

## Implicature of Paper Town Script by John Green's Movie

Muhammad Said Abdulwahid<sup>1</sup>✉, Rijalul Afkar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Departement of English Literature, Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey.*

<sup>2</sup> *National Land Agency, Aceh Tamiang Regency, Aceh, Indonesia.*

✉ email: muhammadabdulwahid@stu.aydin.edu.tr

### Received:

19 May  
2023

### Revised:

27 June  
2023

### Accepted:

30 June  
2023

### ABSTRACT

Implicature is the study of how to understand the speaker's meaning which is stated indirectly. This study deals with conversational implicature found Paper Towns movie script in John Green's movie. The objectives of the study are to analyse the types of implicature used in the debate and to explain the ways of performing implicature used by the characters. The qualitative research was used in this research. Grice's conversational implicature (1975) was applied in analysing the data. The result showed that there were two types of conversational implicature used by the characters, namely: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. There were 4 generalized conversational implicature and 16 particularized conversational implicature. It was found four violations of maxims namely maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner, and maxim of relevance. Margo mostly violated relevance maxim. Through the implicatures the characters tried to convince the hearers, hide some information, keep a secret, express feeling and reject invitation.

**Keywords:** Conversational Implicature, Maxim, Violation, Paper Towns

---

## INTRODUCTION

Human is a social life that communicates and interacts by using language. As a tool of communication, language plays a very essential role in conversation to convey the meaning, influence the listeners, or tell the information. To get communication achieves successfully, the listener and the speaker should be cooperative and clear in delivering the information. In conversation, sometimes the listener misunderstands what the speaker says and tries to assume what the speaker means. This can occur if the speaker does not say clearly or directly what he/she means. When the meaning is not directly stated by the speaker, it means he/she implies the meaning.

Ani, F. (2018) While having the conversation, the speaker is not just sharing the information, but there is another meaning which provides implicit information. Since the implicit information is not clearly understood, there are many perspectives will appear in people's minds. It is an additional meaning called implicature. Grice (1975) as the first person who introduces the term of implicature gives the notion of a conversational implicature as the theory of speaker meaning. He distinguishes two different sorts of implicature: conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas (1995) Conventional implicature ignores the context of the utterance, while conversational implicature conveys what is implied by the speaker

according to the context of the utterance. Instead, the implicatures are computed as a relation between what is said and what could have been said based on general principles of cooperation between participants in a conversation.

Mey (1993) stated that a conversational implicature is something which is implied in conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use. While Leech (1983) assumed that conversational implicature is the directness language which is modified in politeness rather than to what is the speaker's actually said.

Cooperative principle which is mainly attributed to Grice (2001) presents the cooperative principle in the following terms: "Make your conversation contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." Hence Grice proposed four conversational implicature known as conversational maxims to explain the link between utterances and what was understood from them in order. The four maxims are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner and maxim of relevance.

Gazdar, G. (1979) However, people sometimes are not always telling truth and may not observe the maxims. Every conversation may contain various purposes of the speaker. These purposes can be good or bad from both the speaker and the listener. Thomas said that people may fail to observe a maxim because, for example, they are incapable in speaking clearly, or because they deliberately choose to lie. On the other hand, they manage to convey their real intention by saying something which is quite different from the meanings of their words.

They have some reasons to "violate" their utterances that cause them uncooperative. According to Peccei, R. D. (1999) violation is quiet in the sense that is certain at the time of the utterance that the speaker has deliberately lied, supplied insufficient information or been ambiguous, irrelevant or hard to understand. Cook, G. (1989) stated that there are five purposes that can be achieved by violated maxims, namely: to create hyperbole and irony, to change the topic, to keep secret and to create humor.

The movie script is chosen as the source of the data because there are some uniqueness in their utterances found in the movie. First, its conversation contains figurative language. Second, the speaker uses random capitalization which aimed to express the personal character. Therefore, based on the phenomenon explained above, this study investigated the implicature in the Paper Towns movie script written by John Green. It is expected to analyses the types of implicature found in the movie and explain the ways of performing conversational implicature used by the characters in the movie. Based on the background of the study above, the researcher concerned a study about violation maxims found in Paper Town. This study investigated the implicature in the Paper Towns movie script written by John Green. It is expected to analyses the types of implicatures found in the movie and explain the ways of performing conversational implicature used by the characters in the movie.

## METHOD

This research can be categorized as qualitative descriptive research. Adha and Astri (2020) Qualitative descriptive research generates descriptive data, speech or words, and behavior that the subject can observe. Qualitative research methods prefer to use in-depth analysis techniques, which is to examine a problem one by one, from the case by case. The purpose of this qualitative method is not a generalization but an in-depth understanding of a problem.

Bodgan & Biklen (1982) stated that qualitative research is descriptive. Qualitative means to find out how theory works in different phenomena whose data collected are in the form of words rather than numbers and the researcher described why the phenomena happens. Descriptive method simply described what data shown or what was going on by counting the percentage what was set source of the data.

Researchers typically use descriptive qualitative methods to collect qualitative and detailed data explanations. This method should be planned in order to obtain any data required by the researcher. The data has an important section because the researchers will begin to analyze any possible answers based on the problem that has been formulated using this data Jimmi, Khairunas, and Yulianto (2022).

In order to identify the problem, the researcher used the method to collect data by observation and note taking technique Pubas and H. Hilman (2022). The data is collected through several steps or stages; Downloading the Paper Towns movie from You Tube, Transcribing the Paper Towns movie into written text (script), Reading the Paper Towns text carefully and writing down the entire sentences in which belong to implicature and maxims and find out the implicature and maxims dialogue.

According to Nawawi (1992) descriptive method is the way of solving the research problem by describing the situation and condition of investigated object as the way they are (fact finding) that actual in the present. Hasbalnikistan, Mahriza, and Muslem (2020) the qualitative approach is the approach used in an object to see the object of research as naturally as possible, as it is, and thoroughly. The data were collected by applying qualitative content analysis. In Hanafiah (2016) Cohen, Manim and Marrison argue that qualitative content is the process of summarizing and reporting written data – the main contents of data and their messages.

According to the definition provided above, as a result, the researcher intended to carefully examine the research subjects using qualitative research methods in order to determine the implicature in conversational and co-operative principle in the Paper Towns movie script.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The ways of performing implicature are divided into four categories namely by violation of quantity maxim, violation of quality maxim, violation of manner maxim, and violation of relevance maxim.

The researcher found that the four violation maxims were found during the conversation. Those can be find in the convesation among characters. From 20 utterances consisted conversational implicature, they were found six violation of

quantity maxim, one violation of quality maxim, five violation of manner maxim, and eight violation of relevance maxim. For further explanation, those were shown below:

### 1. Violation of Quantity Maxim

The process of violation quantity maxim found in Radar's utterance while the question is being asked by Ben. The process can be seen below:

Ben: Radar, what up with that?

Radar: *You know very well "what up with that"*

Quentin: we just like to hear you say it. (Page 5)

In answering the question comes from Ben, radar violates quantity maxim as he provides less information by repeating the previous statement *You know very well what up with that*. The given contribution is not informative.

Another process of violation quantity maxim from Margo's utterance can be seen below:

Quentin: Why can't you use your car?

Margo : *My parents locked the keys in the safebeneath their bed.And while I'm sureI could go in there and crack the combo, it just so happens that Myrna Mountweazel'sin thereand that goddamn dogdespises me.* (Page 7)

The given response by Margo is violation of quantity maxim. She gives too much information which is not related to the question. She adds more information about Myrna Mantiwearel who has spied on her. According to Grice's notion, gives your contribution as informative as required. Her contribution is not match to the concept of quantity maxim.

The process of violation quantity maxim can be seen from Quentin's utterance as follow:

Man: Who's the kid?

Margo: It's Q.

Quentin: *Me? I'm 6 months older than her.* (Page 13)

In the dialogue above, Quentin answers the question by providing too much information. Basicallly, the question is not for him but he adds more explanation about who he is. He *I'm 6 months older than her*. Therefore, the way he conveys the information as violation of maxim quantity.

### 2. Violation of Quantity Maxim

There is only one utterance that violates quality maxim. The violation can be seen in the script below:

Margo: You are not in love with me.

Quentin: Don't say that.

Margo: You don't even know me.

Quentin : Yeah, I do. Don't say that I don't.

Margo: I don't even know me. Q, I've no idea who I am. What do you think I'm here?  
(Page 47)

In responding to the statement from Quentin, Margo violates maxim of quality as she conveys information with lack of evidence by using words 'I don't even know me' and 'I've no ideas' which describes her hopeless. She herself does not know what should she do, what kind of life she has and people that she must share the problems with. It can be seen that Margo does not trust anyone even herself. In this case, Margo tries to convince Quentin about who the real she is.

### 3. Violation of Manner Maxim

There are five utterances which violate maxim manner. They are as follow:

Ben : I'd feed her grapes, take her to Paris. Treat her like the princess she is. What, is that wrong?

Radar : It's Weird!

Quentin : It's always weird. (Page 4)

Based on Radar's and Quentin's answer, they give the same response by saying weird. The word weird is ambiguous and obscure. There is more than one meaning drawn in listener's mind. It may be negative or positive thought. Therefore, the given response by Radar and Quentin can be classified as violation of manner maxim.

Another process of violation manner maxim from Radar's utterance can be seen below:

Ben: I Wanna ride bikes with her

Radar : What? (Page 4)

In responding to the statement from Ben, Radar gives a strong question by saying what?. In this situation, the word what? has more than one meaning to interpret this response. It can be negative or positive question. Since the given information is ambiguous, his utterance can be classified as violation of manner maxim.

The process of violation manner maxim from Margo's utterance found in the script below:

Quentin : So, then you came here?

Margo: *A paper town for a paper girl. Not a lot to do, but it's a great place to read and think.* (Page 48)

To analyze the violation that occur in the dialogue, the researcher selects Margo's utterance. She says *a paper town for a paper girl. Not a lot to do, but it's a great place to read and to think.* The phrases *paper town* and *paper girl* are ambiguous. There are many assumptions that will appear on listener's mind. Since the contribution is obscure, she violates the concept of maxim manner.

The process of violation manner maxim found in Cashier's utterance when Quentin buys all the materials with Margo in supermarket. The process of violation can be seen below:

Quentin: It's not as weird as it looks.

Cashier: *still weird!* (Page 9)

The violation of manner maxim is found in cashier's utterance. The given response is obscure. She said *still weird!*. That contribution is difficult to understand because it has more than one meaning. There are many assumptions appeared on people's mind. It may be negative or positive thought.

The last process of violation found in the dialogue from Radar's and Quentin's utterance below:

Ben: Gives her grapes, takes to Paris, treats her like a princess, is that wrong?

Radar : *Weird!*

Quentin: *That's always weird* (Page 4)

In the dialogue above, Radar's and Quentin's response are ambiguous. The word weird makes the situation becoming quiet. It sounds like a strong command to wake Ben up from his bad thought about Quentin's mother. Ben wants to convince them how beautiful Quentin's mother and he adores her much.

#### 4. Violation of Relevance Maxim

There are eight utterances which violate maxim relevance. They are as follow:

Quentin: How do you know all this?

Margo : I'm doing an investigation, are you in?

Quentin: Sure!

Margo: Great, come one!

Quentin: Wait, what? (Page 2)

The violation of relevance maxim is found in Quentin's utterance. His contribution is not relevant with the previous statement. When Margo invites him to do an investigation, Quentin does not approve or ignore it. He looks surprised and raises a question to Margo by saying Wait, what?. Quentin broke the concept of relevance maxim.

Another process of violation relevance maxim from Radar's utterance in the dialogue below:

Ben : It's your senior prom.

Radar : I don't understand! (Page 4)

In responding the first statement from Ben, Radar violates relevance maxim as he conveys information unmatched with the topic talk about. It can be seen from his

utterance I don't understand. What is being discussed is not matched with the expected response. He provides irrelevant response.

Another process of violation relevance maxim from Radar's utterance can be seen below:

Quentin: Radar, has she been to your house yet? Oh, yeah. Has your girlfriend come to your house yet?

Radar : Stop! (Page 5)

From the utterance above, the answer given by Radar is not relevant with the context. The possibility answer that will be said is yes or no, but he does not say that. He tries to hide something from his friends. The utterance broke the concept of relevance maxim.

Another process of violation relevance maxim from Ruthie's utterance can be seen as follow:

Quentin: Would it be cool if we went up to Margo's room for a sec?

Ruthie:Why? (Page 19)

The response that Ruthie gave is not matched with the question being asked. She consciously does not answer the question and gives a question back to Quentin by saying why?. Therefore, she violates maxim of relevance.

Another process of violation relevance maxim from Quentin's utterance can be seen below:

Margo: I can't believe you're here. How are you?

Quentin: Wait, what? What do you mean you can't believe I'm here? I'm just a little surprised. (Page 46)

From the utterance above, Quentin provides irrelevant response by questioning Margo back. In this situation, Margo wants to know his condition but he asks another question again to Margo. The utterance from Quentin is not relevant with the rule of Grice. The process is violation of relevance maxim.

Another process of violation relevance maxim from Margo's utterance can be seen in the script below:

Quentin: wait, what did you think?

Margo: Quentin, what are you are doing here?

Quentin: I'm in love with you. (Page 46)

From the utterance above, Question does not provide relevant answer. He should answer the question from Margo and question her back then. Generally, question should be responded by giving an answer. Based on the utterance, the process occurred is violation of relevance maxim.

Another process of violation relevance maxim from Margo's utterance can be seen in the dialogue below:

Quentin: Why are you here?

Margo: Can I buy you a drink? (Page 47)

The response from Margo is not relevant with question being asked. Margo violates maxim relevance as she conveys unmatched information. The question from Quentin should be answered with because not a question again. Therefore, the process above is violation relevance maxim.

The process of violation relevance maxim from Quentin's utterance in the dialogue below:

Margo: Quentin, come on!

Quentin: I'm in love with you, since we were kids! And I never stop loving you every single day. (Page 47)

In the conversation above, Quentin's contribution is not relevant with the context. When Margo wants everything be normal, but Quentin keeps conveying his feeling to her with hope she understands. In this situation, Quentin just wants to convince Margo that he really loves her at the first sight they met.

After analyzing the data deliberately, there are some findings found. The findings of the research are described below:

1. The reasons of using implicature due to violating the conversational maxim in the dialogue is the characters want to convince the hearers, hide some information, keep a secret, express feeling and reject invitation.
2. It was found four violations of maxims namely maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner, and maxim of relevance. Margo mostly violated relevance maxim.
3. There are 16 utterances including particularized conversational implicature in movie script, and 4 utterances including generalized conversational implicature which found in the script.

## CONCLUSION

After deliberately analyzing the data, the researcher finally concludes statements as follows: The first is there are two types of implicature in the Paper Towns movie script. They are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. The characters mostly use particularized conversational implicature. It is used to convince the hearers, hide some information, keep a secret, express feeling and reject invitation. The second is the violation of relevance maxim mostly found in the Paper Towns movie script. It is because they tend to keep a secret by giving irrelevant answer when being asked. Those question are the reason why violation relevance maxim occurred that makes information not matched with the concept of Grice's theory.

## REFERENCES

- Adha, Ruly, and Aprilisa Astri. (2020). "Students' Ability in Understanding Homophone in English." *JL3T (Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching)* 6(1):31–54. doi: 10.32505/jl3t.v6i1.1884.



- Ani, F. (2018). *Implicature Used in the First American Presidential Candidates' Debate of CBC News Network*. Unpublished Thesis, Department of Cultural Sciences, University of Sumatera Utara. Medan.
- Bodgan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative Research For Education: An Introduction to Theory and Method*. Boston: Ally & Bacon.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Gazdar, G. (1979). Pragmatics, implicature, presupposition and logical form. *Critica*, 12(35).
- Grice, H. P. (2001). *The conception of value*. Oxford University Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- H. Hadari, Nawawi. (1992). *Metode Penelitian Bidang Sosial* (Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press).
- Hanafiah, R. (2016). An Analysis of Lexical Density and Grammatical Intricacy in Thesis Abstract of English Department Student of USU', *The ASIAN EFL Journal. Second Language Acquisition- Academic Research*. Vol.5. 47-51
- Hasbalnikistan, Muhammad Yusuf, Rita Mahriza, and Muslem. (2020). "Application of the Reflective Learning Theory in Disclosure of Student Achievements When Learning Grammar Ii in Iain Langsa." *JL3T (Journal of Linguistics Literature and Language Teaching)* 5(2):120–38. doi: 10.32505/jl3t.v5i2.1428.
- Jimmi, Sayyid Khairunas, and Krismunandar Yulianto. (2022). "Analysis of Survival Aspect Faced by The Main Character in The Revenant's Movie." *JL3T (Journal of Linguistics Literature and Language Teaching)* 8(1):18–27. doi: 10.32505/jl3t.v8i1.3861.
- Leech, G.N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). Pragmatics as deconstruction. *Social Semiotics*, 3(2), 219-230.
- Peccei, R. D. (1999). CP violation and weak decays. *Arxiv preprint hep-ph/9904456*.
- Pubas, Mutiarani, and Evert H. Hilman. (2022). "An Analysis of Category Shift in Me Before You Novel by Jojo Moyes." *JL3T (Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching)* 8(2):114–24. doi: 10.32505/jl3t.v8i2.4692.
- Robertson, Neil, Paul Seymour, and Robin Thomas. (1995). "Sachs' Linkless Embedding Conjecture." *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 64(2):185–227.