mencinta* including the interpretation of the hidden meanings in the implicatures through contexts of culture and situation. It is therefore recommended that pragmatic research on implicatures should not be limited to identification and interpretation. It is very much expected that future researchers can formulate the ideal proportion and distribution of implicatures in a text through comparative rhetoric, employing special research instrument.

REFERENCES

- Betti, M. J., & Khalaf, N. S. (2021). A Pragma-Stylistic Study of Implicature in Shakespeare’s Hamlet and Twelfth Night. *International Linguistics Research*, 4(3), p12–p12. <https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v4n3p12>
- Cai, Z. G., Sun, Z., & Zhao, N. (2021). Interlocutor modelling in lexical alignment: The role of linguistic competence. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 121, 104278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2021.104278>

- Isanova, Z. (2021). The Importance of Intercultural Pragmatics In Teaching A Foreign Language. *Philology Matters*, 2021(2), 166–177. <https://doi.org/10.36078/987654499>
- Kurniadi, S. (2021). A Gricean Maxim Analysis in Teaching and Learning Process at Higher Level Education. *Jurnal Inotera*, 6(2), 112–118. <https://doi.org/10.31572/inotera.Vol6.Iss2.2021.ID145>
- Lestari, D., & Firdaus, D. (2021). Flouting Maxim of Quantity in The Characters' dialogues in "Detective Pikachu" Movie. *CALL*, 3(1), 93–104. <https://doi.org/10.15575/call.v3i1.12838>
- Lestari, N. G., & Helmie, J. (2020). An analysis of Flouting Maxims in Conversation Speaking of the Main Character in the Movie of Home Alone 2 "Lost in New York" by John Hughes. *Jurnal JOEPALLT (Journal of English Pedagogy, Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching)*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.35194/jj.v7i1.537>
- Li, S. (2021). Conversational Implicature Instruction as a Pedagogical Strategy for English Majors in a Chinese Context: A Pragmatic-Analysis of Its Effectiveness. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(10), 1279–1287. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1110.16>
- Lodge, W. (2021). 'Complex and confusing': the language demands of school science texts. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, 39(4), 489–505. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2020.1772740>
- Mansyur, M. (2020). Implikatur dan Praanggapan pada Program Debat Terbuka Pasangan Pemimpin Jawa Barat Periode 2018-2023 dengan Tajuk "Debat Publik Kedua Cagub Jawa Barat"(Suatu Kajian Pragmatik). *Diskursus: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia*, 2(01), 49–54.
- Maydolina, S. P., Syofiani, S., & Yetty, M. (2020). *Implikatur pada Percakapan Penjual dan Pembeli di Pasar Raya Padang: Suatu Tinjauan Pragmatik*. UNIVERSITAS BUNG HATTA.
- McConachy, T., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2021). *Teaching and learning second language pragmatics for intercultural understanding* (T. McConachy & A. J. Liddicoat (eds.); 1st ed.). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003094128>
- Meyer, M.-C., & Feiman, R. (2021). Priming reveals similarities and differences between three purported cases of implicature: Some, number and free choice disjunctions. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 120, 104206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2020.104206>
- Nahak, Y., & Bram, B. (2021). Gricean Maxim Violations in a Javanese Song Entitled Sléncó. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 4(3), 307–315. <https://journal.unhas.ac.id/index.php/jish/article/view/15020>
- Olmstead, A. J., Viswanathan, N., Cowan, T., & Yang, K. (2021). Phonetic adaptation in interlocutors with mismatched language backgrounds: A case for a phonetic synergy account. *Journal of Phonetics*, 87, 101054. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2021.101054>
- Pires, F., Masanet, M.-J., & Scolari, C. A. (2021). What are teens doing with YouTube? Practices, uses and metaphors of the most popular audio-visual platform. *Information, Communication & Society*, 24(9), 1175–1191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1672766>
- Qin, T., & van Compernelle, R. A. (2021). Computerized dynamic assessment of implicature comprehension in L2 Chinese. *Language Learning & Technology*, 25(2), 55–74. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/73433>
- Sbisà, M. (2021). Presupposition and implicature: Varieties of implicit meaning in explicitation practices. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 182, 176–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.05.027>
- Seo, W., & Jung, H. (2021). Challenges and opportunities to improve the accessibility of YouTube for people with visual impairments as content creators. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-020-00787-8>
- Terkourafi, M., Haugh, M., & Kádár, D. Z. (2021). Inference and implicature. In D. Z. Haugh, M.; Kádár (Ed.), *Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics* (pp. 30–47). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108954105.004>
- Wahyunianto, D., Djatmika, D., & Purnanto, D. (2020). Grice's Cooperative Principles Violation in The Communication of Children with Autism. *Sosiohumaniora*, 22(1), 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v22i1.24378>
- Yudith, Y., Natsir, M., & Lubis, I. S. (2021). Conversational Implicature in "In The Heart of The Sea" Movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni Dan Budaya*, 5(2), 201–211. <https://doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v5i2.3380>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Terjemahan Jumadi. 2006 (H. G. Widdowson (ed.); Series Edi). Oxford University Press.

Yulianti, Y., & Utomo, A. P. Y. (2020). Analisis Implikatur Percakapan dalam Tuturan Film Laskar Pelangi. *MATAPENA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 3(1), 1–14.

