

## CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE: TALKSHOW IN OPRAH WINFREY NETWORK

Astrid, Faidah Yusuf,\* Jumharia Djamereng

English and Literature Department, Faculty of Adab and Humanities,  
 UIN Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia  
 e-mail: faidah.yusuf@uin-alauddin

### ABSTRACT

This study is to determine the various forms of conversational implicature and their function on the talk show Oprah Winfrey Network's SuperSoul Sunday Program. The data were evaluated descriptively qualitatively. The results show that three types of data classified as generalized conversational implicature and eleven types of data classified as particularized conversational implicature, depending on the utterance. Each host has a unique personality and circumstance, which contributes to defiance of the dictum. By floating the maxim, the speaker inferred meaning through his or her justifications, which either too brief or too detailed. As a result, the speaker delivered an irrelevant and ambiguous speech in response to the interlocutor. In conclusion, this implicature discovered the representational, directive, expressive, and declarative functions of utterances.

**Keywords:** *Implicature, Conversational Implicature, Talkshow, Floating The Maxim*

### INTRODUCTION

Implicature is the purpose included in non-direct statements. It is a common occurrence of pragmatic use. Sutherland (Sutherland, 2016) defines implicature as an implied meaning of words. Language is used in social life (Sutherland, 2016). The speaker's utterances are sometimes implicit or explicit, thus not everyone will comprehend the speaker's meaning. Interpretation is required to understand individuals. Misinterpretations are always possible and, at times, seem to be the rule rather than the exception (Meyer, 2018). For clarity, readers or listeners must comprehend the context. That is, the persons involved, their backgrounds, where it is spoken, and so on.

The prevalence of implicature in real-world language usage can lead to miscommunication and misinterpretation of information. To share the same intention/purpose and interpretation in the discussion, both speaker and listener must collaborate. Using Co-Principle and the maxims as a guide, we can figure out how people decide what someone means. Grice's maxims are four maxims (Over & Grice, 1990). Assuming the cooperative principle,

the following four maxims are assumed when individuals engage verbally or in writing. Quantity rule: quality vs. Quantity: Rule of truthfulness: make your points relevant. Modesty's dictum Prevent uncertainty or obscurity by being concise. The second categorization of implicatures, according to Grice, distinguishes between conventional and conversational. Implicature can provide meaning to the listener. So it may interpret the speech. It is something left implicit/implied in real language use, or conversational implicature (Akmal & Yana, 2020). Language users observe or flout maxims, according to (Op.Sunggu & Afriana, 2020). Its link to the context is restricted. Confidentiality refers to the ability of the speaker and listener to understand and interpret each other's intentions, intentions, and intentions. Generalized and specific conversational implicature are the two types. No particular information or background to assess the transmitted message. A context is required for Particularized Conversational Implicature to evaluate the message. A speaker wants the listener to understand his or her communication aim (Stevenson et al., 1986). To conduct an activity, the delivered words are vital. The speech act has five purposes, according to (Gu & Tipton, 2020). Representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative

Discovery Inc. and Harpo Productions own and operate Oprah Winfrey Network (OWN), an American multi-platform cable network. It was accessible on Philo, Youtube TV, and AT&T TV as streaming media. Los Angeles, California, USA, is the broadcasting centre. OWN is the first and only network named after and inspired by a single legendary figure. A global network of like-minded viewers who engage on social media and beyond is created by Winfrey's programming leadership. The network's URL is [www.oprah.com](http://www.oprah.com). OWN's SuperSoul Sunday. Happy, personal satisfaction, spirituality, conscious living, and what it means to be alive in today's world are subjects discussed on SuperSoul Sunday.

For the investigation, the researcher chose the multi-award winning series SuperSoul Sunday Program because it is aimed to help viewers awaken to their best selves and discover deeper connections with the world around them. It also helps pupils grasp topics and concerns including conscious living, personal fulfilment, spirituality, and life lessons. In pragmatics, the implication is a crucial concept (Haugh, 2007). Why implicature is a model of pragmatic explanations of language occurrences. According to (Levinson, 2010), the speaker's purpose may differ from what is expressed. Grice's notion of implicature explains how communication may occur without the use of traditional channels. If a speaker thinks that his/her utterance's implicature cannot be grasped quickly by the hearer, he/she will often cancel the speech and endeavour to obey the cooperative principles in discussion (Taguchi, 2008). We infer what people say, especially on talk programs, due to conversational implicature. A conversational implicature is an utterance that has a function. To grasp the literary work examined in pragmatics areas. A dialogue or a screenplay is analyzed, which is comparable to earlier investigations. On the Oprah Winfrey Network's SuperSoul Sunday program, however, the researcher looked at the speakers' functions of implicature, not

just the kinds. The study's goals are to identify the forms and roles of conversational implicature on the Oprah Winfrey Network.

Aside from the obvious theoretical and practical implications, the following possible reader advantages can be expected: That implicit meaning is sometimes contained in utterances to avoid misunderstandings is theorized by this research. After that, the researcher thinks that the study's findings will help to better comprehend the implicit meaning. Although this research aims to provide fresh perspectives in the field of pragmatics, particularly about the implications of discourse analysis. Readers who want to assess comparable studies can use this study as a source of reference.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. Implicature

Grice introduced the concept of Implicature in 1975. He introduced implicature in his work "Logic and Conversation." This study's focus is on the relationship between what individuals say and what they truly mean during a discussion. The implication, originating from the verb 'to suggest,' is a synonym for implicature (Yule, 1989). Imply is derived from the Latin word *place*, which meaning implied is 'folded in' and must be 'unfolded' to be understood. Implicit meaning, according to (Chapman, 2005), differs from the words expressed. Thus, the notion of conversational implicature is that that is implied in real conversational discourse. Implicature is a metaphor for the most significant pragmatic use phenomenon (Khairunas et al., 2020). Implicature shows how intentions might differ from actual speech. Implicature is a considerable simplification of the semantic description's structure and content. Linguists are increasingly aware that some features of language require both semantic and pragmatic inquiry. The principles that produce implicatures can explain other language occurrences. In conclusion (van Tiel & Schaeken, 2017), implicature is commonly defined as follows: (5) Obedience or disobedience to cooperative ideals inside the dialogue results in the inference. Two kinds of implicature

#### 1. Typical Implicature

This is not supported by the cooperative principle or maxims. It does not require a discourse and does not rely on certain situations (Yule, 1989). The availability of certain words that result in additional transmitted meaning when utilized can be considered as implicature (Grice, 2012). In certain circumstances, the meaning of the words used determines what is implied as well as what is expressed.

#### 2. Implication in speech

Conversational implicature is a sort of implicature that requires both the speaker and the listener to understand the specific context of the speaker's goal. Conversational implicature is the presence of a relationship between two individuals chatting. Authorized by the speaker's speech. Conversational implicature as follows: Generalized and Particularized

Conversational Implicity. Using the cooperation principle, we can learn how people decide what someone means. Grice's hypothesis is about how individuals utilize language. Then he argues that implicature allows speakers to express their objectives without exactitude. (Grice, 1989) starts with the Cooperative Principle technique to explain implicature. "Make your contribution when needed, at the point where it shows, by the agreed objective or direction of the discourse in which you are involved," says Grice (1989). In other words, if the conversation is to be effective, the parties should work together to avoid misconceptions. Only this way can participants deduce what the interlocutor meant. Using implicature effectively conveys more than words can express. To interpret the implicature. The co-principle must be assumed early on. These values are stated as follows: Quality vs. Quantity: Relevance maxim: Manner's maxim: implicature functions When we speak, we are also acting. Yule (1996) defines a speech act as "an activity accomplished through utterance." So, when we speak, we are also acting. "I'll be there at nine" Using the example, we can see that we are not just speaking but also promising. The researcher will assess each implicature's purpose using (Gu & Tipton, 2020) notion of five broad speech act classifications: expressive, representational or assertive, directive, commissive, and declarative.

## **METHOD**

This study used a descriptive qualitative approach. The researcher described the verbal implicature discovered between the presenter and the guest on Oprah Winfrey Network. Qualitative research describes a process, meaning, or knowledge through words or pictures (Creswell, 2014). The statistics were obtained from the SuperSoul Sunday Program on the Oprah Winfrey Network. Intuition, strength, and grace is the first video at 00:41:53. "Maya Angelou" episode 416 with 00:42:02 minutes. The video is available on [www.Oprah.com](http://www.Oprah.com) or the OWN YouTube channel (OWN). The data collection technique was as follows: Transcribing Oprah Winfrey Network video screenplay. Identifying and gathering data from Oprah Winfrey Network conversations and theories. Analyzing and interpreting acquired data. Following the collection of data, data analysis is an important aspect of the research. First, the researcher assessed the acquired data using the (Ma & Zhang, 2020) theory of situation and context. The researcher next noticed which forms and functions of discussion by explaining the obtained data. Finally, the researcher drew findings from his investigation.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **Research Findings**

#### **The Types and The Functions of Conversational Implicature**

According to Grice (1975), Conversational Implicature is classified into two types:

## 1. Generalized Conversational Implicature

CarolyneMyss: there it is..  
 Oprah Winfrey: **There you go. you said it [laughing]**  
 CarolyneMyss: you know, I'm mean, yeah.(D<sub>1</sub>S<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub>)

The dialogue is from 00:09:23 to 00:09:39. Oprah broke the rule of quantity by providing Caroline with what she needed to justify the assertion in Caroline's book. Quantity dictates that the speaker's contribution be as informative as feasible. Oprah Winfrey is waiting for Caroline to explain a quotation from her book "Sacred Contract." Caroline verifies twice what Oprah said about the book. However, Oprah may want an explanation as to why individuals suffer when they follow a goal that is not theirs. Oprah wanted Caroline to explain what she meant when she mentioned in her book, "people suffer when they seek a life or a goal that is not theirs." This implicature has a directive function of requesting since Oprah expects Caroline to reply by explaining her book. The directive function is used when the speaker expects a response from the audience.

Oprah Winfrey: **That is so big. I am going to take a commercial break.**

CarolyneMyss: [Laughing]

Oprah Winfrey: That is big.(D<sub>2</sub>S<sub>8</sub>V<sub>1</sub>)

The dialogue runs from 00:09:23 until 00:09:39. By delivering what Oprah requested Caroline to explain the assertion consist in Caroline's book, Oprah flouted quantity. Quantity dictates that the speaker's input be as informative as feasible to collaborate effectively. A passage from Caroline's book "Sacred Contract" has Oprah Winfrey waiting for an explanation. Then Caroline verifies twice what Oprah said about the book. Because individuals suffer when they follow a goal that isn't theirs, Oprah may need an explanation. Oprah wanted Caroline to clarify what she meant when she mentioned in her book, "people suffer when they follow a life or a goal that is not theirs." The implicature is classed as Generalized Conversational Implicature since it does not require special context to comprehend. As a response, Oprah wants Caroline to explain what is in her book, hence this implicature has a directive function. The speaker wants the listener to perform something in response to his or her directive function.

Oprah Winfrey: Yeah...As a spiritual leader and teacher, one would think that you never have problems, and that you're always in the flow, and that you're connected to the law. Do you have good days and bad days too, like regular folks?

CarolyneMyss : **Oh, come on.**

Oprah Winfrey: Oh, come on?

CarolyneMyss : Oh, come on. I take—take my calendar—bad day, good day,--

Oprah Winfrey: [Laughing](D<sub>3</sub>S<sub>11</sub>V<sub>1</sub>)

Caroline Myss did not appear to follow the conversational guideline in the foregoing dialogue. The discussion is from 00:38:04 to 00:39:04. The utterance defied etiquette. When Oprah asked Caroline about her life, if she had terrible days and good days like the rest of us, Caroline made an incredible face and said, "Oh come on." She does not answer the question clearly and directly, but rather says something different. A conversational implicature, because it does not require specific context to grasp Caroline's experience, the study found. Despite her reputation as a spiritual leader and teacher, her face says it all. But behind it all, she is an ordinary person who has good and bad days. Caroline's speech functioned as an expressive function expressing her psychological state. She was making an utterance while simultaneously acting. Caroline responds to Oprah's question with surprise. Caroline's thoughts concerning a scenario were communicated.

## 2. Particularized Conversational Implicature

- CarolyneMyss: and there is no other choice. But even, even if you thought--even if you're in a grocery store, and you're thinking should I by this or not? **And your Gut says you know you can't eat that.**
- Oprah Winfrey: ahaa.
- CarolyneMyss: And you decide, I'm not going to listen to that voice. Right there, even that tiny thing, you're walked toward fear.
- Oprah Winfrey: wow. (D<sub>4</sub>S<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub>)

The dialogue occurs at the minute 00:06:23 to 00:06:47. When Oprah was still questioning the content in Caroline's book entitled "Anatomy of the spirit". The utterance flouted the maxim of how Caroline Myss gave a vague example of why there is no other choice except walking toward fear. Flouting the maxim of manner will lead the listener to confusion if the speaker makes obscure and ambiguous utterances. Caroline used the phrase "and your gut says you can't eat that" in this context. When we consider the context of the dialogue, this sentence is ambiguous and vague. The kind of this implicature is categorized in Particularized Conversational Implicature since the inference is taken from the specific context of the utterance. Caroline responded to Oprah's question by saying that there is no other option but to walk in fear. Then she gave an example, saying, "and your gut says you can't eat that". The term "gut" refers to the stomach or belly, and it is unusual when combined with the verb "says." Gut, also known as a digestive and, is unable to communicate to consider the option. As a result, it is possible to conclude that Caroline's utterance has the implied meaning. It can be seen from the context that Caroline gave an example of how people cannot walk away from fear and gut as a feeling or reaction based on an instinctive emotional response. Based on the dialogue above, the function of this implicature is included in the representative or assertive function of informing because Caroline told Oprah how her gut reacted based on an instinctive or emotional response to fear.

CarolyneMyss: **You know why? Because they define it by what they want versus what they have.**

Oprah Winfrey: Oh, this is the thing that you say that I love the most. Well, lots of things I love the most, but OK. “You say that people suffer when they pursue a life or chase a dream that doesn't belong to them”.

CarolyneMyss: There.

Oprah Winfrey: There it is.(D<sub>5</sub>S<sub>2</sub>V<sub>1</sub>)

This dialogue occurs at the minute 00:09:08 to 00:09:17. Oprah Winfrey is the host of this program. In this section, the guest Caroline Winfrey with a theme "Intuition, power and grace". She is an American author who has published some books and one of her books called “SacredContracts” and Oprah asks Caroline “...how can you—how can you be so confused about your reason for being here?”When Oprah asked Caroline Myss about the reason or purpose of being here or the existence in this universe, she was referring to one of Caroline Myss' books, "Sacred Contract," which discussed the reasons for someone's born. The utterance flouted the manner maxim. The type of this implicature is Particularized Conversational Implicature because some assumed knowledge is required during the conversation. What kind of thing that we have to define based on what they have. So, Carolyne said that the way we define the reasons for our existence is by defining what we have.The function of the utterance is included in the representative function of concluding. Caroline concluded that the reason people are confused about the reason of people confuse about their existence is because they define it by what they want versus what they have. In the conversation above, Caroline stated what she believes in the case or not.

Oprah Winfrey: So then the question becomes show do you know what is the life or the path that is meant for you?

CarolyneMyss: **Well, that is not so difficult as people think.**

Oprah Winfrey: Yeah.(D<sub>6</sub>S<sub>4</sub>V<sub>1</sub>)

The dialogue occurs at the minute 00:10:21 to 00:10:28 when both of them discuss Caroline's best-selling book entitled Sacred Contract which discusses the purpose of life, and Opera asks Caroline how she knows what life or path is meant for Caroline. However, Caroline flouted the Maxim of quantity because Caroline conveys response that is not as informative as they are required, Caroline gave Oprah less information than she should have. Here, Caroline's response that "people" means not the meaning of life is based on her perspective.The type of this implicature is Particularized Conversational Implicaturebecause the specific context of Caroline's answer is required to understand the conversation and she did not give the answer based on her perspective but saying what people think and the word "difficult" here does not have more explanation what difficult mean in the perspective of people. Perhaps people do not believe that life is difficult, or the majority of the people Caroline met with stated that life is difficult. The

function of this implicature is representative or assertive because of Caroline's assumption in saying that life or path is difficult as people think. She was not only acting on saying something, but she was also acting on stating something.

CarolyneMyss: If you have life, you have purpose

Oprah Winfrey: **Tweet tweet.**(D7S5V1)

Oprah Winfrey flouted the maxim of relevance at the minute 00:11:48 to 00:11:58 because she blocked the conversation by expressing contentment. After Caroline restate her statement that "if you have life, you have purpose". Furthermore, Oprah abruptly interrupted the conversation by flouting the maxim of relevance, Oprah did not intended to abrupt the conversation but she expected Caroline to recognize her expression of contentment on her statement. The type of this Implicature is Particularized Conversational Implicature because the term "tweet" can refer to both a chirping sound and a 140-character message posted on Twitter. Particularized Conversational Implicature is an implicature in which some assumed knowledge is required during a conversation in a very specific context. Whereas, Oprah used the word to express her reaction to Caroline's quote. Caroline's response astounded her. The function of this implicature above is to express the psychological state. Here, Caroline does an action of praising. The expressive function expresses the speaker's feelings and attitudes toward the proposition.

CarolyneMyss: No matter where it is, no matter what it is.  
Appreciated fully--what a person does--

Oprah Winfrey: **I can not pay my bills. I lost my job.**

CarolyneMyss: OK

Oprah Winfrey: I mean, I am speaking for people.(D8S6V1)

The conversation above showed that Oprah's utterance was not appeared to adhere to the conversational maxim. She flouted the maxim of relevance because Oprah deviates from the particular topic being discussed. The dialogue occurs at the minute 00:13:41 to 00:13:49 when Oprah suddenly blocked the conversation by saying "I cannot pay my bills. I lost my job" Oprah deviates the conversation from the particular topic being discussed. The type of this implicature is Particularized Conversational Implicature because we need specific knowledge to understand what Oprah is saying. Perhaps, Oprah was really cannot pay her bills and lost her job or she provided an example to the listener of a situation in which people are in the depths of despair. Whereas, Caroline advises not to judge life, not to expect it, and to let go of the need to know what will happen tomorrow. The function of this implicature included into the representative function of informing because Oprah informs the situation when she is in the depths of despair. The representative function is an example of the world as something the speaker who describes it believes it to be.

Oprah Winfrey: But is God always fair and just?

CarolyneMyss: **Life on Earth will never be fair the way we want it to be. It will never be for everyone cause, there's**



**one effect. There's not. For every, there's millions of causes and millions of effects for every single breath we take.**

- Oprah Winfrey: You don't recognize that every choice you've ever making in any given moment.  
 CarolyneMyss: --are our unconscious make--so every moment we're probably making 500 million choices.(D9S7V1)

Caroline Myss' answer deliberately flouts the maxim of quantity, where she gave too much information. The dialogue occurs at the minute 00:17:15 to 17:54. When Oprah asked Caroline Myss is God always fair and just? Caroline Myss flout the maxim of quantity because she provides a lot of explanation of reasons why we must understand that God will never be impartial as the way we expected. This type of implicature is known as Conversational Implicature because we require specific knowledge or explanation to understand Caroline's statement about why God will never be fair and just to everyone. The function of this implicature is included in a representative or assertive function that is about informing. The representative function is an example of the world as the speaker who describes it beliefs it to be. Caroline told Oprah about her perspective on why God is never fair in the way we want it to be.

- Oprah Winfrey: How does grace work?  
 CarolyneMyss: **Works like this.**  
 Oprah Winfrey: Oh, this is good. We're going to get the answer to that question.(D10S9V1)

Caroline Myss flouted the Maxim of manner when the dialogue occurs at the minute 00:24:53 to 00:24:56 after the breaking moment. Oprah asked Caroline's perspective about how does Grace work. However, Caroline gave obscurity information to Oprah by saying "work like this". By flouting the maxim of manner will lead the listener to confusion but she wanted Oprah to recognize her implied meaning. The type of this implicature is Particularized Conversational Implicature because it is needed local knowledge to calculate the implied meaning of the conversation. We need to know what Caroline meant when she said the word "this". Grace is an abstract form that cannot be pointed out by saying this or that. Grace is something we experience. It is a power that comes in and transforms a moment into something better. The specific context is needed to understand the word of "this" meant by Caroline. The function of Caroline's utterance was included in the representative or assertive function of informing. In above the conversation, Caroline's response above the conversation informs Oprah how Grace works by stating work like this. She was not only acting on saying something, but she was also acting stating something.

- Oprah Winfrey: Are you still a practicing Catholic?  
 CarolyneMyss: **Mmm, You know what? You know what Oscar Wilde said?**  
 Oprah Winfrey: No.  
 CarolyneMyss: I'm not going—I don't go to that place because they have all those gargoyles and all that other tuff..I

don't live like a Catholic, but I'm going to die like one.

Both : [Laughing](D<sub>11</sub>S<sub>10</sub>V<sub>1</sub>)

The dialogue occurs at the minute 00:36:28 to 00:30:31. The conversation demonstrates that Caroline flouted the Maxim of Relevance by blatantly responding to Oprah's question. Caroline did not intend to break the conversation, but she wanted Oprah to be aware of her point about what Oprah is asking for. To be cooperative with each other, that makes the utterance irrelevant. Caroline should have answered Opera's question straight away instead of asking another question. Oprah asked Caroline if she was still a practising Catholic, but Caroline responded by questioning her understanding of Oscar Wilde's statement. This implicature is included in Particularized Conversational Implicature type because it requires a stock of knowledge to understand what Caroline meant by knowing what Oscar Wilde conveyed about Catholicism. The specific context is required to interpret Caroline's implied meaning. Caroline should have responded to Oprah's question instead of asking another. In this case, we have to draw assumed knowledge that Caroline was not questioning but rather describing her religious situation. To understand what Oscar Wilde said we have to read his book or watch his video to know what Caroline was meant. Perhaps, Caroline's response was meant by Oscar Wilde's perspective that she does not live like a Catholic but will die like one. The function of this implicature is the directive function. Caroline was not questioned Oprah what Oscar Wilde said but she commuted Caroline to do something as a response. Caroline did not only do in the action of uttering something, at the same time she was also acting of asking.

Oprah Winfrey: So, how did you learn to love yourself at that time?

Maya Angelou: **Well, Bailey loved me my grandmother loved me, and my mother loved me.**(D<sub>12</sub>S<sub>12</sub>V<sub>2</sub>)

Above the conversation, it showed that Maya Angelou's utterance did not appear to adhere to the conversational maxim. The dialogue of occurs at the minute 00:15:07 to 00:15:10. Maya Angelou flouted the maxim of the manner by answering that did not brief and not directly on point. Angelou stated that Bailey loved her, her grandmother loved her, and her mother loved her in a series of overly descriptive sentences that may confuse Oprah. Flouting the maxim of manner will confuse the listener if the speaker made obscurity or ambiguous utterance. The type of this implicature is Particularized Conversational Implicature because Angelou's response requires specific knowledge to understand that the way she received love at the time was from people she mentioned in the utterance, namely Bailey, her grandmother, and her mother. However, there is no previous explanation of who is named Bailey. Perhaps, Bailey is her husband or her son. She was supported by someone who loved her and it was because of this that she was able to survive her difficult life and learn to love herself. In the conversation above, this implicature included the representative or assertive function of informing. Angelou inform us how she was able to love herself at the time by

accepting love from Bailey, her grandmother and her mother.

- Oprah Winfrey: Where do you do for solace, for comfort? Are there books that you read? When Maya Angelou needs comforting. What do you use?
- MayaAngelou : I am a student of unity, and there's a book called--
- Oprah Winfrey: **The Unity Church?**
- MayaAngelou : Unity Church.(D<sub>13</sub>S<sub>13</sub>V<sub>2</sub>)

Oprah flouted the maxim of relevance when Angelou was asked what she used to do to comfort herself. Whereas, she wants to explain that she was a student of Unity Church and there is a book called. Oprah abruptly blocked Angelou's answer by convincing and asking "The Unity Church?" The video occurs at the minute 00:19:00 to 00:19:15. In the dialogue above, Oprah was not intended to break the conversation but she wanted to convince herself that the school was Caroline talking about is the one she knew. The type of this implicature included Particularized Conversational Implicature because it is needed specific knowledge to understand what Oprah was trying to convince, what kind of school that Oprah asked about. Perhaps The Unity Church is a school or a place where Angelou can find solace or probably it is a kind of Unity of Christian movement. The function of this implicature is a directive function of asking. Directive function directs the hearer towards doing something as a response. Oprah expects Angelou to do something as a response which is Oprah trying to convince Angelou the place of what Angelou meant by.

- Oprah Winfrey: Yes. What do you believe happens when you die?
- Maya Angelou: **Oh, I go back to All.**[Both laugh]
- MayaAngelou : That's all.
- Oprah Winfrey: You go back to All?(D<sub>14</sub>S<sub>14</sub>V<sub>2</sub>)

Maya Angelou flouted the maxim of manner because when Oprah asked Angelou about her beliefs what happens when people die. She replied "Oh, I go back to All". She made an ambiguous statement. The dialogue occurs at the minute 00:30:20 to 00:30:35. Flouting the maxim of manner will lead to the listener of confusion if the speaker gives the listener obscurity or ambiguity information. The implicature is included Particularized Conversational Implicature because it is required a specific context and knowledge to understand what the word "All" meant by Angelou. Perhaps, the word All refers to the whole quantity or extent of a particular group or thing or it could be the every member individual component or it could be the definition of all means, God, as Angelou stated in her previous answer about the definition of God. If it could be, based on Angelou's perspective that people will return to God when they die. Based on the conversation above, The function of this implicature is included in the representative or assertive function of the state. Representative is a type of speech act that states what the speaker believes in the case or not. Angelou is her believe that after people die they will return to God as creatures.

## **Discussion**

After obtaining and analyzing data based on the types of implicature and their functions using Grice (1975) and Searle (1977) theories to answer the research problem in the previous chapter.

### **1. The types of Conversational Implicature**

The first issue raised in this research is the sort of conversational implicature that happens throughout the "SuperSoul Sunday" program's dialogue. He provides an additional categorization of Implicature based on Grice's (1975) approach. Implicature is split into two categories: conventional and conversational. However, the researcher focuses on the conversational implicature since the program's dialogue is composed of utterances between the visitor and host that are examined using the conversational maxim. Conversational Implicature is classified as Generalized and Particularized Implicature.

When no particular information is required in the context to assess the given meaning, Generalized Conversational Implicature arises. The researcher discovered three pieces of data classified as Generalized Conversational Implicature. As a result of violating the quantity and method maxims. It happens in the absence of any contextual characteristics. Additionally, Particularized Conversational Implications need the use of local knowledge to analyze the given meaning. As a consequence of floating the maxims of style, amount, and relevance, the researcher discovered 11 facts that are classified as Particularized Conversational Implications. It is an implicature that requires certain presumptive information during a dialogue in a very specific setting. Particularized conversational Implicature need further explanation to compel the utterer and interlocutor to collaborate. The context was critical for interpreting or assessing the suggested meaning of utterances during data analysis. It contains information on the subject or theme that was discussed between the speaker and the interlocutor, as well as who, where, when, and why the utterance was uttered.

According to an earlier study, one of the reasons some individuals implied the conversation was because the speaker was unconcerned or uninterested in the subject at hand, and the speaker also desired to avoid the subject at hand. The similarities of this study discovered that the speaker inferred the dialogue to clarify anything by providing extra meaning. Additionally, the study discovered that the speaker occasionally inferred intention to praise, inform, direct, and presume. With a different guest and presenter for each episode, the context and response will vary because each character is unique. By floating the maxim, the speaker creates an irrelevant and ambiguous utterance in response to the interlocutor's suggested meaning due to insufficient or excessive information. Apart from that, the speaker's intention was not to interrupt the discourse but to be cooperative or to make the listener aware of the suggested meaning.

### **2. The Conversational Implicature's Functions**

The second issue addressed by the research is how the functions of implicature are discovered in the utterances of the SuperSoul Sunday Program by applying Searle's (1977) theory of the functions of speech act to the utterances. A speech act is an activity that is carried out through the production of an utterance. Thus, when humans produce an utterance, they are also doing an action. For instance, "do you know what? "Are you aware of what Oscar Wilde said?" According to the example, Maya Angelou was not simply expressing something; she was also urging the listener to do something in response, in an attempt to persuade them of what the speaker meant.

According to the study, utterances have four distinct functions. To begin, representational or forceful language tends to convey the validity of the articulated notion by actions such as informing, concluding, expressing, assuming, and informing. The speaker expresses if she or he believes in the case. In this study, eight sample utterances were discovered. One of the data may be seen in (D14S14V2), where Maya Angelou states, "Oh, I go back to All." The objective of this implicature is to express her beliefs of what happens to individuals when they die. Second, directive happens when the speaker directs the listener to respond in a particular way. Three pieces of data were discovered in this investigation, one of which was on (D13 S13V2) "the oneness church?" According to the utterance, Oprah expects Angelou to persuade her of what Angelou aims to explain. Thirdly, the expressive function conveys information about a person's psychological state, such as pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, or a particular scenario. This investigation discovered two utterances. One of the examples on (D7S5V1) "tweet twitter" is how Oprah expresses her satisfaction with Caroline's comment in this utterance. Finally, assertive speech alters the circumstance or perhaps the reality. There is one declarative foundation in this study, as evidenced by (D2S8V1) "That is so large, I'm going to take a commercial break." According to the statement, Oprah did not only make a speech; she also altered the circumstance by interrupting the dialogue with a commercial break. Among those functions, the representational function was more frequently meant by the utterance on Supersoul Sunday. As a consequence of this research, the researcher concluded that the speaker did not commit any future action on the implicature. However, each syllable transmitted the statement for which a function must exist.

## CONCLUSIONS

The data for this study come from the utterances of the various varieties of conversational implicature on the Oprah Winfrey Network's SuperSoul Sunday program (OWN). This research used two films, each with a unique topic, guest, and setting, but all with the same host. According to the study, there are three types of data classified as Generalized Conversational Implicature and eleven types of data classified as Particularized Conversational Implicature, depending on the utterance. Each visitor has a unique personality and circumstance, which contributes to their defiance of the dictum. However, the speaker did not want to interrupt the discussion;

rather, they attempted to draw the listener's attention to their inferred message. Furthermore, Based on the speaker's implicature functions. The researcher discovered four distinct roles of implicature in this investigation. They are authoritative, directive, empathetic, expressive, and declarative. Eight representative functions were found, three of which were directive in nature, two of which were expressive, and one of which was a declarative function.

## REFERENCES

- Akmal, S., & Yana, D. U. (2020). Conversational Implicature Analysis in “Kingdom of Heaven” Movie Script by William Monahan. *Buletin Al-Turas*, 26(2), 335–350. <https://doi.org/10.15408/BAT.V26I2.15356>
- Chapman, S. (2005). Logic and Conversation. *Paul Grice*, 85–113. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230005853\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230005853_5)
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. SAGE Publication, Inc. <https://doi.org/https://book.asia/book/3700358/d95149>
- Grice, H. P. (2012). Further Notes on Logic and Conversation. *Reasoning*, 765–773. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511814273.039>
- Gu, C., & Tipton, R. (2020). (Re-)voicing Beijing’s discourse through self-referentiality: a corpus-based CDA analysis of government interpreters’ discursive mediation at China’s political press conferences (1998–2017). *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 28(3), 406–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2020.1717558>
- Haugh, M. (2007). The co-constitution of politeness implicature in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(1), 84–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PRAGMA.2006.07.004>
- Khairunas, S., Sidauruk, J., Desi Pratama, R. M., & Dwi Natalia, T. O. M. (2020). Conversational Implicature in Beauty and Beast Movie Directed by Bill Condon. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 12(1), 16–24. <https://doi.org/10.31294/W.V12I1.7459>
- Levinson, M. (2010). *From Fear to Facebook One School’s Journey*. International Society for Technology in Education.
- Ma, W., & Zhang, S. (2020). Research Methods in Linguistics. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 40(2), 269–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2019.1574777>
- Meyer, J. (2018). What is Literature? A Definition Based on Prototypes. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*, 41(1). <https://doi.org/10.31356/silwp.vol41.03>
- Op.Sunggu, E. J., & Afriana, A. (2020). Flouting Maxims in “Wonder Woman” Movie. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 4(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.31539/LEEA.V4I1.1394>

- Over, D. E., & Grice, P. (1990). Studies in the Way of Words. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 40(160), 393. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2219730>
- Stevenson, M. B., Ver Hove, J. N., Roach, M. A., & Leavitt, L. A. (1986). The beginning of conversation: Early patterns of mother-infant vocal responsiveness. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 9(4), 423–440. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0163-6383\(86\)90016-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0163-6383(86)90016-0)
- Sutherland, S. (2016). A Beginner's Guide to Discourse Analysis. *A Beginner's Guide to Discourse Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-40289-9>
- Taguchi, N. (2008). Cognition, language contact, and the development of pragmatic comprehension in a study-abroad context. *Language Learning*, 58(1), 33–71. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-9922.2007.00434.X>
- van Tiel, B., & Schaeken, W. (2017). Processing Conversational Implicatures: Alternatives and Counterfactual Reasoning. *Cognitive Science*, 41, 1119–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/COGS.12362>
- Yule, G. (1989). The study of language. In *Semantics* (pp. 114–127).