

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
UNIVERSITY OF DANANG**

-----***-----

VO THI THANH THAO

**A STUDY OF CONVERSATIONAL
IMPLICATURES IN *TITANIC* FILM**

FIELD: THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
CODE: 60.22.15

M.A THESIS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
(A SUMMARY)

Supervisor: ASSOC. PROF. DR. PHAN VĂN HÒA

Danang, 2011

This study has been completed at the College of
Foreign Languages, University of Danang

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. PHAN VĂN HÒA

Examiner 1:

Examiner 2:

The thesis will be orally presented at the Examining Committee at
the University of Danang

Time:

Venue:

The thesis is accessible for the purpose of reference at:

- Library of the College of Foreign languages, University of Danang
- The University of Danang Information Resources Center

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale

Conversational implicature is an interesting thing where it is not a matter of a sentence but instead of an utterance's meaning. Conversational implicature is one of the most important ideas in pragmatics. The importance of conversational implicature as a means of expressing a message indirectly is well established. Participants in a conversation expected each other to make their contributions to that conversation truthful, relevant, clear, and sufficiently informative [9]. It is important to know that it is speakers who communicate meanings via implicatures and it is listeners who recognize those communicated meanings via inference [31, p.30].

It is observed that Vietnamese learners of English, on making conversations in the target language, often pay little attention to the specific context, have improper or even odd reply to native speakers and then fail in communicating with others. Recognizing conversational implicatures exactly and responding felicitously can be regarded as language learners' pragmatic competence.

In this study, the researcher examined the conversations between two speakers only, which are called dialogues. Dialogue was selected because they constitute a purposeful use in the school environment. They also serve as bridge between natural spoken conversations with its participants. Dialogue builds directly on the communicative competence in oral language. Moreover, the point is that language is functional, interactive and self-generated.

Usually, learners of English are suggested to watch English films because films generally show daily life of people in English. Besides, film enters into the life to a greater extent and more intimately than it ever did before. Film and language interact in a complex and paradoxical way. Therefore, work with film can affect students in positive and valuable ways.

In this study, as the researcher is going to do a research on conversational implicatures where main data is taken from utterances, film can certainly be her good source of data.

Titanic has also been considered a very English film, both its plot and actors. In the film, amidst the thousands of well-wishers bidding a fond bon voyage, destiny has called two young souls, daring them to nurture a passion that would change their lives forever. Nothing on earth is going to come between them, not even something as unimaginable as the sinking of *Titanic*. The tragic ruins melt away to reveal the glittering palace that was *Titanic* as it prepares to launch on its maiden voyage from England [36]. Besides, when watching *Titanic*, the two main characters Jack and Rose produce a lot of implicatures, which may make it difficult to understand the film well. That is why the researcher chooses *Titanic* film as her source of data.

From these points of view, the researcher decides to do research on the topic “*A Study of Conversational Implicatures in Titanic Film*”. The issue raises in this study is clearly what is stated is not exactly the same as what is intended; it should be implicitly understood, not explicitly in all the words.

1.2 Purposes of the study

1.3 Research questions:

1. What types of implicatures are identified in the conversations done by Jack and Rose, the two main characters in the film *Titanic* and which type is produced more frequently?
2. Why are the implicatures produced?
3. What are the effects of producing the implicatures?

1.4 Scope of the study

1.5 Significance of the study

1.6 Organization of the thesis

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Review of related study

Conversational implicature (C.I) is a type of indirect communication, first described by the English language philosopher Herbert Paul Grice. He proposes that in a normal conversation, speakers and listeners share a cooperative principle [19]. When a speaker appears not to follow the maxims, he implies a function different the literal meaning of form. The speakers assume that the hearers know that their words should not be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning.

Sperber & Wilson's Relevance Theory [28] (1986) could be regarded as an attempt to develop Grice's basic insight. Their aim is

to characterize a property of mental process which the ordinary notion of relevance approximates.

Cruse (2000) uses Grice's theory as a basis to do his research in implicatures. He takes a closer look at conversational implicatures for explaining how they arise and be defined [14].

Leech (1983) proposed an independent pragmatic principle, to function alongside the co-operative principle, which he calls the politeness principle. The greater politeness comes across in the form of implicatures.

Carston (2002) considers ways in which the distinction between the proposition expressed by the speaker and the propositions she has implicated may be drawn. More broadly, he is looking at views what can be called the explicit/implicit distinction in human verbal communication. He looked over and analyzed the Grice's theory to clarify saying and implicating [12].

Nguyen Thien Giap (2000) says that in conversation, to understand what the speaker wants to communicate, the listener must be aware of not only the explicit meaning drawn from the literal meaning of the words and the structures of the utterance, but the implicit meaning inferred from what is said [4, p115].

Related to conversational implicature and its reasons, Cao Xuan Hao [1] raised a question why people avoid saying explicitly or indicating literal meaning instead of saying implicitly, which sometimes challenges the hearers. He showed that conversational implicatures were produced because of the complicated requirements of social communication, of the interaction in community, of the

distinctive culture and of the trends towards the beauty. In that book, he listed four main reasons which lead to the producing of conversational implicature in Vietnamese as well as in many other languages.

2.2 Theoretical background

2.2.1 Concepts

2.2.1.1 Conversation

A conversation is a series of utterances exchanged between two or more speakers, typically of comparable status, which follow a regular pattern of turn-taking [20, p.208].

In this study, the researcher examines the conversations between just two speakers, which are called dialogues.

2.2.1.2 Utterance

Utterance is any stretch of talk by one person, before and after which there is a silence on the part of the person. It is the use by a particular speaker, on a particular occasion, of a piece of language, such as a sequence of sentence, or a single phrase, or even a single word. [8, p.15]

2.2.1.3 Implicature

Implicature is used to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest or mean as distinct from what he/she literally says [19].

2.2.2 Conversational analysis (C.A)

This theory is issued by Yule (1996). Conversation is mainly about talking. The term “conversational analysis” is to present any

study of people talking together, “oral communication” or “language use”. Speakers having a conversation are viewed as taking turns at holding the floor. The structure of talking, the basis patterns of “I speak – you speak – I speak – you speak”, will derive from the fundamental kind of interaction people acquire first and use most often [31].

2.2.3 Cooperative principles

In most circumstances, the assumption of cooperation is so pervasive that it can be stated as a cooperative principle of conversation and elaborated in four sub-principles, called maxims [31, p.37]. Grice [19] proposes that in ordinary conversation, speakers and hearers share a cooperative principle. The cooperative principle is a principle of conversation stating that participants expect that each will make a “conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange”.

2.2.4 Conversational implicatures

Conversational implicatures refer to the implications which can be deduced from the form of an utterance, on the basis of certain co-operative principles which govern the efficiency and normal acceptability of conversations, as when the sentence “there’s some chalk on the floor” is taken to mean you ought to pick it up [37].

A: Did the Minister attend the meeting and sign the agreement?

B: The Minister attended the meeting [14, p.350]

We can represent the structure of what was said, with b (= attend the meeting) and c (= sign the agreement) as in (2). Using the symbol +> for an implicature, we can also represent the additional conveyed meaning.

1. A: b &c?

B: b (+> not c)

2.2.5 Types of conversational implicatures

2.2.5.1 Generalized conversational implicature

When no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called a generalized conversational implicatures [31, p.41].

One common example in English involves any phrase with an indefinite article of the type “a/an X”, such as “a garden” and “a child” as in (4). These phrases are typically interpreted according to the generalized conversational implicature that: an X +> not speaker’s X.

1. I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence.[31, p.41]

The implicatures in (4), that the garden and the child mentioned are not speaker’s, are calculated on the principle that if the speaker was capable of being more specific, then he/she would have said “my garden” and “my child”.

Scalar implicatures

Certain information is always communicated by choosing a word which expresses one value from the scale of values. This is particularly obvious in terms for expressing quantity, as shown in the scale below, where terms are listed from the highest to the lowest value.

< All, most, many, some, few >

<Always, often, sometimes >

2. I’m studying linguistics and I’ve completed some of the required courses [31, p.41].

By choosing “some” in (5), the speaker creates an implicature (+> not all). Given the definition of scalar implicature, it should follow that, in saying “some of the required courses”, the speaker also creates other implicatures (for example, +> not most, +> not many).

2.2.5.2. Particularized conversational implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is an implicature where some assumed knowledge is required in very specific contexts during a conversation [31, p.42].

Let us imagine this scene in which a husband and wife are reading in the kitchen while their dinner is cooking:

3. Wife: Do you want to test the potatoes?

Husband: Can I just finish this sentence?

Wife: Of course.

The question is not met with something that looks like an answer. Here the second question is presumably intended to mean that the husband will check the potatoes once he has finished his sentence. It implies a positive answer to the question [17, p.29].

In summary, a conversational implicature is an implicature that is drawn in accordance with pragmatic principles such as the cooperative principle rather than being inferred from the meaning of a lexical item or a sentence structure.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research approach

In order to reach the goal of the study, the researcher uses descriptive method to analyze the data and to obtain a more holistic picture what goes in a particular situation or setting, and then describes the finding as to answer her questions.

3.2 Data and source of data

The data of this study are the utterances which contain conversational implicatures expressed by Jack and Rose in Titanic film, when they are talking to each other.

3.3 Sampling

3.4 Data collection

3.5 Data analysis

Firstly, the researcher classifies the types of conversational implicatures produced by the speakers by using Grice's theory of implicature. Secondly, she categorizes those utterances containing

conversational implicatures into their categories. Thirdly, she gives the explanation to work out conversational implicatures and the reason why the main characters made the conversational implicatures. Finally, the researcher does the analysis by referring to both the transcript and the film so as to find out whether or not the listener understood the speaker's speech.

3.6 Validity and Reliability

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Findings and discussion on conversational implicatures

In this section, the researcher presents the types of conversational implicatures as found, namely the generalized and particularized ones.

Table 4.1: Types of conversational implicatures

No	SPEAKER	TYPES OF C. I			
		G.C.I		P.C. I	
		Number	%	Number	%
1	JACK	19	37,3	32	62,7
2	ROSE	12	25,5	35	74,5
	TOTAL	31	32,3	67	67,7

Two types of C.I are arisen in utterances by each main character. Jack produced both 19 generalized and 32 particularized

conversational implicatures. To follow, Rose produced 12 generalized and 35 particularized ones.

Table 4.2: Number and percentage of conversational implicatures by each type

No	Types of C. I	Number	Percentage (%)
1	P. C. I	67	68.4
2	G. C. I	31	31.6
	Total	98	100

From the data collected, the researcher has found the total of 98 implicatures. Between the two types, generalized and particularized conversational implicature, the latter takes a bigger percentage. It means 67 out of the 98 implicatures are particularized ones. Then, when it comes to the other type, 31 out of the 98 implicatures are found. The fact is that 68.4% of the implicatures was particularized conversational implicatures while generalized ones occupied 31.6%. It can be seen that particularized conversational implicatures are produced more frequently.

4.1.1 Conversational implicature and types of Conversational implicature

4.1.1.1 Generalized conversational implicature (G.C.I)

From the study, the researcher also recognizes that indefinite article of 'a/an' could be interpreted according to generalized conversational implicature not only from the formula an X +> not

speaker's X. Next, we know that 'a/an' in English indicates number, namely one, therefore it certainly implicates +> only one. Then, she also finds that one single utterance can have two same types of conversational implicatures, which are generalized conversational implicatures. Finally, the researcher found that there were 5 utterances that could not apply the theory of G.C.I as proposed by Yule (1996).

1. Scene V: in Rose's suite

Setting: Jack and Rose are in her suit.

Situation: Rose unlocks the safe and removes the necklace, then holds it out to Jack who takes it nervously.

JACK: *Huh, that's nice (191)! what is it (192)? A sapphire (193)?*

ROSE: *A diamond (194). A very rare diamond (195).*

Utterance (193) – implicature (75, 76)

It is clear for us to interpret the above implicature because it does not need any specific knowledge and it is not context dependent. Jack in utterance (193) certainly implicates +> not my sapphia. Then “a” in the same utterance which indicates number, namely one certainly implicates +> only one sapphia.

3. Scene I: boat deck- night

Setting: Jack sees the tear tracks on Rose's cheeks in the faint glow from the stern running lights.

Situation: Jack tries to persuade Rose not to do so.

ROSE: *what? (27)*

JACK: *Well, they have some of the coldest winters around, and I grew up there, near Chippewa Falls (28). Once when I was a kid me and my father were ice-fishing out on Lake Wissota... (29). ice-fishing's ... (30)*

Utterance (28) – implicature (10)

When producing this utterance, a speaker selects the word from the scale which is the most informative and truthful in the circumstances. By choosing “some” in (28), the speaker creates an implicature (+> not all). This is one scalar implicature of uttering (28). It is a kind of G.C.I.

4.1.1.2 Particularized conversational implicature (P.C.I)

On the study, the researcher found out 67 P.C.I. When getting the intended meaning of those utterances, we need to have specific information about the context or shared background knowledge to interpret what have been said by the two main characters. Furthermore, in addition to shared background knowledge, findings of this study also show that we also need cultural schemata in order to really infer the speaker's intended meaning.

6. Scene I: boat deck- night

Setting: Rose looks down. The reality factor of what she is doing is sinking in.

Situation: Jack tries to rescue Rose

ROSE: *You're crazy. (42)*

JACK: *That's what everybody says (43). But with all due respect, Miss, I'm not the one hanging off the back of a ship (44). Come on (45). Give me your hand (46). You don't want to do this.*

Utterance (44) – implicature (23)

Supposed that anyone who hangs off the buck of a ship when it is moving is considered to be crazy. Jack conveys that +> you are crazy. Since specific knowledge is needed to calculate the implicature, P.C.I certainly works here.

7. Scene IV: on Titanic - day

Setting: Titanic steams toward US.

Situation: Jack hears Rose’s voice behind him. She is looking for him.

ROSE: *Hello, Jack. (169). I changed my mind (170).*

Fabrizio said you might be up—(171)

JACK: *Sssshh. Come here (172)... Close your eyes. (173)*

JACK: *Okay (174). Open them. (175)*

ROSE: *I'm flying! (176)*

JACK: *Come Josephine in my flying machine... (177)*

Utterance (177) – implicature (72)

We must have the knowledge that the song “Come Josephine in my flying machine” was written in the early days of the airplane. The light-hearted song tells of a young man courting his girl by "flying machine". In the context, Jack puts his hands on her waist to steady her and starts singing this song softly, he certainly implicates +> you are my love. Since specific knowledge is needed to calculate the C.I, it is certainly P.C.I.

4.1.1.3 Generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature

The findings show that one single utterance can have more than one type of implicature. Furthermore, the researcher also found that one single utterance could have three implicatures at the same time. In this case, it consists of two G.C.I and one P.C.I.

14. Scene II: Boat deck - day

Setting: Jack and Rose are in the boat deck. She sits on a deck chair and opens the sketchbook.

Situation: Rose looks up from the drawings which is a celebration of the human condition.

ROSE: well, **you have a gift, Jack** (139). You do (140). You see people (141).

JACK: see you (142).

Utterance (139) – implicature (58, 59, 60)

For this implicature, we do not need any context to infer what is said by the speaker. Utterance (139) will convey a generalized conversational implicature if we apply the theory of generalized conversational implicature where an X +> not speaker's X Therefore, the utterance (139) implicates +> not my gift. Then "a" in the same utterance which indicates number, namely one certainly implicates +> only one gift.

Based on the context above, we should have an assumed knowledge that everyone is jealous because they wish they had what somebody has. Thus, Rose implicatures+> I wish I had your gift. This meaning comes from context and special knowledge, so it is a particularized conversational implicature.

4.2 Reasons for producing conversational implicature

Table 4.3: Reasons for Producing Conversational Implicatures.

C. I	Reasons	(No)	(%)
G.C.I	To be sarcastic	5	16.1
	To change the topic	3	9.7
	To show the feelings	7	22.6
	To clarify the idea	11	35.5
	To stress the statement	5	16.1
		31	100
C. I	Reasons	(No)	(%)
P.C.I	To confuse somebody	5	5.7
	To get attention	4	4.5
	To be polite	3	3.4
	To be sarcastic	11	12.5
	To change the topic	7	8.0
	To show the feelings	24	27.2
	To clarify the idea	15	17.0
	To stress the statement	17	19.4
	To save time	2	2.3
	Total		88

4.2.1 Reasons for producing generalized conversational implicature

17. Scene II: Boat deck – day

Setting: Jack and Rose walk side by side in the boat deck.

Situation: He feels out of place in his rough clothes. They are both awkward, for different reasons.

JACK: *It's a simple question (84). Do you love the guy or not?*

ROSE: *This is not a suitable conversation (86).*

Utterance (86) – implicature (38)

In utterance (86) “a” is indicating speaker’s X, therefore, it implicates +> this is not her suitable conversation. Therefore, Rose really wants to change the topic.

4.2.2 Reasons for producing particularized conversational implicature.

20. Scene II: Boat deck – night.

Setting: Jack sees Rose climb over the railing.

Situation: Rose is going to jump into the sea to suicide. Jack tries to persuade Rose not to do so.

ROSE: *What do you mean no I won't? (9) Don't presume to tell me what I will and will not do. (10). You don't know me. (11)*

JACK: *You would have done it already (12).*

Utterance (12) – implicature (4)

Jack does not give a clear statement. He just wants to confuse Rose so that Rose does not think of what she is going to do. And then by offering his hand to Rose and trying to close to her step by step, he really wants to her to take his hand.

21. Scene II: Boat deck – night.

Setting: Jack sees Rose climb over the railing.

Situation: Rose is going to jump into the sea. Jack tries to persuade Rose not to do so.

ROSE: *You're crazy. (42)*

JACK: *That's what everybody says (43). But with all due respect, Miss, I'm not the one hanging off the back of a ship (44). Come on. (45) Give me your hand (46). You don't want to do this.*

Utterance (44) – implicature (23)

Supposed that anyone who hangs off the buck of a ship when it is moving is considered to be crazy. Jack conveys that +> you are crazy. In this implicature, Jack really wants to give his sarcastic comment to Rose, who is doing a very crazy action.

4.3 Effects of making conversational implicature.

In spoken interaction, it is also useful if speakers are good communicators, who are good at saying and conveying what they want in a way that the listeners find understandable. And the listeners have to be cooperative and have contributions or message which can be understood so that the communication successes.

Table 4.4: Effects of producing conversational implicatures

Understanding		Misunderstanding		Total	
No	%	No	%	No	%
95	96.9	3	3.1	98	100

4.3.1 The understanding of conversational implicature.

Verbal communications with conversation implicatures can be successful when the meaning conveyed by the speaker is recovered as a result of the hearer's inference.

25. Scene V: In Rose's suite.

Setting: Jack and Rose are in her suit decorated with beautiful woodwork and satin upholstery.

Situation: Rose hands him a dime and steps back, parting the kimono. The blue stone lies on her creamy breast. Her heart is pounding as she slowly lowers the robe.

ROSE: *So serious!* (208). *I believe you are blushing, Mr. Big Artiste.* (209). *I can't imagine Monsieur Monet blushing* (210).

JACK: *Because he does landscapes* (211). *Just relax your face*

Utterance (210) – implicature (85)

In this situation, Rose delivers a statement but Jack responds by giving a reason as if he answered a “why” question. It seems that there is something irrelevant. However, Jack absolutely understand that Rose implicates +> “Why are you so blushing?” when she uttered “I can't imagine Monsieur Monet blushing”. That is why he responds to her statement by using “Because he does landscapes”. Both speaker and hearer understand the implicit meaning. It is an evidence to show that the communication does not break down.

4.3.2 The misunderstanding of conversational implicature.

Using C.I, the speaker assumes that the hearer knows that the words should not be taken at the face value and he should infer the

implicit meaning conveyed. However, sometimes the hearer does not recognize the implicature of the saying – he misunderstands it, which may lead to the breakdown of the communication.

29. Scene II: Boat deck – day.

Setting: Jack and Rose are in the boat deck.

Situation: Rose looked at Jack's sketchbook.

ROSE: **You liked this woman** (126). You used her several times. (127)

JACK: Well, **She had beautiful hands** (128). You see (129)

ROSE: I think you must have had a love affair with her... (130)

JACK: **No, no! Just with her hands** (131). She was a one-legged prostitute. (132)

Utterance (126) – implicature (51)

In this scene, Rose looked at a draw of a woman in Jack's sketchbook and she said that Jack liked that woman. Actually, Rose had difference assumption about the word “like”. In the context she gives a small smile to Jack, she implicates +> you love her. However, Jack had another perception of the word “like”. He told her that he only admired the woman's hand only, which expressed in utterance (131). Obviously, Jack made an interpretive error. In other words, he misunderstood her implicature, which may cause the communication to break down.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Firstly, findings from the data collected, the researcher has found the total of 98 implicatures. Between the two types: G.C.I and P.C.I, the latter takes a bigger percentage. It means 67 out of the 98 implicatures are particularized ones. Then, when it comes to the other type, 31 out of the 98 implicatures are found. The findings of this study also revealed that both generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature are identified in the conversations done by Jack and Rose, the two main characters in the film *Titanic*.

Next, the fact is that 68.4% of the implicatures was particularized conversational implicatures while generalized ones occupied 31.6%. It can be seen that particularized conversational implicatures are produced more frequently. The researcher can also conclude that between the two implicatures, generalized and particularized, the latter is the more difficult one. The reasons are, firstly clear understanding of the context should be clearly derived so that proper understanding of the implied meaning can be achieved. Secondly, the difficulty in interpreting the intended meaning of the utterances, namely those on P.C.I is doubled by the fact that they are very much context dependent and that they may related to culture, particularly that of England or America. Therefore, shared background knowledge and cultural schemata are essential. After that, the researcher's findings confirm the claim of Yule (1996, P.42) that most of the time, our conversations take place in very specific

context in which locally recognized inferences are assumed. Such inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings which result from particularized conversational implicature. Surprisingly, the researcher found that generalized conversational implicature was produced less although the use of scalar terms and indefinite article of “a/an” are frequently used in our daily conversation.

Then, this study also reveals significant finding that may contribute to the theory of implicature and its applications in as much as it will be useful for further reference. Firstly, the study reveals that one single utterance can produce three implicatures in two types of C.I at the same time. It means it licenses both a generalized and a particularized conversational implicature. Lastly, the theory of an indefinite article of the type “a/an X”, which is typically interpreted according to the G.C.I that: an X +> not speaker's X, cannot be generalized in this study since it can be interpreted otherwise, namely as the speaker's X. In line with this particular finding, as for future references, extra care should be made when applying this theory since it has been proven by this study that an X +> not speaker's X is not generally applicable.

Last but not least, in terms of the reasons for producing conversational implicatures, from the results of the analysis of the six scenes in the *Titanic* film, the researcher found out that there are some reasons for Jack and Rose to produce conversational implicatures. There are five reasons why the main characters produced generalized conversational implicatures while particularized conversational implicatures have nine reasons to happen. Among them, the most frequent reason used for producing

particularized conversational implicatures is to show the feelings while the reason to clarify the idea takes the biggest portion in generalized ones. In comparison with the reasons for conversational implicatures by Cao Xuan Hao, the researcher found out 5 more reasons for conversational implicatures. Conversational implicatures are produced to show the feelings, to stress the statement, to change the topic, to get attention, to clarify the idea and to save time.

Finally, those findings prove that implicature is used as an effective tool of communication. In majority (96.9%), verbal communications with conversation implicatures are successful when the meaning conveyed by the speaker is recovered as a result of the hearer's inference. The communication was successful even though conversational implicatures were produced. Only 3.1% of the total number of the conversational implicatures caused misunderstanding. This means that the hearers always manage interaction so that meanings are successful exchanged with others.

5.2 Implications

C.I is a very effective tool of communication, so it is very important for ESL teachers to focus on not only the explicit meaning but also the implicit meanings while teaching English. The study contributed a source of conversational implicatures to the learners of English. With a highly recognition of C.I, communicative participants might prove the accuracy and efficiency of information exchanged. The researcher hopes that the learners can get the higher awareness and understanding of predicting the conveyed meaning

when communicating so that meanings are successful exchanged with others.

5.3 Limitation and suggestions for further study

This study is done within the scope of discourse analysis and pragmatics. The researcher only analyzes the two main characters' conversations (Jack and Rose) in the film Titanic to find out their conversational implicatures. In other words, the utterances by other characters are not analyzed. The researcher uses Grice's theory of C.I as the basis of the analysis of the study.

The researcher hopes that this study will contribute some useful information to Vietnamese users of English in understanding implicatures. For a suggestion, further research can also be done in order to generalize these findings so that some contributions, both the practical and theoretical ones, can be proposed. Besides, this study can be elaborated for another research such as by combining with the theory of Politeness strategy, Speech Act, Cross culture, Gender, or Humor.