CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THATCHER-INTERLOCUTORS RELATIONSHIP IN IRON LADY MOVIE

Lydia Sela Ardine
English Literature, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya,
lydiaardine@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Lisetyo Ariyanti
English Literature, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya
lisetyoariyanti@unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis implikatur percakapan yang digunakan oleh Margaret Thatcher berdasarkan hubungan Thatcher dengan lawan bicaranya. Rumusan masalah dalam penelitian ini adalah bagaimana Thatcehr menyampaikan implikatur percakapan dan bagaiman dia membentuk implikatur melalui hubungan solidaritas yang terjalin antara dia dan lawan bicara. Subjek dari penelitian adalah Margaret Thatcher sebagai karakter utama dalam film Iron Lady. Data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini diambil dari ucapan Thatcher yang diklasifikasikan berdasarkan teori milik Grice (1975) tentang implikatur dan teori milik Holmes (1992) tentang *social distance*. Metode penelitian ini menggunakan kualitatif. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukan bahwa Thatcher menyampaikan implikatur menggunakan violating maksim dari kuantitas karena dia ingin membuat knotribusi ucapannya tidak spesifik. Dia juga menggunakan maksim dari kualitas untuk menunjukan kontribusi ucapannya agar terlihat salah. Selain itu, maksim dari relavansi digunakan untuk menunjukan bahwa Thatcher ingin membuat kontribusi ucapannya tiodak relevan, dan di juga melakukan violate maksim cara untuk menunjukan eskspresi yang tidak jelas. Penelitian ini juga menunjukan bahwa partisipan dalam percakapan menetukan jenis implikatur yang akan digunakan. Generalized implicature adalah tipe yang paling banyak digunakan oleh Thatcher ketika dia berbicara dengan orang-orang yang tidak dekat karena tidak membutuhkan pengetahuan khusus antara partisipan, sedangkan particularized implicature banyak di ucapkan oleh Thatcher untuk menyampaikannya kepada orang-orang terdekat karena tipe ini membutuhkan pengetahuan khusus yang harus diketahui oleh partisipan yang mengindikasikan bahwa hubungan mereka terjalin dekat satu sama lain.

Kata kunci: ucapan, sistem kerjasama,film Iron Lady, implikatur percakapan.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to analyze conversational implicature that are used by Margaret Thatcher through Thatcher-interlocutors relationship. The questions are about how she delivered her conversational implicature, and how she generated her implicature through high solidarity and low-solidarity relationship among them. The subject of this study is Margaret Thatcher as the main character in movie: IRON LADY. The data are taken in Thatcher's utterances that are classified by Grice's theory of implicature, and Holmes's theory of social distance. The method of this study is qualitative approach.As the results, it is found that the ways she delivered her implicature are violating maxim quantity since she wanted to make her contribution is not specific, she violated maxim of quality in order to make her contribution be false, then violated maxim of relevance since she wanted to make her contribution is not relevant , and violated maxim of manner since she wanted to make an obscurity of expression. It is also found that the use of types of her implicature depends on the participants. Generalized implicature is mostly used by Thatcher when she tlked with low-solidarity people since it does not need any specific knowledge, while particularized implicature is mostly used when she talked with high solidarity people since it needs specific context that indicates the participants in conversation are connected each other.

keywords: utterance, cooperative principle, Iron Lady's movie, conversational implicature

INTRODUCTION

language is used to express thoughts, and emotions. That is why people have their own characteristic to deliver her thought itself. Communicating is a social activity. Like other social activities, communicating happened when human take a part of it. In doing conversation, people realize that there are some rules to be obeyed that will control their act, language use, and interpretations in their utterances. People have to be responsible for what they have said. In communication, the speakers tend to use some utterances and hope their utterances will be understood clearly by hearers. So, the speakers have to make sure that their utterances are relevant with context, clear, and easy to understand. Beside, the utterances should be concise and straight forward.

Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning, Yule (1996: 3). This study is concerned with meaning as

communicated by speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader), and it has more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances. Holmes (1992: 2) states that:

"language gives an important function, such as the way to ask and give information to others"

Chaer (2006:1) also states that language is used to communicate, self-identified, and cooperate. People who are in conversation should concern with the way they deliver their speech because of its important function. Some of people believe that an ideal communication is a communication that is based on a general idea about communication. The general idea states that people involved in a conversation will cooperate with each other. Leech (1993) argues that there are some ways to understand the cooperation in conversation. First, people are expected to be as informative as is required and avoid the contrast action. Second, people are expected to say something they believe based on the accuracy of the information given to them. Third, people are expected to avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity and labor the point. Those kinds of a simple cooperation in doing conversation which people who are speaking is not assumed to make the hearer be confused, and curious about what the speaker told. That is why pragmatic is important to be applied in this study in order to analyze the implicit meaning that is spoken by main character. The ability of pragmatics is to communicate more than what is explicitly stated. Pragmatic is divided into deixis,

presupposition, and implicature. This study is concerned with implicature which will be focused specially in conversational implicature that found in the movie.

When people speak to other people and then there are some utterances that cannot be understood or related clearly, it can be such kind of type of implicature, especially conversational implicature. Conversational Implicature is a message that is not found in the plain sense of the sentence. The hearer should be able to infer the message in the utterance by appealing to the rules successful conversation interaction. Levinson (1983) states that conversational implicature is essentially connected with certain general features of discourse, and the general features of discourse arise from the fact that if our talk exchange are to be rational, they must consist of utterances that in some ways connected to each other. This thing focuses in studying the meaning of utterances based on the context. *Conversational Implicature* can also be applied to know the implicit meaning behind what people speak or write as what people implicate to. That is why people are expected to speak cooperatively. When they are not cooperative during conversation, it might because they want to implicate something so that they will not speak straight forward to the point.

People want to communicate something and expected the hearer will understand what they are communicating to. For that reason, the speaker will make the utterances they produced as relevant with context, clear, easy to understand as the hearer expected to. If people communicate cooperatively, their communication will run smoothly. It will be different if they are not being cooperative while speaking. For example the utterances *"help"* and *"can you help me?"* in different context. If people are in danger, they will prefer the utterance *"help"*. If people ask for help in normal situation, they will prefer utterance *"can you help me?"*. It will be weird if people who are in danger say "can you help me?" to get people's help while the situation is not proper and vice versa. So, that is why Grice in Rohmadi stated that there is a cooperative principle that must be obeyed to get an expected communication between the speaker and the hearer. She also stated that in order to apply these cooperative principles, the speaker have to obey 4 conversational maxims such as maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner.

This study focuses on Margaret thatcher's utterances in *Iron Lady* Movie which indicates conversational implicature. As people might know that Margaret Thatcher is the first woman who become prime minister of the united kingdom from 1979-1990 and the leader of the conservative party from 1975-1990. She was the longest-serving British Prime minister of the 20th

century and is currently the only woman to have held the office. The *Iron Lady* movie tells about Margaret's life , and how is her journey become a prime minister looks like. Since this movie tells about her life, so in the scenes, many differences of representing conversational implicature to the hearer along the movie, because in this movie, family and her colleagues take an important role in the way she delivers her implicature. So it would be more interesting to analyze how Margaret deliver her implicature by using the theory of implicature by Grice (1975) and how does she implicate it to different people, high-solidarity poeople and low-solidarity people by using the theory of Grice and also supported by Holmes (1992) which is about social distance. The relationship between Thatcher-interlocutors is needed in order to analyze the representative of implicature that is used by Thatcher. The theory of social factor from Holmes (1992) is also needed to see the context of that conversation, so that the writer could see the context in 4 components; **The participants**, **the setting**, **the topic**, and **the function**.

The study of conversational implicature is interesting since people should have to pay attention to what other people say because their utterances will speak more than is said. People tend to add conveyed meaning beyond their utterances. In one researcher, Huda (2013) whose study is "Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue of "*Euro Trip*"Movie", he analyzed the types of conversational Implicature in the movie. The idea about people involved in a conversation will cooperate each other, make the study of this topic be more insteresting since people sometimes does not cooperate each other in the conversation. People expect that they and the speaker will tell the truth, being relevant, and try to be as clear as they can. That is why it is important to recognize the maxims as unstated assumptions that people have in a conversation. It is found in researchers, Huda (2013) and Lestari (2013) whose work is "The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in the Movie Script of "DESPICABLE ME" who analyzed the flouting maxims in their movie, but using different theory with this. Huda preferred to use Brown and Yule (1989) theory, instead of Grice theory which was preferred by Lestari. Based on those works, the writer tries to develop the idea from those researchers and tries to compare the ideas that have been conducted to make a better comprehending of conversational implicature in *Iron Lady's* movie. This study would focus on the types of conversational implicature as the previous researchers have been discussed, and also the violation maxims which occur in *Iron Lady's* movie. But in conducting this study, the writer used Grice (1975) theory about impliacture who says that conversational implicature is distinguished into

2; **Generalized conversational implicature** and **particularized conversational implicature**. generalized conversational implicature is implicature that arise without any particular context or special scenario being necessary. It is added by Yule (1996:41) that when no special knowledge in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning it is called **generalized conversational implicature.** According to Grice (1975:38), the implicature of this kind (generalized) is present because the speaker has failed to be specific in a way in which he or she might have been expected to be specific as the reason that she or he is not closely connected with the identifiable person so he or she use generalized implicature, with the consequence that it is likely to be assumed that he or she is not in a position to be specific that makes this situation failed to fulfill maxim of quantity . While, **Particularized implicature** arise with any particular context. Lakoff (1993:107) defines particularized implicature is implicature that needs context or cultural understanding must be assumed. Generally, this conversational implicature will lead people to break the maxim by **violating** Gricean"s maxims. Example, when someone asks about the party whether it goes well or not then the or she says that they got drunk, it implies that the party does not run well. It means that the person is failed to fulfill maxim of relevance since she says something specific by going out of the context. The implicature is generated by the available information in the context. Grice (1975:38) states that the specification of closeness and remoteness that is given through particular context between particular person and other person should be likely to be interest. It is added by Holmes (1992:12) that A social distance is one of the reason for people to influence them producing a languange. He states that if the participants have a high soidarity, they will intimate each other, but when the participants have a low-solidarity, they will have a distance in communication.

Speaker recognize when a series of sentences "hangs together" or when it is disjointed stated by fromkin (1992:214) in Anggraningrum. Cutting also stated that when speakers appear not to follow the maxims but expect hearer to appreciate the meaning implied, one says that one is flouting the maxims. When it happens, it means the speaker also violating the maxim. The Speaker who **violates maxim of quantity** normally will give too little or much information. It is different with **violating maxim of quality** since people have rules to fulfill this maxim; 1. Do not say what you believe to be false; 2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. **Maxim of relevance** is fulfilled when people try to be in the context. According to Leech (in

Anggraningrum, 2009:20), there are some requirements to be fulfilled by the speaker as follows:

1. People know the sense of the utterances.
2. People know the conversational principle that applies to it.
3. People know the context.
4. People are able to provide an informal common sense reasoning to (1), (2), and (3).

The last is Violating maxim of manner that can be happened if the participants do not follow the rules as follows:

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used qualitative approach. It was based on the types of the writer's work which was a qualitative data. This work would focus on the violating maxim which occurs in the script of *iron Lady* Movie in order to get comprehending about the reasons of the occurrence of it. In line with this, Bogdan and Biklen in Anggraningrum (2009:28) mention one of the characteristics of the qualitative research was descriptive since the data were collected in the form of words, and pictures. Beside describing and analyzing the types of conversational implicature, and violating maxim in the movie, the writer was also investigating the reason why could people violate the maxim while communicating.

The subject of this study was *Iron Lady's* Movie that assumed containing of implicature. Which The source of data in this study came from *Iron Lady's* Movie. While this research concerned with violating maxim in the forms of conversational discourse, this form can be taken from utterances which is being uttered by Margaret Thatcher in the movie script of *Iron Lady's* movie. As Rossman and Rallis as cited in Creswell (2003:181) that qualitative method was the method which the data collected involve text data (word), and image (picture). From this statement, it showed that it was suitable for the writer to use qualitative method for this study since movie script contains of texts in order to make this study could be explored and observed well from her utterances.

There were some procedures to answer all questions. Here are some procedures that must be done to gain the data: the first is download the movie and the movie script, wathing the movie, segmenting the dialogue (make transcriptions and classify the data), and the last analyze the data of each fragment.

In analyzing the data, there were some procedures to be done, through; 1). Data condensation. This part was needed t make a strong data that would be analyzed. It would not take a full part of conversation, but only part that contributes much to answer all research questions. It means that in data condensation, there would be reducing data to strengthen it; 2). Data display. Data display was needed in order to answer research question number 1 which is about how does she deliver her implicature. research question number 2 and 3 would be answered by looking at the context but still related with the research question 1 which were about how she deliver it in high and low-solidarity people; 3). Conclusion. In this part, there would be an explanation to how the writer could answer each question as follows;

1.Research question 1

The data that have been collected are used to answer the research questions in this study. Research question 1 that aims about how conversational implicature was constructed by Margaret Thatcher in the movie, that is analyzed by seeing the classification. At first, those conversational implicatures were classified whether it is generalized or particularized implicature. Then how the way she generated those conversational implcatures by using the theory of cooperative principle by Grice (1975) . It would be related with the situation when conversation happens.

2.Research question 2

The implicature that was being implicated by Margaret Thatcher was influenced by the relationship between the speaker-hearer. It could be analyzed by seeing the relationship between Thatcher and people who have high solidarity to represent the use of conversational implicature that is used by the main character in this movie. It used the theory of Holmes (1992) *A social distance* and also Grice (1975).

3.Research question 3

The implicature that was being implicated by Thatcher also influenced by the relationship between Thatcher and people who have low solidarity. That was why the theory of Grice (1975() and Holmes (1992) are used in this study.

DATA ANALYSIS

1. How conversational implicature is constructed by Margaret Thatcher

This section consists of types of conversatinal implicature that is used by Margaret Thatcher and how she delivered her implicature by following the cooperative principle.

a. Generalized Conversational Implicature

In "iron Lady" movie" Margaret Thatcher used conversational implicature through her utterances that is categorized as generalized conversational implicature which is used to respond people's arguments or opinions. She only used one way in generating her generalized conversational implicature that is violating maxim of quantity. The clear analysis about generalized conversational implicature can be seen through three data which are applied below;

Datum 1

MARGARET: Really it's becoming quite tiresome. **DENIS** : What is? **MARGARET**: You. **I was on my own for twenty four years before I met you and I can manage perfectly well without you now**. Would you please stop bothering me.

This conversationa was between Thatcher and her husband Denis, they wre having talk in the house to discuss about Denis who still came to Thatcher's life. In this conversation, Margaret tried to deny her husband's existence. It was just She knew that it was already tired to recognize that her husband was still alive, instead of not. Then she realized that it was just her hallucination and she tried to throw her thought away about her husband around her. When, Denis tried to clarify to Thatcher about it, she directly answered *"you"*, then she explained it why she was becoming tiresome. This utterance could be categorized as **generalized** conversational implicature. It is characterized by the application of a certain form of words "*i can manage perfectly well*" without mentionaing what kind of things that she could manage, but it implicates she is allright without him. And it is called generalized since there is no special knowledge to be infered in her utterance because the hearer would recognize her mplicature as request that Thatcher wanted

to be alone. It implicates that she was fine now without Denis. She only gave an explanation about her feeling.

In delivering her implicature, Thatcher seemed making her contribution more informative as is required. She broke the rule of cooperative principle by violating **maxim of quantity.** It could be seen from how she delivered it with too much information. She was not going to say what was required from Denis. She was supposed to say the reason only of her feeling about her husband appearance such as *"because…."* that is why, she tried to generalize her answer to make Denis be more sensitive for what Thatcher has said by offering statement *"i can manage perfectly well without you now"*, she tried to make the hearer interpreting it as the request to be done by the hearer.

Datum 2

REECE	: Well er...For a start, that hat has got to go. And the pearls. In fact I think all hats may have to go.
THATCHER	: But the pearls were a gift from my husband on the birth of our twins and they are absolutely non-negotiable.

In this conversation, Thatcher and Reece were having talk about their plan. Reece tried to give an advice to Thatcher about her pearls. He asked Thatcher to do not use that thing to make her appearance looks different, but Thatcher rejected it. She said that thing (pearls) is non-negotiable one for her which implicates that she didn't want to take it off. It is categorized as **generalized** conversational implicature since she tried to generalize her answer of rejection. The utterance implied that her pearls symbolized as her children who are non-negotiable. Family could not be separated away from people's life because it would be the reason for people to live for, the hearer could understand what Margaret Thatcher feel about her family. That is why she thought that her family was very precious for her so, she seemed rejecting it in indirect way of Reece's suggestion to not wearing it. She have only answered it by rejection or acceptance.

The way she delivered her implicature was going through by violating **maxim of quantity**. She tried to give much information which was not needed and not expected. But from the utterance, the hearer would consider it as a kind of rejection from Thatcher. It can be seen from how she generalized the answer which was indicated that she rejects by saying it indirectly, rather than answer it to the point by using declarative sentence *"they are non-negotiable"* that is the implication of her disagreement about the topic that was being discussed.

b. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Beside generalized conversational implicatures which are used by Margaret Thatcher in this movie, she also used particularized conversational implicatures which are categorized as particularized conversational implicature which can be seen in five data as follow.

Datum 3

> **MALE GUEST**: Whoever can sort that lot out - he's my man.
>
> **THATCHER** : Or woman?

In this conversation, Margaret Thatcher was having dinner with her guest. They talked about her plan being a part of parliament. The man was not sure about her decision because he felt that women cannot handle that kind of work. Women only had a chance to do housework. The man only believed on man not her. So, Margaret Thatcher said *"or woman?"* to show her ambition to work in that place. She tried to deliver her implicature using **particularized** conversational implicature because the man knew *"woman"* that she meant. She said that to make the man know that she really wanted to be in that place and worked as public services, but the man was not sure with Margaret Thatcher. He did not believe in her.

The way she delivered her implicature, she broke the **maxim of quantity** since she gave a little information *"or woman?"* to make the man would think it again. He assumed from her utterance that Margaret Thatcher tried to make requirement to be a public service too by asking question to the hearer that makes the hearer assumed that it was a kind of request.

Datum 5

> **DENIS** : M, I really think you should come home and defend yourself old girl.
>
> **MARGARET**: I do think my time is best spent seeing an end to the Cold War, don't you?

This conversation happened between Thatcher and Denis in their house. It discussed about Thatcher who got many problems in the beginning of her year in the party. Denis tried to carry her going back to home and make her life run as usual without worrying about the country. Then, Thatcher tried to reject her husband's suggestion by implying a conversational implicature that categorized as **particularized** conversational implicature, since she said *"best spent an end to the cold war"* to describe how she care about her country a lot. She used a specific context "cold war" that means, it will be handled by a leader to make the country safe. She believed that she was the right one to make the country safe. Because may be she has ever faced this situation before, so that she could say like that.

The way she deliver her conversational implicature was also violating **maxim of quality** since, it did not mean that she only spent her whole life time seeing a cold war. It was only parable to indicate that she would dedicate herself to the country whatever will happen. So she said something that it was not really true. According to Grice (1975), people will violate maxim of quality if they say anything that they believe to be false. Here, Thatcher tried to say that to deliver her request to always be in that condition so that her husband knew that the question *"don't you?"* was delivered in order to convince Denis.

Datum 5

> **CAROL** : Call Robert he'll get it for you if June's not up-
>
> **THATCHER:** I am not for the knackers yet.

This conversation happened between Carol and Margaret. They talked in Thatcher's bedroom. They will prepare for dinner with the colleagues in Thatcher's house. In the middle of preparation, Carol tried to ask her mommy about what is being happened this day with her mom. Her mommy should not go out on her own, but she did because there was no milk to drink. So, she went to supermarket in order to get some milk. Then Carol tried to give an advice to her mom to not going alone and asking for help to Robert, her driver to pick her up. But Margaret seemed angry with Carol then said that *she is not that knackers yet*.

That sentence implicated that she did not need any help from others. She could do it by herself and her own. The type of implicature that she used is **particularized** implicature since the word *knackers* occurs in her utterance to describe herself as what Carol describe about her mom. Her daughter might protect Margaret Thatcher so, she always been worry about her. But Margaret Thatcher did not like to be treated like that. Form her

implicature, it seemed that Carol always done the same thing before, that made Margaret Thatcher got bored.

In this case, margaret seems not being cooperative since the way she delivered her answer is violating the **maxim of relevance**. The sentence *"I am not for the knackers yet"* shows that it did not match with relevance principle "be relevant" of what being said before from the other speaker. In fact, Carol did not talk about the condition of Margaret. She only gives an advice for Margaret to not be alone on the street by asking a help from her driver. But Carol's advice is assumed by Margaret that she could not do it by herself and she has to look at her condition. The violation of **maxim of relevance** is appeared in this conversation since what was being said by Thatcher was irrelevant with the previous utterance. Through her utterance *"I'm not for that knackers yet"*, she actually implicates that she was not that old to be worried. She could still handle it and did not need any help by offering her statement so that she could show her disagreement

In short, the way Thatcher delivered her implicature is using generalized and particularized implicature. but she tend to use particularized during the movie, it means that Thatcher likes to use specific context behind her utterance. The way she deliver her implicature is through beaking the maxim. She violated all maxim ; quantity, quality, relevance and manner. There is apurpose for Thatcher to violate it. She mostly violated the maxims to show her disagreement about something. So that she has a chance to show it without saying in direct way, but through implicature.

2. The Representation of Thatcher's implicature toward people in high-solidarity relationship

The way she represent her implicature is different among the participants. They tend to use particularized mostly when she talked with her close people, but she rarely used generalized too inside her implicature. here is the example of conversation between Thatcher and her close people using different types of implicature;

2.1 The use of particularized conversational implicature

> **DENIS**
> M, I really think you should come home and defend yourself old girl.
>
> **MARGARET**
> **I do think my time is best spent seeing an end to the Cold War, don't you?**

This conversation is between Thatcher and her husband (Denis) in the part of their house. They talked about Thatcher who still survive to dedicate herself to the country. This utterance is purposed to make Denis (the hearer) could receive her opinion that makes she tried to deliver statement.

The statement that is delivered by Thather is categorized as particularized implicature since she use specific context (cold war) that means how big her responsibility to the country because seeing an end to the cold war is something that needs more energy and thought.

Moreover, the particular context taht inferred by Thatcher in her utterance *"cold war"* would connect people in conversation since it is the specification of closeness that makes Thatcher and Denis who have a conversation in particular context should be likely of interest because Thatcher was interested to show her disagreement by saying that impliature. Besides, this implicature is also used to show her disagreement about Denis suggestion. This conversation could happen where the relationship between wife-husband is tied each other so she could deliver her thought critically. It means the participant takes an important role in the way someone is speaking. Besides, the setting of this conversation is also influenced Thatcher to use this kind of implicature. This is taken at home, so she could show her closeness with Denis more by asking question in the end of the conversation in order to make the conversation would intimate them each other.

2.2 The use of Generalized Conversational Implicature

> **MARGARET:** Really it's becoming quite tiresome
> **DENIS** : What is?
> **MARGARET:** You. I was on my own for twenty four year before I met you and **I can manage perfectly well without you now.**

This conversation is between Thatcher with her husband. This conversation is taken at her house where is the cozy and comfort place for people to talk. they talked about Denis who always in her mind all the time. She tried to make Denis go away from her life because she is too tired to be always in her hallucination. She delivered her thought by using generalized implicature to deliver her request that wanted her husband to go away. Eventhough she has close relationship with him because of her husband, she used generalized conversational implicature, which means that she tend to generalize her

answer without using specific context that makes Thatcher was not in her position to be specific. In fact, The close relationship would produce something that intimate each oher, it means they would speak specifically because they knew well each other. In this case, Thatcher tried to use generalized implicature, that means she did not need to speak something specifically eventhough she was speaking with her husband. It could happen because there is something that forces Thatcher to say that. The topic of the conversation is the reason of it. She is too tired to take part in having conversation with her husband, so that makes she violated maxim of quantity. So, she spoke like she was speaking with other people who did not have closeness with her because she was not interested to discuss about her husband anymore eventhough the setting of this conversation is in home.

In short, the relationship between Thatcher-interlocutors influenced the representation of implicature that is used by Margaret Thatcher. She preffered particularized implicatre to be used when she was speaking with close people. It is like Grice (1975:38) stated that particular context is the specification of closeness to connect one person and another person and they should be likely of interest of that conversation. It means that when the participants are connected each other, they would have something interesting inside their utterances that generates particularized implicature. it is supported by Holmes (1992:12) who says that if the participants have a high solidarity, they would intimate each other. But it did not mean that she was not using generalized implicature with her close people. In fact she used generalized implicature with her husband, but it is influenced by the topic of conversation. Thatcher did not want to take a part of that conversation so she spoke like she was speaking with someone who just knew

3. The Representation of Thatcher's implicature toward people in low-solidarity realtionship

The way she delivered her implicature toward people who have high solidarity is totally different with the implicature that she deliver to people who have low solidarity, in this section, there would be description and expalanation of how Tahtcher deliver her implicature to low-solidarity people using generalized and particularized implicature eventhough she tend to use generalized implicature in mostly conversation. Here are the examples;

3.1 The use of generalized conversational implicature

HOWE	: Margaret, the cost of sending 28,000 men and a hundred ships **t**welve thousand miles will be absolutely crippling.
THATCHER:	I don't think we should be worrying about money at this point, Geoffrey

This conversation is taken between Thatcher and Howe where Howe is her colleagues in that conservative party. The relationship between them is categorized as low solidarity since they only have conversation to discuss about work. Howe did not know Thatcher well. He only knew that she is the prime minister, and he only obeyed what is instructed to him.

So in this case, Thatcher preffered to use generalized implicature to Howe in order to make him be more sensitive of her. It could be seen in how she generalized her opinion toward Howe. There is no special knowledge that needed in her utterance, because everyone would interpret is the disgreement toward Howe's statement.

She did not want to speak specifically with people who did not have closeness with her since she has been to be specific while speaking. The setting of this conversation also makes Thatcher to maintance her attitude toward the hearer, which is taken in the office so there would be a distance between Thatcher and Howe in order to make the situation more formal.

3.2 The use of particularized conversational implicature

MAN	: May we have a word prime minister?
THATCHER:	yes, but in order to arrive at the palace on time

This conversation is taken betweeen Thatcher and the man who wanted to have a conversation, while Thatcher was preparing to have a dinner in a palace. The situation of this conversation could be considered as formal situation.

Thatcher tried to use particularized in this case. It could be seen from how she used specific context "arrive at the palace on time" because she knew that the hearer would come at the palace too, so he considered to think about the time.

Eventhough she is talking with someone who did not have a close relationship with her. She could use particularized implicature with him because the topic among the conversation, forced Thatcher to infer specific background knowledge in order to make them speak intimately because Thatcher did not want to come to palace late. So, The function of her implicature forced Thatcher to use that kind of implicature because there is a purpose from Thatcher to say that, beside, eventhoug the man here have no closeness with her but they are connected in the topic so, she could infer specific context inside her utterance.

In conclusion, Generalized implicature mostly used when she talked with her colleagues. It is because there is a distance between Thatcher-interlocutors, so Tahtcher would not speak specifically, she only used background knowledge that everyone has known. It is added by Grice (1975:38) who says that since the speaker is not closely connected with the interlocutors, generalized implicature is present because the speaker has failed to be specific and it is indicated as a failure in conversation. It means that the participants who have low solidarity would have a distance in communication, stated by Holmes (1992:12). But sometimes, she used different way (particularized implicature) to speak with same person or same level of solidarity in relationship. She used particularized implicature rarely to speak with her colleagues. Eventhough she has no closeness with the man whom she is speaking with, but they are connected each other by the topic. If the topic is known and suitable between Thatcher-interlocutors, they would speak intimately.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION
Conclusion
Most people tend to use implicature, especially conversational implicature while speaking. It is also happened with Margaret Thatcher in this movie which found about twenty three of converational implicatures uttered by Margaret Thatcher. She delivers her conversational implicature in different ways based on its types. The first way is through generalized conversational implicature which is found ten and the second is particularized conversational implicature which is found thirteen in the movie. She also has different ways how to deliver her implicature. She violates maxim in both types of conversational implicature. When she delivered her generalized conversational implicature, she preffered to deliver it through violating maxim of quantity only, while when she used particularized conversational implicature, she preffered to deliver it through violating maxim of

quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. It all happen because of the relationship among speaker-hearer. Generealized conversational implicature mostly happened when Thatcher talked with her colleagues and particularized conversational implicature mostly happened when Thatcher talked with her family and close people. But, it also depends on the topic because sometimes Tahtcher use generalized to all people in some condition and vice verca because of the topic among the participants and also the function of those implicatures to be delivered by the speaker.

Suggestion
After conducting this research, people are expected to know more about what conversational implicature and how it can be used for. The writer expects this research to be useful for people in understanding the term of conversational implicature more. this term can be considered around us not only at movie, but also in other entertaining programs like reality show, and advertisement in the movie. or, it will be more interesting if the next researcher can explore more about conversational implicature in real situation like observing the conversation between teacher and student in the classroom. Beside, because this research has been analyzing the conversational implicature of Margaret Thatcher who is a women politician, the next researcher can explore the other object like trying to analyze the conversational implicature which is being said by man politician, or a common people, in their social status point of view rather than relationship among the participants. So it might be giving different results of the ways they deliver their conversational implicatures.

REFFERENCES

Bogdan, C and Biklen Knopp.1992. *Qualitative Research for Education*. Boston:Advison of Sinn and Schuster,Inc.

Brown, Gillian and George, Yule. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chaer, Abdul. 2006. Tata Bahasa Praktis Bahasa Indonesia. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

Creswell, J. W. 2003. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage

Cutting, Joan. 2002.*Pragmatics and Discourse*. New York:Routledge.

Grice, H.Paul. 1975. *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Huda, Miftahul. 2013. *Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue of Euro Trip Movie*. Malang: University of Brawijaya Press

Janet Holmes, *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman, 1992.

Lakoff, R. 1983. The limits of politeness : Therapeutic and classroom discourse. *Multilingua* **8**.

Leech, Geoffy. 1993. *Prinsip Prinsip Pragmatik*. Terjemahan dari *Principles of Pragmatic* (Oleh penerjemah M.D.D. Oka). Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.

Lestari. 2013. *The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in the movie script of "Despicable Me"*. Salatiga: STAIN Press

Levinson, S.C. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S.C. 1995. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moleong, Lexy J. 1989. *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya

Nada*r*, F.X.2009. *Pragmatik dan Penelitian pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Nanda,Sheila, Didi Sukyadi,and Sudarsono.2012.*Conversational Implicature of the Presenter Take Me Out.Vol 1 (2)*. Retrieved in 23 December 2015 from http://jurnal.upi.edu/file/Sheila-final_120-138.pdf.

Resti Ayuningrum.2010. *The Study of Conversational Maxim in The Pink Panther 2 movie*. Surabaya: State University of SurabayaPress.

S.Anggraningrum. 2009.*The study of flouting maxim of cooperativ principle in Charles Dickens' Great Expectation.*Surabaya: State University of Surabaya press

Sudaryanto. 1993. Metode *dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian*

Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistis. Jakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*.oxford:Oxford University Press.