

An Analysis of Conversational Implicature In “Materialists” Movie In 2025

Vina Ismatul Maula, Evi Pebri Ila Rachma

English literature, Faculty of Social and Cultural Sciences, Universitas Trunodjoyo Madura

ARTICLE INFO

Riwayat artikel:

Received 10 April 2026

Revised 15 April 2026

Accepted 20 April 2026

Available online 30 April 2026

Keywords

Conversational implicature, Politeness, pragmatic analysis



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.
Copyright © 2025 by Author. Published by Yayasan Daarul Huda

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the types of conversational implicature and their processes used by the main character in the film “Materialists” (2025). This study applied Yule’s (1996) theory of conversational implicature, which classifies the types of Conversational Implicature into generalized Conversational Implicature and particularized Conversational Implicature. A qualitative method was employed to describe and interpret the utterances of Lucy Mason that reflect Types of Conversational Implicature and Processes of Conversational Implicature. The results show that out of 34 data, 16 utterances are categorized as generalized conversational implicature and 18 as particularized conversational implicature. Regarding processes, there are 10 data of PP, 11 of II, and 13 of IR. The findings indicate that generalized conversational implicature appears more frequently, while Indirect Illocution and Interpersonal Rhetoric are the most dominant processes. This study demonstrates that dialogues in the film convey complex implied meanings that depend on context and social interaction among characters.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis jenis-jenis implikatur percakapan dan fungsinya yang digunakan oleh tokoh utama dalam film Materialists (2025). Penelitian ini menggunakan teori implikatur percakapan dari Yule (1996), yang mengklasifikasikan implikatur percakapan ke dalam dua jenis, yaitu generalized conversational implicature dan particularized conversational implicature. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif untuk mendeskripsikan dan menginterpretasikan tuturan-tuturan Lucy Mason yang mengandung jenis dan fungsi implikatur percakapan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa dari 34 data yang ditemukan, 16 tuturan termasuk dalam generalized conversational implicature dan 18 tuturan termasuk dalam particularized conversational implicature. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa generalized conversational implicature lebih sering digunakan dibandingkan particularized conversational implicature. Sementara itu, Indirect Illocution dan Interpersonal Rhetoric merupakan Proses yang paling dominan. Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa dialog-dialog dalam film tersebut mengandung makna tersirat yang kompleks, yang pemahamannya sangat bergantung pada konteks dan interaksi sosial antar tokoh.

INTRODUCTION

Language is a fundamental tool of communication that people use to convey thoughts and feelings, functioning as a means of communication, an expression of identity, imaginative expression, and emotional release (Wardhaugh, 2015). Through language, people express ideas by combining speech sounds into words. Numerous factors shape the way people communicate, including geography, age, social status, and gender, and the relationship between language and society can be examined from regional, social, ethnic, and gender perspectives (Wardhaugh, 2015). In digital contexts, language does more than transmit messages: it shapes digital identities and builds social relationships among users, allowing people to express who they are, signal closeness to others, and create a sense of belonging within online communities (Nani, 2024). Within linguistics, pragmatics divided into deixis, speech act, presupposition, and conversational implicature addresses how speakers convey meaning and how listeners interpret it in context (Yule, 1996). Pragmatics is therefore concerned less with the literal meaning of words and phrases than with what speakers mean by using them; it is, in short, the study of speaker meaning. Conversational implicature is considered one of the central ideas in pragmatics, offering an

*Corresponding Author

e-mail: evi.rachma@trunodjoyo.ac.id, vinaismatulmaula09@gmail.com

account of how speakers can mean more than what is literally said (Levinson, 1983). It refers to meaning communicated indirectly, beyond the literal content of an utterance, requiring hearers to infer the speaker's intended message from context, shared knowledge, and the Cooperative Principle (Grundy, 2010). Grice (1975) similarly describes implicature as meaning conveyed indirectly, relying on the listener's ability to draw on context and conversational principles to recover the speaker's intention, meaning what is implied need not match what is literally said.

Yule (1996) distinguishes two types of conversational implicature: generalized conversational implicature (GCI) and particularized conversational implicature (PCI). In the exchange "Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese. Dexter: Ah, I brought the bread," Dexter's reply implies, without stating directly, that he did not bring the cheese. Because this inference follows from common background knowledge rather than any special situational context, it illustrates a generalized conversational implicature understandable to most listeners through shared cultural knowledge alone. Cases like this also show implicature operating as an indirect illocution, since the speaker's intended meaning must be inferred rather than read off the words themselves. Despite this well-established theoretical foundation, the varied types and processes of implicature remain insufficiently explored in naturalistic dialogue, including in film. Film dialogue offers rich material for pragmatic analysis because language functions there as the primary vehicle for communication, identity, and interpersonal connection (Alejandro, 2024; Nasution & Tambunan, 2022).

This study analyzes conversational implicature in the film *Materialists* (2025), which follows Lucy Mason, a professional matchmaker, as she navigates personal and professional challenges while balancing career ambitions against complicated romantic choices between two very different men. The film's emotional tension, social expectations, and subtle power dynamics produce dialogue rich in implied meaning, indirectness, sarcasm, and interpersonal nuance, making it a productive object of study for understanding how meaning is conveyed indirectly through conversation. *Materialists* (2025) is therefore used as the data source, with analysis focused on the utterances of the main character, Lucy Mason, whose dialogues foreground the hidden meanings, emotions, and intentions central to the film's narrative.

Accordingly, this study aims to identify the types of conversational implicature they are generalized and particularized (Yule, 1996) present in Lucy Mason's dialogue in *Materialists* (2025), and to explain the processes through which these implicatures are used (Leech, 1983), in order to clarify how implicature contributes to character development and narrative expression. Theoretically, the findings are expected to contribute to pragmatic studies by deepening the understanding of indirect communication and supporting the application of Leech's and Yule's frameworks to everyday and cinematic language use. Practically, the study offers linguistics and pragmatics students material for learning about the types and processes of conversational implicature in film dialogue, and provides a reference point for future research on implicature in other films or communicative contexts.

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of the meaning of words or sentences in relation to context, encompassing social context, situational context, textual context, and background knowledge, all of which support the understanding of intended meaning beyond the literal words. As a branch of linguistics, pragmatics examines not only what speakers say but also what they intend to mean and how listeners interpret that meaning based on the context of communication (Yule, 1996). Levinson (1983) similarly emphasizes that pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that underlie language understanding, meaning that speakers and listeners rely on context to grasp intended meaning. Zufferey (2015) adds that pragmatics is the study of

language in use and how language is employed by speakers in specific social contexts and how listeners interpret communicative intentions beyond literal meaning, shaped by factors such as social relationships, shared knowledge, intentions, and situational cues. This field of study involves interpreting what people mean in a particular context and how that context shapes what is said, taking into account who is speaking to whom, where and when the conversation occurs, and under what circumstances. In short, pragmatics shows that language is not only about words but also about intentions and the relationships between speakers and listeners. It can be concluded that pragmatics is the study of how listeners or readers understand the meaning of utterances expressed by speakers or writers, by taking into account the context in which communication occurs—demonstrating that communication is fundamentally about sharing understanding based on context and experience.

Implicature

Implicature refers to the additional meaning a speaker intends beyond the literal words used. Yule (1996) explains that implicature is meaning not directly spoken but understood by the listener through context, meaning that a speaker's real intention can differ from their exact words. For example, in the utterance "I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence," the absence of the possessive "my" implies that neither the garden nor the child belongs to the speaker—illustrating a generalized conversational implicature, where the listener infers the hidden meaning from common conversational knowledge without needing extra context. Leech (1983) similarly states that implicature involves meanings not expressed openly but understood by listeners through interpretation and contextual information. Rahayu and Safnil (2018) define implicature as the implied meaning in speech understood through indirect expressions.

Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is a key concept in pragmatics explaining how speakers convey meaning indirectly. Yule (1996) describes conversational implicatures as inferences listeners draw to understand more than what is literally said, requiring listeners to consider context, situation, and shared knowledge between speaker and listener. Grundy (2010) similarly explains that conversational implicature is meaning communicated indirectly, requiring hearers to infer the speaker's intended message through context, shared knowledge, and the Cooperative Principle. Levinson (1983) further explains that these implied meanings arise not from language structure itself but from general principles of cooperative interaction between speakers and listeners. According to Musa et al (2022), conversational implicature is a speaking ability involving both speaker and listener: what a speaker implies without explicitly stating it, requiring the listener to infer intended meaning by considering context, tone, and shared knowledge, since communication extends beyond words to include understanding intentions, feelings, and relationships. Based on these explanations, conversational implicature refers to meaning communicated by a speaker beyond the literal content of an utterance, requiring listeners to draw on context, shared knowledge, and communicative principles. Although the concept originates with Grice (1975), this study adopts Yule's (1996) classification of conversational implicature, as it offers a clear framework for categorizing the data. For instance:

Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.

Dexter: Ah, I brought the bread. (Yule, 1996)

Dexter's statement implies, without stating directly, that he did not bring the cheese. This implicature is understood even without special situational context, since mentioning only some items conventionally implies the rest were not brought and illustrating a generalized conversational implicature, understandable through shared cultural and background knowledge

alone. Yule (1996) identifies two types of conversational implicature: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized conversational implicature is a type of implicature that requires no special background knowledge of the context to understand the meaning conveyed. According to Yule (1996), the listener can grasp the speaker's real meaning from the words alone, without needing extra situational detail, because the hidden meaning draws on common sense and general knowledge. For instance:

Doobie: Did you invite Bella and Cathy?

Mary: I invited Bella. (Yule, 1996)

Mary's answer allows the listener to infer that Cathy was probably not invited, without needing further context, since mentioning only one of two people conventionally implies the other was excluded. This illustrates how generalized conversational implicature allows messages to be inferred through shared conversational norms alone.

Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is a type of implicature in which the listener needs specific background knowledge of the situation to understand the speaker's intended meaning. According to Yule (1996), such implicatures arise in a specific context and require additional background information; the meaning of an utterance can shift depending on where, when, and to whom it is said, as well as the relationship between speakers. For instance:

Rick: Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?

Tom: My parents are visiting. (Yule, 1996)

To interpret Tom's response, Rick must draw on shared situational knowledge that visiting parents typically preclude attending a party rather than the literal words alone, illustrating how particularized implicature depends on context specific to the interlocutors.

Processes of Conversational Implicature

Several previous studies inform this research. Azzahra et al. (2023), in "Character Alteration of Cruella from 101 Dalmatians (1961) into Cruella Movie (2021)," examined the transformation of Cruella de Vil's character across adaptations using a literary and character-analysis approach, finding that the 2021 portrayal reframes Cruella as a morally ambiguous antihero shaped by trauma and social conflict rather than a purely evil antagonist. This study is relevant in its shared focus on *Cruella* (2021), though it addresses literary character transformation rather than the linguistic focus of the present study. A'maliyah et al. (2025), in "Conversational Implicature in Frozen 1: A Pragmatic Approach," applied Grice's theory to identify generalized and particularized implicature in the animated film *Frozen*, finding that characters used implicature to express politeness, emotion, and hidden intentions. This study shares a movie-based data source and use of implicature theory but differs in object and scope from the present research, which additionally examines the processes—not only the types—of conversational implicature. Cristina and Afriana (2024), in "The Processes of Conversational Implicature in TV Show F.R.I.E.N.D.S: A Pragmatic Approach," applied Grice's (1975) theory to identify how implicature served indirect meaning, politeness, and communicative effectiveness across sitcom dialogue. This study parallels the present research in its use of Grice's theory but differs in data source, using a television series rather than a film. Chen and Zhang (2020), in "Conversational Implicature in Movie Dialogue Based on Pragmatic Analysis," found that implicature in film dialogue frequently expressed indirect requests, emotion, and politeness strategies, helping audiences infer relationships between characters. Puspitasari et al. (2022), in "Conversational Implicature in Movie Dialogue Scripts," identified generalized, particularized,

and scalar implicatures used to convey indirect and emotional meaning, but did not extend the analysis to interpersonal pragmatic processes. Taken together, these studies reflect a range of approaches, some centered on literary analysis, others on implicature types and processes across film and television using pragmatic frameworks. The present study distinguishes itself by focusing on *Materialists* (2025), analyzing conversational implicature types according to Yule's (1996) theory alongside the processes of conversational implicature based on Leech's (1983) framework, offering a different focus, object, and data source than prior research.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative method, as the data consist of utterances drawn from conversation, presented in the form of words. Qualitative methods rely on textual data, involve distinctive steps in data analysis, and draw on a range of research designs (Creswell, 2018). In this study, utterances from the source of data were analyzed to identify the types of conversational implicature and the processes underlying the main character's dialogue. The analysis proceeded in three stages: first, the researcher collected utterances containing conversational implicature from the film *Materialists* (2025); second, the data were classified according to the types of conversational implicature based on Yule's (1996) theory; and third, each data item was analyzed to explain its implicature type and interpreted to identify the underlying process based on Leech's (1983) theory. The source of data for this study was the film *Materialists* (2025), directed by Celine Song, accessed via Netflix. The data consisted of utterances containing conversational implicature spoken by the main character in the film. Utterances were drawn from selected scenes exhibiting conversational implicature phenomena, including generalized conversational implicature (GCI) and particularized conversational implicature (PCI). Only utterances containing conversational implicature were selected as data. These were subsequently analyzed according to Yule's (1996) theory of implicature types and Leech's (1983) theory of implicature processes.

This study sought to address its research focus using the researcher as the primary instrument. According to Creswell (2018), in qualitative research the researcher serves as the key instrument, directly collecting, selecting, and interpreting the data; the researcher therefore ensured objectivity and competence throughout the research process. To support data collection, several supplementary tools were used, including a smartphone, laptop, notebook, and pen. These tools assisted with watching the film, transcribing dialogue, and taking notes, but functioned only as aids rather than as instruments of analysis in themselves. Data were collected using a documentation technique. According to Ary et al. (2010), document analysis involves examining and interpreting documents to develop empirical understanding, a technique well suited to qualitative research as it enables the collection of textual data from existing sources. In this study, the documentation technique was applied as follows: first, the researcher watched *Materialists* (2025) multiple times to understand the overall storyline; second, potential utterances containing conversational implicature were identified; third, relevant dialogue spoken by the main character was transcribed into written form; and finally, utterances containing conversational implicature were selected for further analysis. The method of data analysis was needed to determine how the data would be processed following data collection. Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014) define analysis as comprising three concurrent flows of activity: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of types is based on the theory proposed by Yule (1996), while the processes are analyzed according to the Leech (1983) theory. From the movie, a total of 34 utterances by the main character were identified as containing conversational implicature based on the established criteria. There are 34 data in the form of utterances produced by the main character that contain types of conversational implicature, according to George Yule (1996). The types identified include generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. In this study, 15 utterances are categorized as generalized conversational implicature, while 18 utterances contain particularized conversational implicature. These results indicate that particularized conversational implicature is the most frequently occurring type. Thus, it can be seen that indirect illocution and interpersonal Rhetoric the most dominant processes of conversational implicature found in the movie. According to Yule (1996), there are two types of conversational implicature: Generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. In this discussion, the writer analyzes each of data that has been classified into two types.

Generalized conversational implicature is a type of conversational implicature that does not require special background knowledge to understand the additional meaning. It can be understood easily from the utterance itself without needing deep analysis or specific context, because the meaning is generally clear to the listener.

Sophie : I don't believe you.

Lucy : i believe it

The conversational implicature in Lucy's utterance "I believe it" is classified as generalized conversational implicature because the implied meaning can be understood without requiring specific background knowledge or a particular context. In this conversation, Sophie says, "I don't believe you," expressing doubt or disbelief. Lucy responds with "I believe it," which creates a contrast. Through this response, Lucy indirectly implies that she trusts or accepts the statement that Sophie doubts. The implicature occurs from the simple opposition between "don't believe" and "believe." This contrast allows the listener to easily infer Lucy's stance without needing additional context. Therefore, the meaning is generalized and does not depend on special situational knowledge.

Client : What about Mark P.? He's okay.

Lucy : I pitched him to her already. She's afraid he's not actually 5'11.

The conversational implicature in Lucy's utterance "I pitched him to her already. She's afraid he's not actually 5'11" is classified as generalized conversational implicature because the meaning can be understood easily without special background knowledge. In this conversation, the client suggests Mark P. by saying "He's okay." Lucy answers that she has already recommended him, but the woman thinks he might not be tall enough. Through this response, Lucy indirectly shows that Mark P. is not a good match or will not be accepted. She

does not say it directly, but the reason she gives makes the meaning clear. The implicature comes from the information about the woman's concern. The listener can easily understand that Mark does not meet her preference. Because this meaning is based on common understanding and does not need a specific context, it is included as generalized conversational implicature.

Clinton : Do you want me to set you up with someone?

Lucy : No, I'm gonna die alone. Or get a rich husband.

The conversational implicature in Lucy's utterance is classified as generalized conversational implicature because the implied meaning can be understood without using special background knowledge or specific context. The utterance "No, I'm gonna die alone. Or get a rich husband" This implies that Lucy is joking or speaking sarcastically about her future relationship. Through this statement, Lucy indirectly imply that she wasn't interested in being matched with anyone at that time. Lucy said this in response to Clinton's question when he offered to introduce her to someone. Therefore, Lucy used this statement to indirectly reject the offer.

John : Poor... voted for Bernie... shitty family. Are we soulmates?

Lucy : Probably.

The conversational implicature in Lucy's utterance "Probably" is classified as generalized conversational implicature because the meaning can be understood easily without special background knowledge. In this conversation, John describes himself in a negative way and then jokingly asks, "Are we soulmates?" Lucy responds with "Probably." Through this response, Lucy does not seriously agree. Instead, she gives an indirect and slightly sarcastic answer. The word "probably" shows uncertainty and suggests that she is not fully convinced. The implicature comes from the use of "probably," which commonly expresses doubt or weak agreement. The listener can easily understand that Lucy is not seriously confirming that they are soulmates. Because this meaning is based on general understanding of the word "probably" and does not need specific context, it is classified as generalized conversational implicature.

Harry : Thank you for agreeing to come on a date with me.

Lucy : Well, I only said yes to this so you'd realize you're wrong and you're not actually interested in me.

By observing the conversation in the data above, Lucy's utterance can be categorized as generalized conversational implicature because the implied meaning can be understood without on special context or background knowledge. In this dialogue, Harry thanks Lucy for agreeing to go on a date with him. However, Lucy responds by saying, "Well, I only said yes to this so you'd realize you're wrong, and you're not actually interested in me." this statement, Lucy indirectly suggests that she believes Harry is mistaken about his feelings toward her. She implies that Harry is not truly interested in her, and that the date is meant to prove her point. Therefore, the meaning of the utterance can be understood directly from the conversation, so it is categorized as generalized conversational implicature.

Particularized conversational implicature is a type of implied meaning that needs specific context to understand it. The listener must know the situation, background, or relationship between the speakers to understand what the speaker really means. The meaning depends on where, when, and to whom the utterance is spoken.

Shopie: this is probably the best first date i've ever had

Lucy: uh. Shopie, i just gote off the phone with him. And he loved meeting you he had ea great time. But he doesn't feel like the chemistry is there for him at this time. So. Onward and upward.

From conversational implicature point of view, Lucy's statement belongs to particularized conversational implicature because it relies on the context or background knowledge. In this dialogue, Sophie says that it was probably the best first date she had ever had. And Lucy's response contains particularized conversational implicature can be seen in the sentences "I just got off the phone with him" and "he doesn't feel like the chemistry is there." These expressions imply that the man does not want to continue the relationship with Sophie. However, this implied meaning can only be understood if the listener knows the context that Lucy is informing Sophie about the result of her date. Without understanding this situation, the listener can't understand the intended meaning. Therefore, the utterance is categorized as particularized conversational implicature because its interpretation relies on the specific context of the conversation.

Sophie : How fucking dare he?
 Lucy : Dating is a risk. You took a risk. It's brave

This data is included in interpersonal rhetoric because of Lucy's words, which are used to manage the emotional situation and maintain a positive relationship between the speakers. Interpersonal rhetoric explains how language is used to express attitudes and build connection in conversation. In this dialogue, Lucy responds, "Dating is a risk. You took a risk. It's brave." Through this statement, Lucy tries to comfort Sophie and reduce her negative feelings. The implicature in Lucy's utterance shows support and empathy, as she reframes the situation in a more positive way. This use of language helps maintain closeness between them and shows how Lucy manages the interpersonal relationship through her response.

Lucy : I just need five minutes alone with her. (To bridesmaid)

The conversational implicature in Lucy's utterance "I just need five minutes alone with her" is classified as particularized conversational implicature because the meaning cannot be fully understood without specific context. In this situation, Lucy is talking to a bridesmaid and asks for some time alone with someone. Literally, she is only asking for five minutes. However, she indirectly implies that she wants to speak privately or discuss something important. The implicature depends on the situation, such as who "her" is and why Lucy needs to be alone with her. Without this context, the listener may only understand it as a simple request. Because the meaning relies on a specific situation and cannot be understood from general knowledge alone, it is considered a particularized conversational implicature.

Charlotte : You cannot tell anyone. Not a soul. It is so awful.
 Lucy : I will take it to my grave.

From the conversational implicature above, it can be classified into particularized conversational implicature because it needs some special background knowledge or the context to understand what Lucy's means. In this dialogue, "I will take it to my grave." The sentence implies that Lucy promises to keep the secret and will not tell anyone about it. However, the implied meaning can only be fully understood if the listener knows the context that Charlotte is asking Lucy to keep the information confidential. Therefore, the utterance is categorized as particularized conversational implicature because the meaning depends on the specific situation of the conversation.

John : You seeing anyone?
 Lucy : You saw me at the singles table.

From the conversational implicature above, it can be seen from the Lucy's utterance that it is categorized as particularized conversational implicature because to understand it, it needs to know of the background knowledge or the context related to the conversation to know what Lucy's means from the utterance. In this dialogue, John asks to Lucy's and then Lucy's replies, "You saw me at the singles table." "The particularized implicature appears in the sentence" Through this statement, Lucy indirectly implies that she is not seeing anyone. The meaning can only be understood if the listener knows the context that the singles table is a place for people who are not in a relationship. Without understanding this context, the listener might not fully understand Lucy's intended meaning. Therefore, the utterance is categorized as particularized conversational implicature because its interpretation depends on the specific context of the conversation.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, the writer concludes that two types of conversational implicature are found in the movie *Materialists* (2025), namely generalized conversational implicature (GCI) and particularized conversational implicature (PCI), in accordance with Yule's (1996) theory. From the analysis of Lucy Mason's utterances, the writer identified a total of 33 data of conversational implicature. Of these, 15 data are categorized as generalized conversational implicature, while 18 data are categorized as particularized conversational implicature. These findings show that particularized conversational implicature is the more dominant type found in this study, occurring more frequently than generalized conversational implicature throughout Lucy's dialogue. This dominance of particularized conversational implicature indicates that Lucy frequently conveys meanings that cannot be understood through general or common knowledge alone, but instead require the listener to draw on specific situational context, shared background knowledge between speakers, and awareness of the particular circumstances surrounding each conversation. Rather than stating her intentions directly, Lucy tends to rely on the immediate context of a scene such as the relationship between the characters, the emotional undertone of the moment, or prior events in the storyline to make her intended meaning understood. This pattern suggests that Lucy's communication style is shaped significantly by context-dependent inference rather than by widely shared conversational norms.

This tendency can also be linked to Lucy's characterization within the film. As a professional matchmaker who frequently navigates delicate emotional situations, complicated romantic dynamics, and professional negotiations, Lucy often needs to communicate sensitive or potentially face-threatening messages such as rejecting a client, expressing doubt, or revealing her true feelings without stating them outright. Particularized conversational implicature allows her to do this by requiring the listener to actively interpret her words based on the specific situation at hand, rather than relying on meanings that would be immediately obvious to any listener regardless of context. This reflects how the film uses indirect language not merely as a stylistic feature of dialogue, but as a narrative tool that reveals Lucy's cautious, strategic, and sometimes guarded way of expressing herself throughout the story. In contrast, the smaller number of generalized conversational implicatures found in the data suggests that while Lucy does at times rely on meanings that can be inferred through common knowledge and general conversational reasoning, this occurs less frequently than her use of context-specific implied meanings. Taken together, these findings highlight that indirectness in Lucy's speech is, for the most part, deeply embedded in the particular circumstances of each conversation, reinforcing the

idea that understanding her communicative intentions in *Materialists* (2025) requires close attention to situational and relational context rather than reliance on general assumptions alone.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the writer offers several recommendations for future researchers, students, and readers interested in the study of pragmatics. First, for future researchers, this study only focuses on the utterances of the main character, Lucy Mason, in analyzing the types and processes of conversational implicature in the movie *Materialists* (2025). Future researchers are recommended to expand the scope of analysis by including the utterances of other characters in the same movie, in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how conversational implicature functions across different characters and relationships. In addition, future researchers may also apply Yule's (1996) theory of implicature types and Leech's (1983) theory of implicature processes to other movies, television series, or literary works with different genres, such as drama, comedy, or thriller, to see whether similar or different patterns of conversational implicature emerge. Second, since this study found that particularized conversational implicature is more dominant than generalized conversational implicature, future researchers are encouraged to further investigate the specific contextual factors such as character relationships, emotional states, or narrative background that influence why particularized implicature tends to occur more frequently in certain types of dialogue or characterization. This could provide deeper insight into the relationship between conversational implicature and character development in film narratives.

Third, for students of linguistics and pragmatics, this study can serve as a reference or learning material to understand how conversational implicature works in real communication, particularly in movie dialogue. Students are encouraged to practice identifying types and processes of implicature in various forms of media, such as movies, novels, or everyday conversations, in order to sharpen their pragmatic competence and ability to interpret implied meaning beyond literal utterances. Fourth, for readers and audiences in general, this study is expected to raise awareness that communication does not always rely on direct or explicit statements. Understanding implicature can help readers become more sensitive to hidden meanings, emotions, and intentions conveyed indirectly in daily conversation, which may improve interpersonal understanding and communication skills. Finally, for future studies, it is recommended that other pragmatic theories or approaches be combined with Yule's and Leech's frameworks, such as politeness theory, speech act theory, or relevance theory, in order to enrich the analysis and provide a more holistic understanding of how meaning is constructed and interpreted in conversational discourse.

REFERENCES

- A'maliyah, N., Mi'rajiah, N., & Rohbiah, D. (2025). *Conversational implicature in Frozen 1: A pragmatic approach*. *Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 5(2), 45–56. <https://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Deiksis/article/view/10491>
- Alejandro, J. (2024). *The Role of Language in Thought Formation and Personality*. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies (IJMS)*, 2(4). DOI:10.37329/ijms.v2i4.3759
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning
- Azzahra, N., Wulandari, R., & Rachmawati, I. (2023). *Character alteration of Cruella from 101 Dalmatians (1961) into Cruella movie (2021)*. *Crossover: Journal of English and*

- Literature*, 7(1), 12–24.
<https://ejournal.uinsaid.ac.id/index.php/crossover/article/view/5994>
- Chen, Y., & Zhang, L. (2020). Conversational implicature in movie dialogue based on pragmatic analysis. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 12(4), 102–115.
- Cristina, R., & Afriana, D. (2024). *The processess of conversational implicature in TV show F.R.I.E.N.D.S: A pragmatic approach*. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Studies*, 6(1), 67–79. <https://ejournal.upbatam.ac.id/index.php/basis/article/view/2935>
- Djahimo, S. E. P., Jama, K. B., & Margareta, K. M. (2023). *Implicature of speech acts in the tradition of Rotenese community engagement*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 12(2), 15–21.
- Fajri, A. N. (2017). The flouting of conversational maxims found in product advertisements. *The Indonesian Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(2), 120–130.
- Grice, H. Paul. (1975). *Logic and Conversation* New York: Academic Press.
- Janney, R. W. (2012). Pragmatics and cinematic discourse. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 8(1), 85–113. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2012-0006>
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nani, N. (2024). *The influence of language on interaction and communication within social media platforms*. *Journal of Social and Foreign Language Learning*, 2(2), 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.62795/fjlg.v2i2.295>
- Nasution, F., & Tambunan, E. E. (2022). *Language and communication*. *International Journal of Community Service*, 1(1), 1–10.71
- Pramadicha, P. R. K., Ediwan, I. N. T., & Utami, G. W. N. (2025). Conversational implicature found in *Inside Out 2* movie. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Bahasa*, 4(2), 247–276. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jurribah.v4i2.5636>
- Puspitasari, R., Faridi, A., & Wahyuni, S. (2022). Conversational implicature in movie dialogue scripts. *Journal of Language and Communication*, 9(2), 55–67.
- Rahayu, E. S. R. S., & Safnil, A. (2018). Types of implicature in informal conversations used by the English Education Study Program students. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature)*, 1(1), 65–83. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v1i1.3942>
- Rizkia, S. N. A., Hanan, A. E. F., & Fauzi, E. M. (2022). Analysis of women's language features in the movie *Cruella* (2021). *Madah: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 13(2), 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.31503/madah.v13i2.492>
- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zufferey, S. (2015). *Acquiring pragmatics: Social and cognitive perspectives*. Routledge.