

Disubmit: 3 September 2025 Direvisi: 18 September 2025 Diterima: 1 Desember 2025

CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN “UPGRADED” MOVIE

Suryany Tanjung Abady^{1*}, Yulius Kurniawan^{2*}, Endar Rachmawaty Linuwih^{3*}

Widya Kartika University, Surabaya, Indonesia

*Correspondence Author: Suryany Tanjung Abady, E-mail: -

Abstract

Effective communication is an essential aspect in the workplace to ensure that implied meanings are well understood and potential misunderstandings are reduced. This study aims to identify the types of non-observance maxims, how the non-observance maxim occurs, and the types of conversational implicatures in the dialogues of the main character in the *Upgraded* movie, which is set in a workplace context. The analysis of conversational implicature is based on Grice's theory, while the classification of non-observance maxim refers to Thomas's theory. This research employs a descriptive qualitative method, with the data collected by watching the movie and transcribing utterances containing conversational implicatures. The validity of the data was strengthened through triangulation. The findings reveal that conversational implicatures emerge through various forms of maxim non-observance, including 13 instances of flouting the maxim of quality, 2 maxim of quantity, 4 maxim of relevance, 2 maxim of manner, and 5 instances of violating the maxim of quality. In addition, the study identified 19 particularized conversational implicatures and 7 generalized conversational implicatures. These findings indicate that maxim non-observance is not merely a form of deviation but also a communication strategy that helps construct conversational implicatures, thereby providing new insights into workplace communication patterns.

Keywords: *Conversational Implicature, Non-observance Maxim, Upgraded movie.*

Abstrak

Komunikasi efektif merupakan salah satu aspek penting di tempat kerja agar makna implisit dapat dipahami dengan baik serta meminimalkan terjadinya kesalahpahaman. Penelitian ini bertujuan mengidentifikasi jenis-jenis *non-observance maxims*, cara terjadinya pelanggaran, serta jenis-jenis implikatur percakapan pada dialog tokoh utama dalam film *Upgraded* yang berlatar tempat kerja. Analisis implikatur percakapan menggunakan teori Grice, sedangkan klasifikasi pelanggaran maksim mengacu pada teori Thomas. Penelitian ini menerapkan metode deskriptif kualitatif dengan teknik pengumpulan data melalui menonton film dan transkripsi tuturan yang mengandung implikatur percakapan. Validitas data diperkuat dengan teknik triangulasi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa implikatur percakapan muncul melalui berbagai bentuk pelanggaran maksim, yakni 13 kali pelanggaran maksim kualitas, 2 kali kuantitas, 4 kali relevansi, 2 kali cara, serta 5 kali pelanggaran kualitas berupa pelanggaran. Selain itu, penelitian ini juga menemukan 19 implikatur percakapan khusus (*particularized*) dan 7 implikatur percakapan umum (*generalized*). Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa pelanggaran maksim bukan sekadar bentuk penyimpangan, tetapi juga strategi komunikasi yang

membantu membangun implikatur percakapan sehingga dapat memberikan pemahaman baru mengenai pola komunikasi di lingkungan kerja.

Keywords: Implikatur percakapan, Pelanggaran Maxim, Upgraded movie.

INTRODUCTION

Effective communication is essential for a productive and collaborative workplace, as poor communication can lead to conflicts, misunderstandings, and failure to achieve organizational goals. Language, as a fundamental tool for human interaction, not only conveys information, thoughts, and emotions but also often carries implicit meanings that depend on shared understanding between speakers and listeners. A survey by Fierce, Inc. involving over 1,400 professionals found that 86% of respondents consider ineffective communication the main cause of workplace failure (Fierce, Inc., 2011). According to Leech (1983), context the background knowledge assumed by both interlocutors is crucial for interpreting the intended meaning of utterances. Therefore, grasping both explicit and implicit meanings is vital for professionals to reduce misunderstandings and enhance interaction effectiveness.

In linguistics, pragmatics examines how meaning is understood within specific contexts, going beyond the literal words used by a speaker (Brown & Yule, 1996). A key idea in pragmatics is implicature, which refers to meanings that are suggested rather than directly stated. Implicature plays an important role in everyday communication, helping speakers convey subtle messages through tone, context, or shared knowledge, while maintaining politeness, expressing emotions, and addressing sensitive topics. In films, dialogue often uses implicature to develop characters and move the story forward. The romantic comedy *Upgraded* (Young, 2024) illustrates this, telling the story of Ana Santos, an intern who pretends to be a company director to impress William and navigate professional and social situations. Her actions create both challenges and opportunities, leading to personal growth and career advancement. The film offers rich material for studying conversational implicature, as the characters frequently rely on indirect language to manage relationships, express hidden intentions, and handle complex social interactions, providing insight into the unspoken aspects of communication that shape the narrative.

Several studies have examined conversational implicature in films, highlighting different types of implicature and maxim violations. Yunia Nirsita (2019) analyzed *Aladdin*, identifying five types of maxim violations flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending and two types of implicature: generalized and particularized, concluding that violations occurred because characters often responded indirectly or excessively. Sayyid, Junianto, Rizky, and Tesalonika (2020), in their study of *Beauty and the Beast*, found both generalized and particularized implicature, with generalized being most frequent, and reported violations of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, with quantity most commonly breached. Siti, M. Bahri, and Ririn (2022) examined *A Star is Born*, focusing on identifying implicatures without analyzing maxim violations, which limited the depth of their study.

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that examines the relationship between language and its users in context. Unlike semantics, which focuses on literal meanings, pragmatics investigates how context shapes interpretation. Yule (1996) defines pragmatics as the study of speaker meaning, emphasizing “what people mean by what they say” rather than the words alone. This field helps explain how listeners infer intended meanings that go beyond literal utterances. A

key aspect of pragmatics is the role of context, which includes background knowledge and situational factors influencing interpretation. Context can be physical, linguistic, or social. Without context, utterances can be misunderstood or lose their intended meaning (Yule, 1996). Horn (2006) highlights the inferential nature of pragmatics, noting that communication requires listeners to interpret meaning based on assumptions, shared knowledge, and relevance. This process allows understanding of indirect speech, politeness strategies, and conversational implicatures. For example, when someone says, "There's someone at the door," they may imply that the listener should open it. The literal sentence alone does not convey this intention; understanding relies on context and shared assumptions. Pragmatics enables such interpretations, making communication more nuanced and effective. In this study, pragmatics provides a framework for analyzing film dialogues. By examining how characters use language in context, the research aims to uncover implied meanings, indirect communication, and the role of conversational principles, offering insight into how language reflects intention, social roles, and unspoken cues understood by listeners.

Grice (1989, p. 26) introduced the Cooperative Principle as a basis for effective communication, emphasizing that participants should contribute appropriately according to the purpose and direction of the conversation. To operationalize this principle, he proposed four conversational maxims: quantity (provide sufficient but not excessive information), quality (speak truthfully and with evidence), relevance (maintain topical focus), and manner (communicate clearly and orderly). These maxims function as flexible guidelines rather than strict rules, guiding interlocutors toward cooperative and comprehensible exchanges.

Implicature, as introduced by Grice (1989), refers to the additional meaning a speaker conveys beyond the literal words of an utterance, relying on the listener's understanding of shared conversational norms (Grundy, 2008). This allows hearers to infer meanings not explicitly stated, such as interpreting "I've got an exam tomorrow" as a refusal to attend a party (Yule, 1996). Grice distinguishes between conventional implicature, which carries a fixed meaning independent of context, and conversational implicature, which depends on situational factors (Thomas, 1995). Conversational implicature can be generalized, understood automatically from the expression itself, or particularized, requiring context-specific knowledge, as when a comment about a dog's happiness hints it may have eaten missing food. This concept highlights that communication relies on both language and context to convey subtle, implied meanings (Levinson, 1983).

Despite extensive research on implicature, there remains a gap in understanding its role in workplace communication, particularly in professional interactions where indirect messages are used to manage relationships, express criticism, or navigate sensitive situations. Addressing this gap, the present study aims to analyze communication strategies in professional settings, focusing on the non-observance of the cooperative principle that gives rise to implicatures, in order to provide insights into how professionals employ indirect language to convey complex or sensitive messages tactfully and effectively.

METHODS

In this study, the researcher applied a descriptive qualitative method to analyze the utterances of the two main characters (Ana Santos and Claire Dupont) in the *Upgraded* movie. Creswell (2023) explains that descriptive qualitative research involves staying close to the data, minimizing interpretation, and presenting findings in straightforward language. Likewise, Marendah et al. (2023, p. 22) define qualitative research as descriptive and focused on

interpreting meaning from observed phenomena, shaped by the researcher's analytical sensitivity. Based on this approach, the researcher conducted descriptive analysis to display the data clearly and systematically, providing an account of the phenomenon's characteristics without attempting to establish causal relationships.

The data for this study were taken from the Upgraded movie directed by Carlson Young 2024. The researcher collected the data from Prime Video application and its English subtitle transcript from www.opensubtitles.org. The researcher downloaded the English subtitle transcript to maintain the accuracy of the movie's dialogues. This decision also simplified the analysis process by reducing potential transcription errors and ensuring reliable representation of the characters' utterance. Furthermore, the researcher classified the data based on categories of conversational implicature and non-observance of maxims to analyze the dialogues in the Upgraded movie.

The data collection involved downloading the Upgraded movie from Prime Video and retrieving its English subtitle transcript from www.opensubtitles.org. The transcript was then revised by adding character names and validated through repeated viewings of the film to ensure accuracy. At the same time, to ensure transcript accuracy, the researcher employed analyst triangulation following Patton's (2015, p. 962) framework. Two lecturers from the English Department served as data validators and were provided with a dataset and validation form. After the data were validated, the researcher selected Ana and Claire's utterances that illustrated non-observance of maxims and conversational implicature.

The data analysis followed three main steps. The researcher first identified dialogues that indicated non-observance of the cooperative principle and analyzed the conversational implicatures of the main characters (Ana Santos and Claire Dupont) with reference to Grice (1989) and Thomas (1995). The findings were then categorized in a table to classify the types of non-observance maxim and conversational implicature. Finally, the results were summarized to highlight the patterns of non-observance and implicature in the Upgraded movie.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis, the researcher identified conversational implicatures in the Upgraded movie. The findings and discussion of this study are primarily concerned with the cooperative principle in conversational implicature and the non-observance of maxims. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Type of Conversational Implicature and the Non-Observance Maxims Found in "Upgraded" Movie.

Number	Types of Conversational Implicature	The non-observance	Maxims	Time played in the movie
1	Particularized	Violating	Quality	00:07:04,416 --> 00:07:10,125
2	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	00:07:10,208 --> 00:07:11,666
3	Particularized	Violating	Quality	00:07:13,166 --> 00:07:15,708
4	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	00:07:15,791 --> 00:07:27,250
5	Generalized	Flouting	Quality	00:07:27,333 --> 00:07:47,041
6	Generalized	Flouting	Quality	00:07:41,666 --> 00:07:47,041
7	Particularized	Flouting	Manner	00:08:19,625 --> 00:08:30,708
8	Generalized	Flouting	Quantity	00:10:00,333 --> 00:10:06,101

9	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	00:11:07,375 --> 00:11:21,833
10	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	00:11:24,083 --> 00:11:27,208
11	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	00:12:54,958 --> 00:13:02,583
12	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	00:13:02,666 --> 00:13:10,041
13	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	00:13:10,125 --> 00:13:15,791
14	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	00:41:16,625 --> 00:41:27,500
15	Particularized	Flouting	Quantity	00:35:48,416 --> 00:35:53,041
16	Generalized	Violating	Quality	00:47:08,958 --> 00:47:20,375
17	Particularized	Violating	Quality	00:47:38,666 --> 00:47:47,750
18	Generalized	Flouting	Relevance	00:59:06,625 --> 00:59:14,166
19	Generalized	Flouting	Relevance	00:59:29,750 --> 00:59:38,583
20	Particularized	Flouting	Relevance	00:20:53,791 --> 00:21:03,666
21	Particularized	Flouting	Manner	00:12:02,250 --> 00:12:19,875
22	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	01:00:19,750 --> 01:00:27,833
23	Particularized	Flouting	Relevance	01:00:27,916 --> 01:00:34,458
24	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	01:17:50,958 --> 01:18:18,666
25	Particularized	Violating	Quality	01:18:18,750 --> 01:18:34,416
26	Particularized	Flouting	Quality	01:18:51,666 --> 01:18:55,958

a) Flouting Maxim of Quality

Data 1

Scene : 00:07:10,208 --> 00:07:11,666

Situation: Claire checks the employees' appearance before the auction begins.

Claire : What's that massive oil spill on the back of your shirt?

Ana : It's nothing.

Claire : *Are you implying I'm hallucinating?*

Ana : Um, it must've happened on the train.

In this scene, Claire's utterance, "Are you implying I'm hallucinating?" is an example of flouting the maxim of quality, where she deliberately disregards the principle of truthfulness. Through this statement, Claire indirectly expresses her doubt toward Ana's previous remark, "It's nothing." In reality, Claire clearly sees a large oil stain on the back of Ana's shirt. Claire's utterance is not a genuine question but rather a form of sarcasm to show her disbelief toward Ana. This flouting of the maxim of quality occurs because Ana was not honest in responding to Claire's question. Despite the clear evidence of the stain on her shirt, Ana insisted that it was nothing. In response, Claire uses a rhetorical question to emphasize that Ana is trying to hide something obvious. Claire's utterance falls under particularized conversational implicature, as the intended meaning relies heavily on the specific context of the situation. The implied meaning is that the stain does exist and cannot be denied. This implicature is context-specific and cannot be fully understood without knowing the situation in which Ana attempted to deny an obvious fact.

Data 2

Scene : 00:07:27,333 --> 00:07:47,041

Situation: Claire checks the employees' appearance before the auction begins.

Claire : Oh, you, short, weird girl, give her your jacket. *The stain's depressing me.* Just cover it up.

Amy : Course.

Claire : You two will be in charge of something where you're less visible.

Suzette: All right, let's go. You heard her.

In the scene from data 5 and 6, Claire's utterance, "Oh, you, short, weird girl, give her your jacket. The stain's depressing me. Just cover it up," exemplifies flouting the maxim of quality. Claire refers to Amy's tattoo as a "stain," even though she knows it is permanent. By deliberately saying something contrary to reality, she violates the maxim of quality. Her statement is delivered sarcastically to express her dislike of Amy's tattoo without stating it outright. This flouting occurs because Claire uses a derogatory term ("stain") to convey her disapproval of Amy's appearance, specifically the visible tattoo. Instead of directly expressing her dislike, she commands that the tattoo be covered, claiming that its presence "depresses" her. In this way, Claire intentionally breaches the maxim of quality to communicate her message indirectly through sarcasm. Claire's utterance represents a generalized conversational implicature because the meaning can be widely understood without requiring very specific conversational context. In everyday communication, calling something a "stain" is enough to convey a negative impression. Thus, listeners can infer that Claire disapproves of or dislikes the tattoo, even without knowing the full background of her relationship with Amy.

b) Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Data 1

Scene : 00:10:00,333 --> 00:10:06,101

The situation during the auction, Ana forced to talk to Claire because she found a problem.

Renee : What do you think you're doing?

Ana : *I need to talk to Claire*, there's been a mistake.

In data 8, Ana's utterance "I need to talk to Claire, there's been a mistake" reflects a flouting of the maxim of quantity. Ana provided limited information to Renee by merely mentioning that a mistake had occurred, without specifying the details. This flouting occurred because Ana was in an urgent situation and did not have time to offer a full explanation. Her utterance falls under generalized conversational implicature, as its implied meaning can be generally understood without requiring highly specific conversational context. In urgent situations, a brief statement like "there's been a mistake" is sufficient to convey that the speaker's actions are important and necessary.

Data 2

Scene : 00:35:48,416 --> 00:35:53,041

Claire prepares for Rome while explaining Ana's job description while in London.

Claire : Also, remind her about the tickets.

Ana : Tickets. Tickets for what?

Claire : *She will know*.

In data 15, Claire's utterance "She will know" is categorized as a flouting of the maxim of quantity. Claire provided limited information to Ana regarding the tickets in question. When Ana asked, "Tickets for what?", Claire did not provide further clarification and merely stated that Suzette would understand. This flouting of the maxim of quantity occurred because Claire

should have supplied additional information to enable Ana to follow the instruction clearly, such as specifying the type or purpose of the tickets. By giving such a brief response, Claire forced Ana to interpret the unstated meaning herself. Claire's utterance falls under particularized conversational implicature because its implied meaning can only be understood by considering the specific context of the conversation. In this case, Claire implied that Suzette was already aware of the ticket issue, even though Ana was not. This demonstrates that in certain interactions, speakers may rely on shared knowledge or situational context to convey messages without explicitly stating all details.

c) Flouting Maxim of Relevance

Data 1

Scene : 00:59:06,625 --> 00:59:14,166

The situation when Claire just returned from Rome

Renee : Foul. Claire!

Suzette: You're here.

Claire : *Thank you for stating the obvious.*

In the conversation in data 18, Claire's utterance, "Thank you for stating the obvious," is an example of flouting the maxim of relevance. Claire gives a response that is not directly relevant to Suzette's statement, "You're here." Instead of responding cooperatively to the greeting or continuing the conversation about her arrival from Rome, Claire makes a sarcastic comment that deviates from the main topic. The utterance does not provide a relevant answer but is used to mock and express displeasure toward Suzette's remark. This flouting of the maxim of relevance occurs because Claire considers Suzette's statement to contribute nothing meaningful to the conversation. Claire's presence is already obvious and visible, making Suzette's comment seem unnecessary or redundant. Although it occurs within a specific conversational context, Claire's utterance is an example of generalized conversational implicature because its implicit meaning can be widely understood. The implicature conveyed is that Claire perceives Suzette's remark as uninformative and even bothersome.

Data 2

Scene : 01:00:27,916 --> 01:00:34,458

The situation where Gerard offers help but Claire refuses

Gerard : Oh, my God. When can we move past that?

Claire : How about when I take over and move you out of the company?

In the conversation in data 23, Claire's utterance, "How about when I take over and move you out of the company?" is an example of flouting, or disregarding, the maxim of relevance. Instead of responding cooperatively or giving an answer that aligns with Gerard's intention to make peace, Claire diverts the conversation with a threat to remove Gerard from the company. This flouting occurs because Claire still harbors resentment toward Gerard, who previously stole her client. When Gerard attempts to close the conflict by suggesting they move past the issue, Claire does not respond appropriately; instead, she brings up past disputes and signals her unwillingness to reconcile. Claire's utterance is an example of particularized conversational implicature, as its implied meaning can only be understood by knowing the background of the conflict between Claire and Gerard. The implication of this statement is that Claire has no intention of forgiving Gerard and even plans to retaliate by ousting him from the company.

d) Flouting Maxim of Manner

Data 1

Scene : 00:08:19,625 --> 00:08:30,708

The situation when the auction will start

Ana : Did she just...

Amy : Yes. She just implied. that we suck a lot of...

Claire : *Ta-ta-ta-ta-ta-ta-ta. Back at your desks.*

In the scene in data 7, Claire's utterance, "Ta-ta-ta-ta-ta-ta. Back at your desks," is an example of flouting maxim of manner. Instead of giving instructions clearly and directly, Claire uses a repetitive and ambiguous expression, deviating from the cooperative principle related to clarity and order in communication. The implicature arises because Claire wants to assert her authority without openly reprimanding Ana and Amy. At that moment, both characters are standing and chatting near the auction area, which is inappropriate in a formal setting. Claire interrupts their conversation with a performative utterance to control the situation and guide her subordinates' behavior without giving a direct command. This utterance is an example of particularized conversational implicature, as its meaning can only be understood within the specific conversational context. In this scene, "ta ta ta ta ta ta ta" functions to stop Amy's commentary and direct Ana and Amy back to their desks, serving as a subtle reprimand to maintain the proper atmosphere of the auction.

Data 2

Scene : 00:12:02,250 --> 00:12:19,875

The situation where Claire is looking for someone who has made a mistake in the catalog.

Claire : What's your name?

Billy : Uh, Buh... Buh... Uh, Buh...

Claire : *Bobby? Bronson? Blake? Blair? Basil? Benedict?*

Billy : Billy. Yeah. Billy.

In the conversation in data 21, Claire's utterance, "Bobby? Bronson? Blake? Blair? Basil? Benedict?" is an example of a violation of the maxim of manner. Claire deliberately mentions a series of names unnecessarily and inefficiently, even though she already knows or can easily guess that the intended person's name is "Billy." This maxim violation occurs because Claire feels angry about a mistake in the auction product materials. When Billy, the staff member likely responsible for the error, nervously tries to say his name, Claire responds by listing several other names. Instead of helping Billy, she uses the opportunity to verbally embarrass him. This utterance falls under particularized conversational implicature because its implied meaning can only be understood in the context of the specific conversation. The series of names mentioned by Claire expresses her frustration and highlights Billy's unprofessionalism, serving as indirect mockery and a display of anger.

e) Violating Maxim of Quality

Data 1

Scene : 00:07:04,416 --> 00:07:10,125

The situation when Claire checked her appearance before the auction, Claire found a stain on Ana's clothes.

Claire : What's that massive oil spill on the back of your shirt?

Ana : *It's nothing.*

In this conversation, Ana Santos' statement, "It's nothing," is an example of a violation of the maxim of quality. The utterance contradicts reality, as Claire clearly points out a large stain on the back of Ana's shirt, referring to it as a "big oil spill." By denying the stain, Ana deliberately provides information that is not factual. Instead of directly acknowledging the stain, she downplays it by saying, "It's nothing." This response shows Ana's attempt to withhold the truth, possibly to divert Claire's attention or avoid reprimand. Claire, in turn, notices the discrepancy between Ana's words and reality, indicating a lack of sincerity in Ana's reply. Ana's utterance falls under particularized conversational implicature because its implied meaning can only be understood by referring to the visual and situational context. The implication of this statement is that Ana is aware of the stain but chooses to minimize it and try to avoid trouble.

Data 2

Scene : 00:47:08,958 --> 00:47:20,375

The situation when Ana was at Catherine's party, Suzette called to give her a Job

Suzette: Where are you? Are you at a party?

Ana : Uh, no. Um, I'm not. I'm at the hotel. The one you booked at... The one you booked me at is, um, right next to a bar.

In the conversation in data 16, Ana deliberately violates the maxim of quality by providing false information. Although she says, "Uh, no. Um, I'm not. I'm at the hotel," in reality, she is attending Catherine's party. This statement is not a mistake or misunderstanding, but a conscious strategy to deceive her superior and avoid negative consequences. This violation of the maxim of quality generates implicature, as the listener must interpret the implied meaning behind the misleading information. Ana chooses to give a false yet plausible answer due to situational pressure, as Claire had emphasized that she should focus on work matters in London, so Ana wants to avoid reprimand. Ana's utterance falls under generalized conversational implicature, because the implied meaning can be understood through general assumptions without requiring highly specific contextual details. By saying, "I'm at the hotel... right next to a bar," Ana subtly misleads about her actual location. Although she does not explicitly admit to being at the party, the structure of her statement allows Suzette to infer that she is still at the hotel as instructed. The implication of this statement demonstrates Ana's effort to conceal the truth in a manner that still appears reasonable and socially acceptable.

Based on the findings, there were a total of 26 instances of non-observance of Grice's cooperative principle as well as occurrences of conversational implicatures in the dialogues of the movie *Upgraded*. The most frequent type was flouting the maxim of quality with 13 cases. This indicates that the characters often conveyed meaning indirectly, such as through sarcasm, hyperbole, or irony, rather than delivering information explicitly. In addition, the study recorded 4 instances of flouting the maxim of relevance, 2 instances of flouting the maxim of quantity, and 2 instances of flouting the maxim of manner. Furthermore, there were 5 cases categorized as violations of the maxim of quality, in which the characters provided statements inconsistent with reality without showing clear signals of non-cooperation. Interestingly, other forms of non-observance such as infringing, opting out, and suspending were not found in the data. With regard to conversational implicatures, the findings revealed that 7 cases could be classified as generalized conversational implicatures, in which the intended meaning could be understood without relying heavily on the conversational context. Meanwhile, 19 other cases were

categorized as particularized conversational implicatures, which required specific situational contexts to be interpreted accurately. The dominance of particularized implicatures highlights that most indirect communication among the characters in the film strongly depended on the context of interaction, especially within the workplace setting and social relationships. Overall, these results provide a clear illustration of how indirectness and implied meanings operate in *Upgraded*, emphasizing the crucial role of context in interpreting utterances.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the utterances produced by the main characters in the *Upgraded* movie, it can be concluded that the form of communication that occurs in the workplace is predominantly implicit. The characters tend to employ indirect strategies in delivering their intentions, so that the actual meaning is not expressed explicitly but rather conveyed through conversational implicature. Thus, understanding the meaning does not solely depend on the literal words spoken, but also on the conversational context and the shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. This communication pattern demonstrates that the use of implicature becomes one of the ways to convey messages while maintaining harmonious interaction.

Furthermore, the use of implicit language in workplace conversations can also be understood as a strategy to uphold professionalism. In a professional setting, speakers attempt to deliver criticism, sarcasm, or rejection in a more subtle manner in order to avoid offending the interlocutor, as exemplified by the characters Claire and Ana. This aligns with the purpose of communication in the workplace, which is not only to convey information but also to build good social relations, maintain authority, and create a conducive working atmosphere. In other words, the conversational implicatures in the *Upgraded* movie represent a practice of professional communication that emphasizes a balance between message delivery and the preservation of social relationships.

REFERENCES

- Akmal, S., & Yana, D. U. (2020). Conversational implicature analysis in Kingdom of Heaven movie script by William Monahan. *Buletin Al-Turas*.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, P. (2008). *Doing pragmatics* (3rd ed.). Hodder Education.
- Horn, L. R., & Ward, G. (Eds.). (2004). *The handbook of pragmatics*. Blackwell.
- Izah, Y. N. A. (2019). *Conversational implicature analysis in "Aladdin" movie* (Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang).
- Khairunas, S., Sidauruk, J., Pratama, R. M. D., & Natalia, T. O. M. D. (2020). Conversational Implicature in Beauty and Beast Movie Directed by Bill Condon. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*.

- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principle of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University.
- Ratnaningtyas, E. M., Ramli, R., Syafruddin, S., Saputra, E., Suliwati, D., Nugroho, B. T. A.,
Karimuddin, K., Aminy, M. H., Saputra, N., Khaidir, K., & Jahja, A. S. (2023). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Yayasan Penerbit Muhammad Zaini.
- Rhamadani, S. N. F., Arifin, M. B., & Setyowati, R. (2022). The Study of Conversational Implicature in A Star Is Born Movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University.