



A conversational implicature analysis on the *Split* Movie

Belinda Mahira Putriayu, Ernie D. Ayu Imperiani

*English Language and Literature Study Program
Faculty of Language and Literature Education
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*

*Jl. Dr. Setiabudhi No.229, Isola, Kec. Sukasari, Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia
belindamahira@upi.edu, ernie_imperiani@upi.edu*

ABSTRACT

Every conversation made between two parties or more must have arisen from specific contextual matters. Effort has become the case in achieving the wanted contextual rationality from the carried-out conversation which is connected to people's strong will in creating ways to overcome the problem. Movies, as a visual communication tool, have been used many times as a depiction of how real-life conversations are performed in many attempts. Hence, this study, which uses a descriptive qualitative method, aims to investigate the use of maxim violation, maxim opt out, the types of conversational implicature, and their meaning of occurrence in the *Split* (2016) movie. To analyze the data, Grice's (1975) theory on Conversational Implicatures and Yule's (1996) theory on Cooperation and Implicature were used as the main theoretical frameworks. The data were taken from the movie script downloaded from the Scripts.com website while the movie was downloaded from the streaming-service platform, YouTube Movies. This study discovered that the violation of the maxim of manner, opt out of the maxim of quantity and quality, and particularized conversational implicature to be the mostly used ones in the conversations of the *Split* movie's characters. The high occurrence of those implicatures demonstrates its purpose which is to make meaning of the characterization of the characters as their personalities and intentions are revealed. In line with the psychological feature that the movie as the data has, the findings also participate in the idea of people's capability in interpreting the characteristics of others to be easily done.

Keywords: Conversational implicatures; Implicatures; Maxim opt out; Maxim violation

How to cite (in APA style):

Putriayu, B. M., & Imperiani, E. D. A. (2022). A conversational implicature analysis on the *Split* movie. *Passage, 10*(2), 1-10.

INTRODUCTION

The notion of implicature arose from the idea of its involvement within people's attempt to cooperate in communicating. Implicature is the concept of the purposely implied utterances without being said or stated (Allott, 2018) that it is eventually understood that something has to be more than just what it says. To execute the concept, the cooperative principle with its maxims exist as the tool for the people to conduct the wanted conversation. However, Grice (1975) centred this concept into a more-focused interest, conversational implicature. As ongoing conversations to be the main focus, Blome-Tillman (2013) points out the conversational implicature to revolve around the contrast between what is said and conversationally implicated since even though the content of utterances might be the same, they can also be delivered in a differing manner. Generalized and particularized conversational implicature then are both established to be the types of conversational implicature. In the matter of implementing the

implicatures, the *Split* movie have been decided to be the main focus of the present study.

Movies, as one of the various forms of communication, are considered to reflect on people's daily lives. Moreover, movie dialogues may include both indirectness and implicated utterances as the filmmakers' attempt to approach the audience's understanding (Desilla, 2012). The presented study specifies the use of the implicatures within conversations in a movie, specifically *Split* (2016). This movie tells the story of a man with dissociative identity disorder who decides to kidnap 3 girls. These girls will have to escape from the man before his monstrous 24th personality appears. As the movie follows the psychological-thriller genre, the mental health condition of the main character becomes the highlight of the story which leads to the opportunity for this study to observe how the characters communicate with each other. Considering the movie's relation with the psychological issue, many of the stated utterances by the characters are

delivered in an ambiguous way. Therefore, the aims of the presented study are to discover the implemented implicatures of the characters' utterances and their meaning to the movie.

Theoretical framework had also been used in this study to achieve the results. The framework in question is Yule's (1996) theory on Cooperation and Implicature that embraces Grice's (1975) theory on Conversational Implicatures. The beginning of the discussion, based on the corresponding frameworks, leads to the cooperative principle that explains the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner alongside the non-observance of maxims, especially the maxim violation and maxim opt out. The types of the conversational implicature, on the other hand, participated as to take the analysis into a further discussion namely the generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. A focused discussion on these implicatures has a pivotal role to figure out their meaning in the *Split* movie. Several previous studies about the implementation of conversational implicature in a movie were included in this study as well to be the references.

METHOD

This study is descriptive qualitative since it involves data taken from the conversations of the *Split* movie's characters. Creswell and Creswell (2018) claim that qualitative is the research method that relies not only on images, but also texts as the data. In addition, a descriptive summary of the data and particular phenomenon or events are all involved in the descriptive qualitative method of study (Lambert & Lambert, 2012). The issue that was being dealt with in this study corresponds with the maxim violation, maxim opt out, the types of conversational implicature, and the meaning of those implicatures on the selected data source. To be specific, the *Split* (2016) movie directed by M. Night Shyamalan is the data source and that the selected conversations of the movie's characters limited to those included the focused implicatures and best clarified the movie plot. Hence, these issues are in line with the understanding of the explained method especially because the data source came from the chosen movie script which is in the form of text, and the process of the descriptive summary was also conducted. The theory of Conversational Implicature by Grice (1975) and Cooperation and Implicature by Yule (1996) were applied to be the theoretical frameworks of the analysis of the study.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis, this study finds the implementation of both maxims violation and opt out, both types of the conversational implicature, and the characterization of the *Split* (2016) movie's

characters to be the meaning of the discovered implicatures. The characters of Dr. Fletcher, Kevin Wendell Crumb, and Casey Cooke were also found to be the ones out of the other characters that mostly performed the discovered implicatures within their utterances. In this article, the findings will be discussed in 3 sections, starting from the maxim violation and maxim opt out, then the types of conversational implicature, and lastly, the meaning of the discovered implicatures.

Maxim Violation and Maxim Opt Out

The violation of the maxim of manner was found to be the most used maxim violation within the characters of the *Split* movie's conversations. Meanwhile, the opt out of both maxim of quantity and quality had the highest occurrence among the other maxims opt out. The mentioned findings of the two non-observance of maxims are displayed in the table below.

Table 1

Maxim Violation and Opt Out in the Split Movie

No	Non-Observance of Maxims	Findings	Occurrences	
				%
1	Violating Maxim of Quantity		11	13,25%
2	Violating Maxim of Quality		13	15,66%
3	Violating Maxim of Relation		12	14,46%
4	Violating Maxim of Manner		24	28,92%
5	Opting Out Maxim of Quantity		7	8,43%
6	Opting Out Maxim of Quality		7	8,43%
7	Opting Out Maxim of Relation		4	4,82%
8	Opting Out Maxim of Manner		6	7,23%
TOTAL			83	100%

Table 1 shows the total of 83 findings out of all maxims violation and maxims opt out. Violating the maxim of manner holds the highest occurrence among the others with 24 (28,92%) data found while opting out both maxims of quantity and quality have the same amount of 7 (8,43%) data found to be the most used maxim opt out. The following sections will give further detailed discussion of each finding of the discovered maxim violation and maxim opt out.

A. Maxim Violation

Maxim violation happens when the speaker chooses to disobey the rule of the Cooperative Principle. Such act corresponds with how the speaker tends to mislead as the addressee is being unaware of the action. In accordance with the highest occurred maxim violation, violating the maxim of manner is discussed in the following subsection.

Violating Maxim of Manner

The violation of the maxim of manner normally happened when the speaker is being ambiguous or rambling. This is the most occurring category of maxim violation. Below is presented the discovered data within the characters of the *Split* movie's conversations.

The context of the situation: After Dennis finds out that Dr. Fletcher has found the girls that he kidnapped, he tries to explain to her about the reason behind his decision in doing it.

Dennis : **They will never reach their potential. They don't really matter.**
Dr. Fletcher : Listen to me, Dennis. I should've listened better. I should've understood what you're capable of, how powerful you are.
Dennis : **Patricia says your way isn't working. The world will understand now.**
Dr. Fletcher : Dennis, this is an egregious wrong. These young women are suffering. This is a crime. I can't let you keep them here. We've gotta stop this. This identity is monstrous.
Dennis : **I'm really sad you feel this way. Can't you see? He is formed because of your time in this place.**

The above dialogue represents how Dennis is being unclear through his stated utterances to Dr. Fletcher. Through his clarification to Dr. Fletcher as to why he committed such crime, he seems to be unable to make a comprehensible explanation. Then, this issue leads to the idea of him performing the act of **violating the maxim of manner**.

In his attempt to provide an explanation to Dr. Fletcher on his wrongdoings, Dennis comes up with an ambiguous expression. As he states, "**They will never reach their potential. They don't really matter**", Dennis talks about the 'potential' that the girls have and since they could not reach the appropriate degree of the potential in his understanding, Dennis then thinks that they do not 'matter'. He continues his explanation as he ignores Dr. Fletcher's claim on his 'powerful' capability by saying, "**Patricia says your way isn't working. The world will understand now**". In this case, another personality of Kevin is mentioned by him whose name is Patricia and he believes her as she said Dr. Fletcher's method in helping Kevin's condition does not work, but somehow the world will eventually understand his 'purpose' which is supported by his unlawful act. Dennis finishes his clarification by saying, "**I'm really sad you feel this way**" and "**He is formed because of your time in this place**" that appear to be ambiguous expressions as Dennis directly expresses his sadness instead of agreeing with Dr. Fletcher on the illegal act he has done and an unknown personality whom he mentions as 'he' still remains unclear as he does not explain anything about him straightforwardly.

This ambiguity proceeds to be performed by another personality of Kevin, known as the Horde, whom Dennis has previously mentioned to his reference as 'he'. This will be explained in the following discussion of the dialogue.

The context of the situation: In the final scene of the movie, Casey appears to protect herself from Kevin's other personality, the Horde, as she hides in appeared-to-be a cage. In the end, the Horde surprisingly stops his attack on Casey after he finds out that Casey's body is full of scars.

The Horde : **We are glorious! We will no longer be afraid. Only through pain can you achieve your greatness! The impure are the untouched, the unburned, the unslain. Those who have not been torn have no value in themselves and no place in this world! They are asleep!**
Casey Cooke : Fuck!
The Horde : **Your gun cannot hurt me. Can't you see I am not human? Kevin is a man. I am much more.** [The Horde looks at Casey's scars on her body] **You are different from the rest. Your heart is pure! Rejoice! The broken are the more evolved. Rejoice.**

In the above dialogue, the Horde is seen not to make a clear contribution in his interaction with Casey. He **violates the maxim of manner** by not stating directly what he truly wants to declare to her. His behavior leaves Casey in a confusing state as she ended up crying and not knowing what to respond to him.

The statements made by the Horde or Kevin convey some unusual phrases that are rarely found in public conversations. The issue in this interaction is first shown by how the Horde uses the pronoun '**we**' who he refers to himself. This means that the Horde indicates the many personalities or identities in contrast with how the people in general would see Kevin, as the real identity of the body, as a singular person. The Horde continues his statement by explaining to Casey that these personalities are '**glorious**' and fearless that he also claims that only through '**pain**' people can truly achieve the success in life. On the contrary, those who have not been through enough '**pain**' do not deserve to live. The Horde asserts another claim that says he is much '**more**' than a human, but then he seems to be surprised as he sees the scars on Casey's body which he considers it as the opposite of his view in mankind earlier. Knowing from the previous scenes of the movie that show the traumatic past Casey has been through, the Horde views it as how Casey is different from the others. With that being so, she is '**pure**' and '**more evolved**' in which the Horde must celebrate as he expresses it by saying, "**Rejoice**". Through this

analysis, the Horde can be seen to perform several obscure expressions as well as ambiguity.

B. Maxim Opt Out

Opting out a maxim occurs when the speaker blatantly shows their unwillingness to cooperate. The speaker, in most cases, provides reasoning while performing such act. In order to discuss the finding of the most occurred maxim opt out within the conversations of the *Split* movie's characters, the following section will provide discussions for both opting out the maxim of quantity and quality with the data in detail.

Opting Out Maxim of Quantity

In performing this type of maxim opt out, the speaker generally plainly refuse to cooperate with their interlocutors by denying to provide sufficient information. Together with the quality maxim, quantity held the highest occurrence of maxim opt out among the other types of maxims. This section presents the conversations that include the opt out of the maxim of quantity performed by the *Split* movie's characters.

The context of the situation: As Hedwig, one of Kevin's personalities, tries to talk to the girls and tell them something, Casey takes the opportunity to obtain some information from him.

Casey Cooke : Could you help us, Hedwig?
Hedwig : **No, I'm not even supposed to be here. I stole the light from Mr. Dennis, but he'll be back real soon. I can't steal the light for too long or he'll know and get angry.** Etcetera. See you!

The above dialogue presents how Hedwig appears to perform a blatant refusal to cooperate with Casey. In refusing to give Casey the information required by her, Hedwig also provides a plausible reasoning into his denial statement. With this being the case, Hedwig can be considered to **opt out the maxim of quantity**.

The context in this conversation between the characters is that Casey tries to ask Hedwig for help. Hedwig directly refuses her request by telling her that he cannot help her as he is not supposed to be there. Another piece of information is given by him as he says he "**stole the light from Mr. Dennis, but he'll be back real soon**" and that he cannot "**steal the light for too long or he'll know and get angry**". These responses indicate how Hedwig completely denies to cooperate with Casey as Mr. Dennis is the one who is supposed to be there and that Hedwig secretly stole 'the light' from him which in this case presumably mean as how the personalities take turn to control Kevin's body. Seeing the fact that Hedwig refuses and gives more information than is required, he allows himself to participate in the way of **opting out the maxim of quantity** goes.

The data presented below is another example of how Hedwig unwillingly and being overly informative in cooperating with Casey under the same context.

The context of the data: Casey tries to persuade Hedwig, one of Kevin's personalities, to let her and the other girls go.

Casey Cooke : Look at me. We're like your babysitters. We'll let you watch TV and make you a fun dinner. We all need to get out of here. You could show us the way out. We could be gone before anybody gets back, but we have to hurry, Hedwig. We have to hurry and get out of here.

Hedwig : Wait a minute. **It took forever to get this place safe without the nosey bodies that work here finding out. You can't get out of here! I have to blow my nose.**

In the above data, Hedwig tends to deny another request of cooperation made by Casey. As she still tries to persuade him to help her and the girls, Hedwig provides another reasonable rejection. In his intention, Hedwig also expresses himself to be more informative than what is required by Casey.

The context within the presented data is the persuasion given by Casey to Hedwig in order to lure him to help her and the girls. Casey tries to use a more intimate approach as she claims that the girls are able to be Hedwig's babysitters and they would let him have fun as much as he wants to. Apart from such approach, Casey continues to influence Hedwig to quickly show the girls the way out which immediately got rejected by him as he says, "**You can't get out of here!**" as he realizes the reason for that is how long it has taken to create a 'safe' place undoubtedly for the kidnapping "**without the nosey bodies that work here finding out**". However, Hedwig adds extra information, although it can be included as his rejection, that says he has to blow his nose. This finding then shows the statements delivered by Hedwig consist of the act of **opting out the maxim of quantity** as he blatantly shows his denial while provides an extra information to Casey.

Opting Out Maxim of Quality

In performing the opt out of the maxim of quality, the speaker generally plainly refuses to cooperate with their interlocutors by not being honest and not giving enough evidence. The same with the previous maxim, quality held the highest occurrence of maxim opt out among the other types of maxims. Some of the opt out of the maxim of quality performed by the characters of the movie is presented below.

The context of the situation: The girls, especially Claire and Marcia, are arguing about the best way to escape the place. On the other hand, Casey tries to calm herself down to avoid being reckless as she observes the abilities of the kidnapper.

Claire Benoit : We're not getting out of here. You're saying that you're not gonna fight with everything in you? You know the only chance... The only chance we have is if all three of us go crazy on this guy. We have to hurry.

Marcia : We need you, Casey. Claire's smart. Let's listen to her. I'll do it if you're gonna do it, too. We can win.

Casey Cooke : **He'll hurt us. No. Shut up. Both of you.**

The data above points out the act of **opting out the maxim of quality** done by Casey as she does not give a proper response to both Claire and Marcia. Claire and Marcia expect Casey to have the same thinking as them. Unfortunately, Casey denies to contribute in the conversation by blatantly expressing it and stating a statement with a lack of evidence.

In the given context above, Casey expresses her different thoughts from Claire and Marcia. Claire's statements indicate her intention to get Casey to be thinking and/or doing the same kind of act she's currently planning out and Marcia takes the position as the one who supports the claims made by her. On the contrary, Casey disproves them by refusing as well as silencing them and includes a statement saying, "**He'll hurt us**" which in fact none of them know if that eventually will ever happen yet. Based on this discussion, the claims made by Casey alongside with not enough evidence provided is categorized to be the act of **opting out the maxim of quality**.

The dialogue or conversation below is another data that can also be considered to be the act of opting out the maxim of quality.

The context of the situation: One of Kevin's personalities, Barry, decides to visit his psychologist, Dr. Fletcher. As Dr. Fletcher thinks there is something wrong with Barry since he sent her many emails saying he needs to see her, he tries to deny it.

Dr. Fletcher : May I talk to one of them (other personalities), please?

Barry : **That can't happen. I... I told them that I wanted to spend the session with you today.**

In the conversation above, Barry shows his uncooperativeness with Dr. Fletcher on purpose. The blatant uncooperative attitude is shown through another statement delivered by him that does not provide enough evidence. Dr. Fletcher as Hedwig's interlocutor expects a response from him that is supposed to be in the same path as her.

As he is shown to avoid cooperating with Dr. Fletcher, Barry adds an additional information that is considered to violate the maxim of quality. Barry

states that Dr. Fletcher is not allowed to talk to another personalities which he relates to an excuse that says, "**I... I told them that I wanted to spend the session with you today**". The refusal that Barry did certainly can be identified as the act of opt out as he also provides a doubtful reason with no proof which can be seen to support his claim on telling the other personalities about the session with Dr. Fletcher. With the presented issue being the case, Barry is identified to perform **the opt out of the maxim of quality**.

Types of Conversational Implicature

The analysis of the study found the two types of conversational implicature namely generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. The two types in concern are both shown in the utterances stated by the characters of the *Split* movie. The found data presented in the conversations of the characters can be seen in the table below.

Table 2

Types of Conversational Implicature in the Split Movie

No	Types of Conversational Implicature	Findings	
		Occurrences	%
1	Generalized Conversational Implicature	6	15%
2	Particularized Conversational Implicature	35	87,5%
TOTAL		83	100%

Table 2 indicates that there are 40 data in total for the two types of conversational implicature, generalized and particularized found in the conversations made by the characters of the *Split* movie. Particularized conversational implicature ended up to be the one that made the higher appearance than the other one as there are 34 (85%) data found. Further detailed elaboration of the analysis, particularly of the particularized conversational implicature as the most occurring type of conversational implicature, is presented in the following section.

Particularized Conversational Implicature

In contrast to the generalized conversational implicature, particularized conversational implicature is normally performed by the speaker when the context of conversation they are currently engaged in require a special background knowledge. In the data of this study, this type was found to be implemented most often by the characters of the *Split* movie. That is why this section will include a profound discussion of this type of conversational implicature.

The context of the situation: After finding out that the kidnapper suffers from Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID), Casey tries to persuade and trick his other identity, Hedwig, who is child-like to free her and the other two girls.

Casey Cooke : This guy ... is coming for you.
Hedwig : You're a big fibber.
Casey Cooke : I never lie, Hedwig.
Hedwig : **But Mr. Dennis, he said that he followed those two girls for four days and that he knew that they were the ones that he would want.**

In the dialogue above, Hedwig can be seen using a specific contextual matter within his utterance. Hedwig intends to deny the utterances stated by Casey as she manages to trick him to escape herself and the girls after knowing the personality that the man shows at the moment is a child. Through his response to Casey's statements, Hedwig mentions his other personality named Dennis that seems to confirm the girls' assumption that he is indeed a different personality of the man from the previous one that Casey and the girls have faced.

Hedwig tends to show his denial towards Casey's words as she tries to lure him to let her and the girls go. In his defense, he includes Mr. Dennis into his statement that says, "**But Mr. Dennis, he said that he followed those two girls for four days and that he knew that they were the ones that he would want**" and it points out several specific hidden meanings. By mentioning the name Dennis, Hedwig unconsciously giving information to the girls on the name of the kidnapper although seeing from his look, he is the kidnapper himself. Hedwig also uses the English honorific, **Mr.** (mister), while referring to Dennis that implies him being younger than Dennis in the matter of age and Dennis holds the higher position. Dennis' action has been mentioned by Hedwig as well that he has been stalking the two girls for days to consider their worthiness to Dennis' liking. The utterance has made another questionable expression from how Hedwig says that there are only two out of the three kidnapped girls that Dennis stalked. The topic of kidnapping the girls then followed by the following statement of Hedwig's that, again, expresses his denial on Casey's utterances:

Casey Cooke : ... we have to hurry, Hedwig. We have to hurry and get out of here.
Hedwig : Wait a minute. **It took forever to get this place safe without the nosey bodies that work here finding out.** You can't get out of here! I have to blow my nose.

The presented utterance stated by Hedwig indicates another fact related to the kidnapping. As

someone who is in fact the same person as the kidnapper, Hedwig's statement is considered to be reckless. Similar to his previous action, he seems to unconsciously tells the girls that the place, specifically the room they are in, is designed specifically for this illegal act done by the man or kidnapper by stating, "**It took forever to get this place safe...**". The statement then follows by, "**...without the nosey bodies that work here finding out**" that indicates the possibility of them at a public place from the highlighted information that says "**nosey bodies that work here**" which means that the place could be more or less the same to an office. This honesty of Hedwig then indicates his distinct personality from the previous one, Dennis, as he expresses the character of a child which is generally incautious.

In this case, it is certain that particular context as realized in the idea of **particularized conversational implicature** is vital in order to understand the issue in the above data. Without knowing the context of the inferences made by Hedwig, the audience or listeners might experience misunderstanding on the point of the story, such as the fact that Hedwig and Dennis are two different people as well as how Dennis or the kidnapper's plan works in kidnapping the girls. The issue in hand can be fully understood when the audience have comprehended that Hedwig and Dennis are surprisingly the same person by looking at his appearance and that the man suffers from Dissociative Identity Disorder.

The data presented below is another example of the findings under this particular type of conversational implicature which this time is performed by Dr. Fletcher, Kevin's psychologist.

The context of the situation: The man's other personality, Barry, is on a scheduled visit to his psychologist, Dr. Fletcher. However, Dr. Fletcher is unsure of the personality that she is talking to is truly Barry.

Barry : Dr. Fletcher, it's Barry.
Karen Fletcher : It doesn't seem like Barry. Barry is an extroverted leader.
Barry : Yes, I am.
Karen Fletcher : **I'm gonna take a professional guess based on the description of all 23 identities that live in Kevin's body, that I've gotten from Barry. I think I'm talking to Dennis. But he's been banned from the light because, among other reasons, he has a proclivity to watch young girls dance naked, which he himself knows is wrong and has fought against with little success. I'm encouraged we can finally meet. And I've guessed this because you've adjusted the chocolate dish twice since you came in here and I understand you have OCD.**

The utterances stated by Dr. Fletcher in the above data appears to include particularized knowledge in order to understand the meaning. Her statements seem to be about her reasonings of her uncertainty towards Barry. Not only Dr. Fletcher shows her confrontation on him, but she also expresses her analysis on the issue.

In her disagreement with Barry, Dr. Fletcher makes some statements based on her knowledge of Barry's personalities. She started her confrontation by saying, **"I'm gonna take a professional guess based on the description of all 23 identities that live in Kevin's body, that I've gotten from Barry"** and with the highlight of the words **"professional guess"** right before she mentions the disease that Kevin has, it is inferred that even though her statement is based on her speculation, she is still certain on delivering it to her interlocutor since she is someone with a broad knowledge in the matter of psychological condition, a psychologist. She continues to mention the name **'Kevin'** as she refers to one specific person in relation with the 23 identities that she and Barry have talked about earlier. She then acknowledges the personality of **'Dennis'** in detail as she mentions his deviant and unusual behavior. The subject that Dr. Fletcher addresses here shows that there is an established relationship between her and Kevin, Dennis or Barry. With her specialist-in-psychology background, she has the chance to identify the man's, here refers to Kevin as his real name, mannerisms after many talks that presumably have been done between them. This analysis is concluded for the utterances made by Dr. Fletcher to be categorized as **particularized conversational implicature**.

The dialogue or conversation below is another data that can also be considered to be the particularized conversational implicature.

The context of the situation: While attempting to leave the place, Casey finds Dr. Fletcher's dead body and a paper with "Kevin Wendell Crumb" written on it. The man/Kevin's other personality, the Horde, surprisingly is in the room she is in too. Casey then attempts to say the written name out loud to the man.

Casey Cooke: **"Kevin Wendell Crumb." Kevin Wendell Crumb? Kevin Wendell Crumb. Kevin Wendell Crumb!**

In this data, the statement made by Casey refers to the name of a man in particular, Kevin Wendell Crumb. The specification of someone's name who is clearly written on the paper found by Casey creates inferences that requires special knowledge in order to make meaning out of it. The process of understanding the statement can be seen by how Casey keeps saying the name on repeat.

The name written on the paper is seen to be written by Dr. Fletcher in the previous scene. This leads to the ability of the audience to comprehend what the name **"Kevin Wendell Crumb"** truly means by knowing Dr. Fletcher's relationship with the kidnapper, Kevin himself, who suffers from DID. In the matter of the connection between the characters, Casey had never interacted with Dr. Fletcher, but then she manages to understand the message from how it seems to be specified to one man which in this case corresponds with the only existing man in the place, the kidnapper or Kevin. The utterance then is further clarified by the following scene of a very strict mother who treats her own child abusively: **"The mother: Kevin Wendell Crumb. Kevin Wendell Crumb. You made a mess. Come out here. Kevin Wendell Crumb! You made a mess! Get out here!"**

The presented scene presents the flashback of Kevin's childhood. It is shown that his mother with a metal-like object on her hand screams at him who hides under the bed. The statement made by his mother conveyed Kevin's unharmonious life as her anger towards the mess made by him and that she wants him to come to her. It is unclear what she is going to do to him, but her gestures indicate an unpleasant act is about to happen. All these events then lead to the idea of the above data to be categorized as the **particularized conversational implicature** which can be drawn from the fact that the utterances contain particular recognized inferences that are relevant to other scene and/or character of the movie.

The Meaning of the Discovered Non-Observance of Maxims and Conversational Implicatures

This section is expected to answer the last research question which is to describe the meaning of the discovered non-observance of maxims and conversational implicatures in the *Split* movie. Referring to the findings that have been elaborated in the previous sections, violating the maxim of manner and opting out both maxims of quantity and quality as well as the particularized conversational implicature were found to be performed the most by the characters. In performing the implicatures, the character of Dr. Fletcher, Kevin Wendell Crumb, and Casey Cooke were found to be the ones who mostly did it compared to the other characters.

The implementation of the implicatures within the performed conversations of the *Split* movie's characters has been discovered by the researcher to define the real intention of the movie. As what have been emphasized by MasterClass (2021), movies, especially the psychological-theme ones, revolve around the minds and behaviour. In this case, the statement is in line with the findings of the study which refers to the characterization of the *Split* movie's characters, especially how their minds work

and behaviourism. The character of Dr. Fletcher, Kevin Wendell Crumb, and Casey Cooke have all shown their intentions through their stated utterances leading to a description of their personalities or what their characters are like and their way of thinking. Dr. Fletcher, on the one hand, has shown her character as a psychologist to be rational and knowledgeable as she is a highly educated person in relation to the degree and occupation she has. On the contrary, Kevin, tends to show his unreliable personality and bizarre mentality as he is also someone who is diagnosed with the Dissociative Identity Disorder. Meanwhile the character of Casey Cooke tends to be more of a strategic person among the other girls in her surroundings as she had grown to be such a person by her father and her dark past related to her uncle's deviant behaviour.

In a more specific context of the characters' intentions, the use of the violation of the maxim of manner, the opt out of the maxim of quantity and quality, and the particularized conversational implicature are all involved to be the used technique for the characters to be able to achieve the matter in question. In the matter of violating the maxim of manner and opting out the maxim of quantity as well as quality, Kevin Wendell Crumb takes the most part in this as he, alongside with his multiple personalities, tends to mislead his interlocutors by not being clear or ambiguous in expressing his desire. Casey Cooke was also found to partake in both violating and opting out as she wants to succeed in escaping Kevin's kidnapping by using several expressions that indicate a blatant denial to cooperate, providing more or less information, and lies. Playing out as the role of a psychologist, particularly as Kevin's, Dr. Fletcher was found to implement the particularized conversational implicature in most of her utterances. Through the performed action, Dr. Fletcher shows her intention in wanting to help Kevin, as one of her patients, by using her knowledge in psychology to understand Kevin's condition which certainly require many of psychology-related topics that the listener or audience must have profound knowledge in relation to such issue.

Through this understanding of the characterization, the meaning of the used implicatures can be concluded, namely that it provides people the ability to interpret others' characteristics with ease. After having an in-depth discussion on what the discovered non-observance of maxims and conversational implicatures mean, the next section presents the discussion of this chapter.

CONCLUSION

The presented investigation of the maxim violation and opt out with the types of conversational

implicature as well as their meaning on the *Split* movie revealed that implicatures play a pivotal role in conveying the speaker's goals in communicating. The data of this study which were analyzed using Grice's (1975) and Yule's (1996) theory on conversational implicature had demonstrated that the *Split* movie's characters mislead the conversations through the expression of obscurity, being uncooperative by not giving the appropriate information followed with the expression of lies, include their special knowledge on particular contexts, and that these discovered implicatures indicated the characterization of the movie's characters. To be the ones that dominantly use the implicatures, the characters named Dr. Fletcher, Kevin Wendell Crumb, and Casey Cooke were figured to be the doers. Therefore, it is concluded that, as what has also been stated in the previous chapter, the use of the implicatures in particular gives the opportunity for people to be able to convey (identify?) the characteristic of a person.

In addition, the reason for the wide usage of violating the maxim of manner and opting out the maxim of quantity and quality can be clarified from its connection with the psychology-related topic of the movie. Each of the characters' various personal intentions is emphasized through their visible mental behavior such as deliberately misleading their interlocutors through vague expression and directly refusing to partake in the cooperation by giving less or more information followed by saying statements with insufficient evidence. Besides, the data also shows the particularized conversational implicature to be more widely used by the characters than the generalized one. The cause of this occurrence is in line with each of the characters' personal relationship with others that leads to the possibility of the conversations to take place in certain contexts. In facing such issue, the listener or the audience will need to have a thorough understanding to make meaning out of each of the contexts. In relevance to the discovery, it can be seen how much of a crucial aspect for the implicatures to be implemented in the conversations to understand the characterization of the characters from the utterances they stated in the movie.

Based on the above findings, it had been revealed that there are consequences that can be drawn from disobeying the maxims and the lack of knowledge in the particular contexts of the utterances as the performer's characteristic to their way of thinking can be easily interpreted. Besides, false impression and even uncertainty might appear from facing such cases of implicatures. This is also supported by Yule (1996) that in a conversation the sense of cooperation is crucial as there should not be any attempt to confuse, deceive or withhold relevant information among the speakers.

REFERENCES

- Allott, N. (2018). Conversational implicature. In M. Aronoff, *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Amrullah, L. (2015). Implicature in the study of pragmatics. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia*, 7(1), 57 – 63.
<https://doi.org/10.21274/ls.v7i1.1723>
- Birner, B. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication.
- Blome-Tillman, M. (2013). Conversational implicatures (and how to spot them). *Philosophy Compass*, 8(2), 170–185.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12003>
- Butar Butar, I. S. P. U. & Natsir, M. (2016). An analysis of conversational implicature in the Interview movie. *Linguistica*, 5(2).
<https://doi.org/10.24114/jalu.v5i2.6429>
- Creswell J. & Creswell D. (2018). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Davies, B. L. (2007). Grice's cooperative principle: Meaning and rationality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2308–2331.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.09.002>
- Davis, W. (2019). Implicature. In E. N. Zalta (Fall 2019 ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/implicature/>
- Desilla, L. (2012). Implicatures in film: Construal and functions in Bridget Jones romantic comedies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(1), 30–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.10.002>
- Fatmawati N. & Nahdia N. (2017). The implicature in the play Zootopia. *Dinamika Bahasa Dan Budaya*, 12(1), 47-52.
<https://www.unisbank.ac.id/ojs/index.php/fbib/article/view/4742>
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan, *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing pragmatics* (3rd ed.). Hodder Arnold Publication.
- Hedberg, N. (2012). *Grice: The pragmatics of inference* [PowerPoint slide]. Simon Fraser University.
http://www.sfu.ca/~hedberg/Pragmatics_Grice.pdf
- Khairunas, S., Sidauruk J., Pratama R. M. D., & Omega T. (2020). Conversational implicature in Beauty and Beast movie directed by Bill Condon. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.31294/w.v12i1>
- Knight, M. (2016). The importance of conversation. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 79(3), 267–269.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2329490616665823>
- Kroeger, P. R. (2018). *Analyzing meaning: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Language Science Press.
- Lambert, C. & Lambert, V. (2012). Qualitative descriptive research: An acceptable design. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research*, 16(4), 255-256. <https://he02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/PRIJNR/article/view/5805>
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Listiani. (2011). Analysis of conversational implicature in Pariah movie Episode of Smallville serial movie. *AKTIF*, 16(1). <http://jurnalnasional.ump.ac.id/index.php/aktif/article/view/180>
- Lubis I. S., Natsir M., & Yudith. (2021). Conversational implicature in In the Heart of the Sea Movie. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*, 5(2), 201–211.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v5i2.3380>
- MasterClass. (2021). *How to write a psychological thriller*. Retrieved July, 16, from <https://www.masterclass.com/articles/how-to-write-a-psychological-thriller#what-is-a-psychological-thriller>
- Mohammed, B. & Musa, R. (2022). The role of conversational implicature in daily conversations – What matters, content or context? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(5), 886–893.
<https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1205.08>
- Muvida, A. N. (2015). *The conversational implicature that is used by the three main characters in Hotel Transylvania movie* [Bachelor's thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga]. <http://digilib.uin-suka.ac.id/id/eprint/16523>
- Noertjahjo, E., Arifin M., & Ariani S. (2017). Analysis of flouting and violating towards maxim of quality in My Sister's Keeper novel. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 1(3), 193 – 206.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v1i3.671>
- Nurhidayah, Yassi A. H., & Sukamawaty. (2021). The types of conversational implicature in “Gifted” movie. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v4i4.18369>
- Prastyaningsih E. & Harida R. (2021). The analysis of conversational implicature in New Moon movie. *Saliencie Journal*, 1(2), 61–69.

- <https://jurnal.lppmstkipponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Salience/article/view/120>
- Putri, M. N. (2020). *The analysis of conversational implicature in "Midnight Sun" movie*. [Bachelor's thesis Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel].
<http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/id/eprint/42620>
- Rhamadani, S. N. F., Arifin M. B., & Setyowati R. (2022). The study of conversational implicature in A Star is Born movie. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*, 6(2), 333–347.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v6i2.5418>
- Richards, J. (1980). Conversation. *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.*, 14(4), 413–432.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3586231>
- Saul, J. (2005). Conversational implicature. In *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Encyclopedia.com.
<https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/conversational-implicature>
- Sigalingging, H. N. E. & Sinaga, L. S. M. (2014). Conversational implicature in Inception movie dialogue. *Linguistica*, 3(2).
<https://doi.org/10.24114/jalu.v3i2.1226>
- Smith, D. (2013, October 18). *The (big) difference between conversation and communication*. Grand Rapids Business Journal.
<https://grbj.com/opinion/the-big-difference-between-conversation-and-communication/>
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (2002). Pragmatics, modularity, and mind-reading. *Mind and Language*, 17, 3 – 23.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-0017.00186>
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.
- University of Colorado Boulder. (n.d.). *Gricean maxims of conversation*. Retrieved June 4, 2022, from
<http://lsa.colorado.edu/summarize/chapter10/section4.html#:~:text=Violations%20of%20the%20maxims%20produce,less%20informative%20than%20is%20required.>
- Williamson, K., Given, L. & Scifleet, P. (2018). Qualitative data analysis. *Research Methods: Information, Systems, and Contexts* (2nd ed., pp. 453 – 476).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102220-7.00019-4>
- Youri. (2008). *Conversational implicatures*. Boston University.
https://www.bu.edu/linguistics/UG/course/lx502/_docs/lx502-implicatures.pdf
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.