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Abstract
This study was aimed at finding analysis of conversational implicature in a drama “the bear” by Anton Chekhov and its application in English language teaching. This research was conducted in a descriptive qualitative method. The source of data is a script of drama, The sampling technique used was purposive for the sample is chosen based on a certain purpose to reach the objective of this research. The data analyzed based on the theory’s Grace (1975), Yule (2005), Levinson (1992), Jacob L. Mey (1998) and Paltridge (2000). And then each Extract was analyzed based on Types and functions of conversational implicature. After that, the real data are displayed using table and particular. Here, the researcher analyzed several applications of conversational implicature in drama. In analyzing the data the researcher finds the idea from the drama that can be used for improving speaking the students in English language teaching. Based on the analysis, the outcome of this study indicated that all Grice’s proposed conversational implicatures applied to the drama entitled “The Bear”. 28 utterances are consisting of 9 types of generalized conversational implicature, 5 types of particularized conversational implicature, 2 functions of self-protections, 6 functions of power and politeness, 3 functions of giving information, 1 function of entertain the audience and 2 functions of lack specific information. The study was enriching the knowledge of conversational implicature for the teachers and students who should be able to improve speaking skill in teaching-learning activity.
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Abstrak
Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menemukan Analisis Implikatur Percakapan dalam Drama "The Bear" oleh Anton Chekhov dan Penerapannya dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris ". Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Sumber data adalah skrip drama, Teknik pengambilan sampel yang digunakan adalah purposive karena sampel dipilih berdasarkan tujuan tertentu untuk mencapai tujuan penelitian ini. Analisis data dilakukan berdasarkan pada teori Grace (1975), Yule (2005), Levinson (1992), Jacob L. Mey (1998) dan Paltridge (2000). Dan kemudian setiap Ekstrak dianalisis berdasarkan Jenis dan fungsi implikatur percakapan. Setelah itu, data nyata ditampilkan menggunakan tabel dan khusus. Di sini, peneliti menganalisis beberapa aplikasi implikatur percakapan dalam drama. Dalam menganalisis data, peneliti menemukan ide dari drama yang dapat digunakan untuk meningkatkan berbicara siswa dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris. Berdasarkan analisis, hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa semua implikatur percakapan yang diasulkan Grice dapat diterapkan pada drama yang berjudul " Beruang". Ada 28 ucapan yang terdiri dari 9 jenis implikasi percakapan umum, 5 jenis implikatur percakapan partikular, 2 fungsi perlindungan diri, 6 fungsi kekuasaan dan kesopanan, 3 fungsi memberikan informasi, 1 fungsi menghibur penonton dan 2 fungsi kekurangan informasi spesifik. Penelitian ini memperkaya pengetahuan implikatur percakapan untuk guru dan siswa yang harus dapat meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara dalam kegiatan belajar-mengajar.

Kata Kunci: Implikatur Percakapan, Drama, Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris
INTRODUCTION

People needed to communicate with each other every day using conversations. Levinson (1983: 284) says that, conversation as the familiar kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking in which generally occurs outside specific institutional settings. The conversation has occurred when people communicated and interacted between one and each other. In doing communication sometimes People might cause a mistake. Surely when communicating with each other, the speaker's tend not to express the meaning of utterance explicitly, it means that the speaker's utterance needs to be further interpreted by people. It is called conversational implicature in pragmatics area.

Grace implies that conversational implicature can be defined as "A different pragmatic meaning of an utterance concerning the literal meaning expressed by utterance" Mey (1998, p. 371). For example, Ann said "John doesn’t seem to have money these days” and Bob answered, “He has been visiting various tourism places lately”. In this conversation, Bob's answer does not directly express what he means. Thus, although Bob simply states a fact about John’s activity in the previous days, Bob likely intended for Ann to understand that John has spent so much money on his tour lately, therefore he has no money.

Those conversations often happen in our daily life because it is usually used by people to give a reason. In this case, what Bob says is not literal meaning but, it is an implicit meaning. The contextual factor needs to be taken into account when we want to understand conversational implicature. Grace (1975), as cited in Buton (1994), propose that in order to deduce conversational implicature precisely, the speaker and the hearer must share knowledge which includes the utterance form which the implicature is to be interpreted; the role and expectations of the participants in a conversation; the context of the conversation; and the world around them connected to their interaction. According to Jung (2002), the process involving inferring is based on a set of rational and the cooperative principle, which all participants in the conversation that are expected to observe for successful communication. Therefore, implicature refers to a preposition implied by utterance in a context even though it is non-part, not the entailment of what said" (Gazdar in Muvida: 2015).

Leech and Short (1981: 290) say that in order to understand an utterance with a certain context, it is important to recognize its pragmatic interpretation. Relating to this statement, the philosopher Grice (in Cook, 1997: 29) states that conversation proceeds according to a principle, known and applied by all human beings. Using this assumption, combined with general knowledge of the world, the addressee can reason from the literal, semantic meaning of what is said to the pragmatic meaning. The understanding of such utterance in the pragmatic context is called implicature.

In order to interpret the utterance containing implicature, Grice proposed what he described as a cooperative principle. According to this principle, we interpret language on the assumption that its sender is obeying four maxims, namely: the maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. Those maxims are the explicitness of the cooperative principle underlying the efficient cooperative use of language. Using maxim we assume that the meaning of the conversation which seems to violate or does
not proceed according to the participant's specifications or doesn't seem to conform to cooperative principle has a deeper level.

Yule (1996a: 37) says that it is important to recognize the maxim as unstated assumptions in conversation. The maxims specify what the participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, and cooperative way. They should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly, while providing sufficient information.

After talking about a conversation with its maxims and context, now the researcher is going to talk about the conversation in drama in particular. The language in daily conversation which is so real and natural is also found in drama or play. Drama which belongs to fiction or literary work is a portrait of real life, so the dialogue, the imitation of speech, also reflects the real form of communication. In this case, Pratt commented that the belief that literature is formally and functionally distinct from other kinds of utterances and the concomitant belief that literature is linguistically autonomous is not valid anymore. It then becomes necessary to consider literary discourse in terms of its similarities to our other verbal activities rather than in terms of its differences from them (1977: xii). It means that drama as literary text can be studied by means of linguistic approach, i.e. pragmatic approach.

Several studies concern with the conversational implicature, have been conducted by some researchers, there are three previous studies about implicature, i.e. the first convey is in the title “An Analysis of Conversational Implicature of Native And Non-Native Guest In CNN Interview Script” By M. Solikhun Huda, University of Muria Kudus (2013), he focused on conversational implicature, cooperative principle and flouting maxim. The second is entitled “Conversational Implicature on Chinese Talk Show Based on Cooperative Principle” by Wang Ling, Wuhan University of Technology China (2010), this present study specifically focused on types of conversational implicature including generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature and its function on the Chew talk show. The third study done by AsrorulNurMuvida University of SunanKalijaga Yogyakarta (2015) on the title “The Conversational Implicature that Is Used by the Three Main Characters in the Hotel Transylvania Movie” this research focused on types of conversational implicature including generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature, types of conversational implicature of the character’s utterances and he identified the maxim that used in the utterances.

Referring to the previous of some studies above, those are focused only on an analyse the conversational implicature in scope of media entertains and society, in that case, this research will bridge the gap of the researcher which is focused on the conversational implicature in different aspect that is in drama and its application in language teaching.

Relating to language teaching, drama or play can be used as the motivating material for it exposes students to complex themes and unexpected use of language. This is because drama, like other literary text, is very rich in multiple levels of meaning. By encouraging students to grapple with the multiple ambiguities of drama text, it is expected that the teacher is helping to develop the student's overall capacity to infer meaning. This very useful skill can then be transferred to other situations where students used to make an interpretation based on implicit/ unstated evidence.

A play or drama can, in turn, be a source of classroom activity in improving student's oral skill. Getting the students to act out an extract from a play will be a
useful activity which can be conducted to achieve that goal.

Seeing all the facts mentioned above, the researcher considers that it is appropriate to take an analysis of drama and its application to teaching speaking.

LITERATURE OF REVIEW
Some Points in Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader) (Lestari, 2013). This type of research necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speakers organized what they want to say with whom they are talking to, where, when and under what circumstance.

Pragmatics is dealing with semantics study whether both of them is a study about meaning. Mey (2001, p. 24) stated that pragmatics is related to the context of society in using their language in communication. While, Yule (2006, p.112) clarify that "the study of what speakers mean, or speaker meaning, is called pragmatics". He also said that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning which analyses the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. So that, from some of these descriptions the researcher is capable of summing up that pragmatics is one of the studies about meaning in language process that used to communicate between societies. It makes the hearers can interfere in understanding or interpret what the speaker intends.

Implicature

Implicature is systematically studied utterances by which the speaker means something more than, or different from, what the sentence she/he used means in itself (Numesi, 2013: 129). See example 1,

Alan: Are you going to Paul's party?
Alice: I have to work.

Alice’s answer above implicated that she is not going. Alice’s answer here is an implicature. The differences between saying and implicating affects whether meaning something one does not believe is a lie. If Alice knew she did not have to work, then she was lying in dialogue. If she knew she was going to Paul's party, she might be guilty of misleading Alan, but not of lying. This sample of implicature is said to be conversational. Implicature is not part of the conventional meaning of the sentence uttered but depends on features of the conversational context. A key feature was the question Alan asked. Had he asked What are you going to do today?, Alice could have implicated something completely different—I am going to work—by saying the same thing.

Conversational Implicature

Grice’s theory of implicature has started the concept of maxims. The maxims are the explicitness of a principle known as the cooperative principle. A principle that is required to account for pragmatic interpretations, saying: “Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.” Grice divides Cooperative principle into four basic conversational maxims, namely the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner, and maxim of relation.

Types of Conversational Implicature

There are two types of conversational implicature those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature which will be explained in the following point.

Generalized conversational implicature

Generalized conversational implicature is type in which the interlocutors do not require special knowledge to know the
meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is a general conversation that makes an interlocutor directly understand the meaning of the conversation (Grice, 1975 cited in Saragi, 2011). As an example of generalized conversational implicature, Grice suggests the use of a/an X, which carries the implicature that X is only remotely related in a certain way to some person indicated by the context. When someone says “John is meeting a woman this evening”, he certainly means that is, conversationally implicates “The woman John is meeting this evening is not his mother, his sister or his wife”.

**Particularized Conversational Implicature**

Particularized conversational implicature is a type in which the interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature. Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during conversation is called particularized conversational implicature. As an illustration, consider an example where Lara's response does not appear on the surface to adhere to relevance. It is simply a relevant answer would be "yes" or "no".

Carol: Are you coming to the party tonight?
Lara: I've got an exam tomorrow.

(Adopted from Yule, 2006, p. 131)

In order to make Lara’s response relevant, Carol has to draw on some assumed knowledge that Lara will be spending that evening with his parents, consequently, he is not at the party.

**Function of Implicatures**

The function of implicature, as listed by Brown and Levinson (1978) is to create a sense of humor and politeness and Micheal (1967: 51) uses language to convey some information. While Channel (1994:194) explored below in English Communication Used listed such as lack of knowledge and/or vocabulary and self-protection.

**Drama**

The word drama comes from the Greek verb “dran”, means “to perform”. In simple senses drama means a story in dialogue performed by actors on a stage before an audience (Pickering, 1997: 1113). At the beginning, the drama was practiced as a religious and cultural event of the ancient Greek community. It was held annually in the spring festival to honor Dionysus, a Greek nature god associated with spring, fertility, and wine at an open-air amphitheater built on a hillside. Some of the ancient Greek theaters were enormous and held about fifteen thousand people.

Drama as one of the genres in literature besides prose and poetry has its own uniqueness. It is written not primarily to be read but to be represented on stage by actors to entertain the audience. In achieving those goals, drama involve some supporting elements, such as audience, myth, action, stage, division, and dialogue.

**The Bear by Anton Chekov**

The Bear is a comedy play. It has two main characters. Popova and Smirnov. Popova is a young lady whose husband is dead, but she is still mourning at his death. She does not leave the house and meet anyone and she is wearing a black dress to prove that she loves her husband even after seven years of his death. Although he was so unkind and faithless to her yet she is and will be true to him forever. Her servant, Luka, is reassuring and telling her that she is young and should forget her dead husband now. He says there are many good people around and she should get married again but she is so attached to her husband's memories that she does not agree with him.
A young man, named Smirnov, comes to Popova to get his debt back that Popova’s husband had borrowed from him because he used to buy oats for his horse, Toby. He tells Luka that he wants to see Popova but she refuses to see him. He pushes his way in and sits in the drawing-room. Luka goes to tell Popova that the devil has come in forcibly. Popova sees Smirnov and tells him that she is in a state of mind that she cannot pay attention to money matters. She also says that he will get his money when her steward comes back from town, but Smirnov says that he wants the money now because he has to pay the interest and if he does not do that the creditors will take his estate and give him a hard time. At this Popova says that since she does not have money at the moment, she cannot pay.

Smirnov becomes angry because he has been calling on his debtors, but none of them has paid him and here he is met by Popova in a state of mind. This really annoys Smirnov and he says, “Madam, you have buried yourself within the four walls of your house; but you haven’t forgotten to powdered your face yet." Smirnov behaves awkwardly and rudely and says, “You cannot get around me with your dimpled cheeks and weeds. I have refused twelve women and nine have refused me. I have fought duels three times on account of women.” He calls all women insincere, selfish, faithless, and trivial to the marrow of their backbone.

Popova also calls him a bear three times. This leads both of them to a fight, which may decide whether only men need to pay for their insults or women must also pay, as they want emancipation. Luka becomes afraid and goes to call gardener and other servants to stop these people from fighting. Popova brings pistols, but she does not know how to fire. Smirnov teaches her. The process of asking for debt and Popova’s stylish attitude makes him fall in love with her. He madly loves her like a student. Popova also begins to like him. Instead of fighting, they are drawn close to each other. When Luka, returns with the gardener and other servants, he finds both of them in happy union and Popova says, “Tell them in the stables that Toby is not to have any oats at all today.”

The Bear is a farce. The boisterous situations make it a complete farce. It is a direct criticism on the hypocrisy of the people of Russian society that how their states of mind change and how they behave differently from their actual nature.

The Application Conversational Implicature in Language Teaching

The definition of speaking

To most people, mastering the art of speaking is the single most important aspect of learning a second or foreign language, and success is measured in terms of the ability to carry out a conversation in the language. Widdowson (1996: 59) defines speaking into two definitions. The first is that speaking is simply the physical embodiment of the abstract system in the usage sense involve the manifestation of the phonological system or of the grammatical system of language or both. And the second id that speaking is active or productive and makes use of the aural medium. Furthermore, Lewis and Hill (1993: 54) say that speaking is a process that covers many things in addition to the pronunciation of individual sounds. It also covers pronunciation stress and intonation. From the definition above, it can be concluded that speaking is a process in which the speakers expresses their idea to the listeners. When the speakers speak, they produce utterances with the specific pronunciation of individual sounds.

The importance of speaking

Ranson (2000) argues for „pedagogy of voice” which enables children and young people to explore self and identity, develop self-understanding and self-respect and
improve agency, capability, and potential. Studies suggest that when young people are listened to, involved in meaningful decision-making processes and supported in expressing their views, they are more likely to feel confident in speaking up when issues of bullying and harassment occur. They are also more likely to have developed a range of skills, strategies, and behaviors that assist them in managing difficult or challenging situations. A language is a tool for communication. We communicate with others, to express our ideas, and to know others’ ideas as well. Communication takes place, where there is speech. Without speech, we cannot communicate with one another. The importance of speaking skill hence is enormous for the learners of any language. Without speech, a language is reduced to a mere script. The use of language is an activity which takes place within the confines of our community. We use language in a variety of situations. People at their workplaces, i.e. researchers working either in a medical laboratory or in a language laboratory, are supposed to speak correctly and effectively in order to communicate well with one another. Any gap in communication results in misunderstandings and problems. For a smooth running of any system, the speakers of a language need to be especially and purposefully trained in the skill of speaking. In order to become a well-rounded communicator one needs to be proficient in each of the four language skills viz., listening, speaking, reading and writing, but the ability to speak skillfully provides the speaker with several distinct advantages. The capacity to express one's thoughts, opinions, and feelings, in the form of words put together in a meaningful way, provides the speaker with the advantages. The joy of sharing one’s ideas with others is immense. When we speak to others we come to have a better understanding of our own selves, as Robert Frost once said: I am a writer of books in retrospect, I talk in order to understand, I teach in order to learn. Undoubtedly, clarity in speech reflects clear thinking. An effective speaker can gain the attention of the audience and hold it until the completion of his message. Speaking skills are important for career success, but certainly not limited to one's professional aspirations. Speaking skills can also enhance one’s personal life.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

**Research Design**

In conducting this research, the researcher uses the descriptive qualitative method. This research is qualitative because the data are in the form of words and are analyzed based on the natural setting or context. Qualitative research is a kind of research in which the data are studied naturally without treatments or the researcher’s intervention.

About descriptive research, Allison et al (1996: 14) state, "Descriptive research sets out to seek accurate and adequate descriptions of activities, objects, processes, and persons". The descriptive method applied here deals with the verbal description, not numerical description. It is suitable with the objective of this research, that is, to describe pragmatic phenomena particularly implicature in the conversation of the drama entitled The Bear by Anton Chekhov.

Considering that this research is descriptive-qualitative, so it doesn't use the hypothesis of the problem statements is usually applied in a quantitative method. The underlying theories discussed in the previous chapter have the function as the basis and sufficient information used by the researcher to analyze the utterances containing conversational implicature.

**Research Object**

In this study, the researcher takes
literature as the subject of her research. Relating to this subject, M. Atar Semi (1993: 18) points out that literary research is “usaha pencarian pengetahuan dan pemberi maknan dengan hati-hati dan kritis secara terus menerus terhadap masalah sastra”. Here, literary research can be viewed as an effort to seek knowledge and to interpret critically and continuously toward literature phenomena. Since literary work itself is too broad and has some genres, the researcher focuses on the subject of this study mainly on the play. The researcher is going to analyze a drama entitled The Bear by Anton Chekhov. The drama is going to be analyzed by using the pragmatic approach in order to understand the phenomena in conversation.

Data Collection

Data collecting method employed in this study was observation. The researcher got the data, from the dialogues containing conversational implicatures after the process of reading the play intensively. The underlying theory about conversational implicatures itself is used as the source of information in getting the relevant data. Besides that, the instrument was observation. Seliger and Shohamy (in Haryanti, 2001: 73) say that observation is one of a family of procedures used to collect data in qualitative research. Observations have always been considered a major data collecting tool in qualitative research. The observation is focused on the reading activity and making a note of the data together with its context situation.

Table 3.1 Field Notes Types of Implicature

| No  | Type of Conversational Implicature                      | Utterance | Meaning |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1.  | Generalized conversational implicature                 |           |         |
| 2.  | Particularized conversational implicature              |           |         |

Table 3.2 Field Notes Function of Implicature

| No  | Function of Implicature                      | Utterance | Meaning |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1.  | Self-protection                              |           |         |
| 2.  | Power and politeness                         |           |         |
| 3.  | To give information                          |           |         |
| 4.  | To entertain the audience                    |           |         |
| 5.  | Lack of specific information                 |           |         |

Data Analysis

The data which categorized types and functions of conversational implicature was analyzed according to Grice (1975), Yule (2005), Levinson's (1992), Jacob. L Mey (1998) and Patridge (2000) theory was described based on the situation and context of the utterances. After that, she analyses those data, types, and their functions then the researcher discusses it by explaining some data which have the same functions, something different from the previous research shows the example in chapter three. Finally, the researcher makes some conclusions from the result of the analysis.

Research Validity

In qualitative method, validity refers to the “trustworthiness” (Erlandson et al., 1993 in Creswell, 1994: 157) of a study, or “how research findings match reality” (Merriam, 1998: 201), and “can be applied to other situations” (Merriam, 1998: 207). Regarding the finding match the reality, design of the present study is qualitative, the
To promote credibility, there are some of the techniques commonly used in a qualitative, i.e. triangulation, member checks, long-term observation, peer examination, participatory or collaborative modes of research, and researcher’s biases, thick description, typicality or modal category, and multisite designs (Merriam, 1998; Cresswell, 1998; see also Alwasilah, 2000: 170-185). Among other strategies mentioned, the present study uses the following techniques:

**Persistent observation.** Persistent observation means that gathering data at the research site without involving observer at the same time. In this case, the observations are conducting more than once to find out their patterns.

**Long term-observation.** In this study, the observation is initiating by preliminary observation on September up to October 2018, which is intending to identify whether the occurrences of conversational implicature significant to study. The formal observations were conducted after the focus of the research vividly determine, that is on November up to December 2018.

**Member Checking.** It means that taking the data and interpretation by checking them from which the data are deriving and asked if the results are deceptive. In this study, the participants are asking to make sure that the transcription is valid based on the data record. In interpreting stance, the participants are asking to check whether the data transcriptions are base language or embedded language. For this, the researcher and the participants have the same perception of determining the utterances.

### RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

#### Research Findings

This study was analyzed the conversational implicature were found in the drama "The Bear" by Anton Chekhov, in answer to the research question. As the starting point for commencing the analysis, the writer identifies the conversational implicature used in the drama, this identification concerns with the type of conversational implicature and function of conversational implicature based on the theory of Grice (1975), Yule (2005), Levinson’s (1992), Jacob. L Mey (1998) and Paltridge (2000). After selecting the date. The writer analyzed the conversational implicature of the drama “the Bear” by Anton Chekhov. The data were analyzed based on the types of conversational implicature and its functions as follow:

#### Type of Conversational Implicature

Classifying the types of Conversational Implicature used by Chekhov in his drama, "The Bear" By Anthon Chekhov in this study, the categorization of Conversational implicature proposed by Yule (2006) Grice (1975), Peccei (1999) and Levinson (1992) is used. Those categories are Generalized Conversational Implicature and Particularized Conversational Implicature.

| No | Type of Conversational Implicature | Utterance | Meaning | Extract |
|----|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|
| 1. | Generalized conversational implicature | My love will last as long as I do, right to my last heartbeat | Tell to her husband she always squires her husband until her husband has died | Extract #1 |
|    |                                   | Why can’t they just leave me alone | She didn’t want to be disturbed by someone | Extract #2 |
| Extract#3 | And I’m afraid I need the money today | Its sentence explained to the reader which Popova have to pay up the debt today |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Extract#4 | I don’t have any cash on me today | She explained to Smirnoff that she can’t pay up the debt at today |
| Extract#5 | It is exactly seven months today that my husband died, and I’m in a sad mood. I’m in no condition to talk about money | It’s not a good time to talk about money. |
| Extract#6 | You’ll have your money the day after tomorrow | It’s explained to the Smirnoff that Popova will pay up at tomorrow |
| Extract#7 | final word | The final word means that it’s the decision of conversation |
| Extract#8 | Why are you always so down in the dumps | He always unlucky when he comes to take off the debt of someone |
| Extract#9 | I might as well hang myself by the day after tomorrow. | Smirnoff didn’t get it the money today he will die |
| Extract#10 | you little pig | It means that Popova’s Husband as a coward |
| Extract#11 | I’ll lose my shirt! | It means that if Popova didn't pay up the debt Smirnoff will lose his work |
| Extract#12 | You’re not in a stable! | Stable, it's not mean a house of animals but it means Popova's House. |
| Extract#13 | You haven't the faintest idea of how to behave in a lady's presence | tell Smirnoff to talked with the woman have to polite and smooth |
| Extract#14 | Well...Bow, click my heels, fall in love, suffer, sigh in the moonlight, freeze up, melt into puddles – I did it all | While Smirnoff expression the beauty of woman |

2. Particularized conversational implicature
| No  | Function of Implicature | Utterance | Meaning                                                                 | Extract |
|-----|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1.  | Self-protection         | My love will last as long as I do, right to my last heartbeat | Tell to her husband she always squires her husband until her husband has died | Extract #15 |
|     |                         | I’ll lose my shirt! | It means that if Popova didn’t pay up the debt Smirnoff will lose his work | Extract #16 |
|     |                         | you little pig | It means that Popova’s husband as a coward | Extract #17 |
|     |                         | Why can’t they just leave me alone | She didn’t want to disturb by someone at the time | Extract #18 |
|     |                         | And I’m afraid I need the money today. | It’s sentence explained to the reader which Popova have to pay up the debt today | Extract #20 |
|     |                         | final word | Final word means that it’s the decision of conversation | Extract #19 |
|     |                         | I might as well hang myself by the day after tomorrow. | Smirnoff didn’t get it the money today he will die | Extract #21 |
|     |                         | You’re not in a stable! | it’s not mean the house of animals but it means Popova’s House. | Extract #22 |
| 2.  | Power and politeness    | I don’t have any cash on me today | She explained to Smirnoff that she can’t pay up the debt at today | Extract #25 |
|     |                         | It is exactly seven months today that my husband died, and I’m in a sad mood. I’m in no condition to talk about money | It’s not good time to talk about money | Extract #24 |
|     |                         | You’ll have your money the day after tomorrow | It’s explained to the Smirnoff that Popova will pay up at tomorrow | Extract #23 |
| 3.  | To give information     | Well…Bow, click my heels, fall in love, suffer, sigh in the moonlight, freeze up, melt into puddles – I did it all. | He always unlucky when he comes to take of the debt of someone | Extract #26 |
| 4.  | To entertain the audience | Why are you always so down in the dumps | He always unlucky when he comes to take of the debt of someone | Extract #27 |
Discussion

After presenting and analyzing the data in the previous findings, in this section, the researcher explains the discussion which is aimed to provide rich descriptions of the research problems that have been formulated in chapter one.

From the research findings which has answered the research questions, there are two types of conversational implicature on Drama “The Bear” By Anton Chekhov, those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. Relate to the focus of the research, those kinds of conversational implicature consist of 9 (nine) generalized conversational implicature and 5 (five) particularized conversational implicature. And then those kind function of conversational implicature 2 (two) Self-Protection, 6 (Six) Power and Politeness, 3 (three) to give information, 1 (one) To entertain the Audience, and 2 (two) Lack of Specific Information.

In this research, the finding shows that generalized conversational implicature dominated the data because it is used in daily conversation and also people do not need specific knowledge to interpret. Particularized conversational implicature depends on the context of their meaning and only used when Popova and Smirnoff difficult to identify what is being referred to from the situational context. It is consequently used when the speakers do not want to utter the sentences or do not see the importance in the context of the informal conversation (Aristiawan, 2018). It seems that participants focus on the point being made so that a specific utterance for the concept is not important.

The researcher argues there are five functions used in the conversation of Drama “The Bear” By Anton Chekhov. Those are, informing, self-protection, power, and politeness, entertaining (create a sense of humor), and lack of specific information. The functions in expressing implicature can be seen on how the speaker utters the sentence. Each category of utterances with implicature might have a different function in influencing the use of implicature utterances although it has the same category. It can be seen in datum four and five, they have the same category of generalized conversational implicature but they have a different function. In datum two, the speaker using implicature to information, while in datum three the speaker protects her-self.

From the analysis in finding points, the researchers found that all particularized conversational implicature is functioned as violating Grice’s maxims. In this case, the finding has proved Levinson’s (1992: 126) theory which stated that the most exploitation or flouting maxims can be categorized as particularized conversational implicature because this type of conversational implicature depends on particular features of the context. Therefore, hearers in the conversation of particularized conversational implicature must observe the cooperative principle on the very deeper level because they do not know what speaker means by the utterance. Particularized conversational implicature can be seen in Extract 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 and for particularized conversational implicature can be seen on extract 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. While for function of self-protection can be seen on extract 15 and 16, function of power and politeness can be seen on extract 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, while for function of to give information can be
seen on extract 23, 24, and 25, also function of to entertain the audience can be seen on extract 26, and the last for function of lack specific information can be seen on extract 27, and 28. It happened because the main reasons of implicature in the utterance depend on text and context. From all the finding and discussion above, the researcher shows that generalized conversational implicature is always dominated by the data as found by most of the previous studies. But, some different results are also found in this present study that the speaker has their own purpose in uttering an implicature as listed by the researcher in five functions of implicature.

Related to teaching English, this research would help students to know about figures of speech – how they are expressed in a certain context of the situation. Referring to the theory of implicature, the students will know that conversation is more than series of exchange; it consists of exchanges which are interpreted according to norms of conversational cooperation, which can be manipulated to create a wide range of meaning. This knowledge, then, can be transferred to other situations where students need to make an interpretation. As a teacher, we should make a lesson plan in teaching. The lesson plan is like as a direction for the teacher in teaching the material to the student. The lesson plan also gives them much information about the method, technique, sources, and media are used in the teaching-learning process. There are several steps in teaching speaking to the students in senior high school. The steps are written in the procedure in the lesson plan as follows:

Before starting the lesson, the teacher asks students for praying together. Then the teacher greets the students first, by saying Assalamu’alaikum wr.wb. After that, the teacher greets the students once more by saying good morning students, how are you today? Then, the teacher checks the students” presence by calling name by name. After that, the teacher gives two questions: Have you ever have a conflict between your friends? And what kinds of things can cause between your friends? What can bring you closer to each other? Then, the students are asked to discuss in pairs. After that, the teacher gives an explanation of the material. To help the students to understand the relation to the text they are going to discuss next.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher concludes that two types of conversational implicature can be found on Drama “The Bear” By Anon Chekhov; those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature based on the theory in chapter two. Generalized conversational implicature dominated the data because it is usually used in daily conversation. While there are five functions of conversational implicature that have been found in the drama “The Bear” By Anton Chekhov those are Self-Protection, Power and Politeness, Give Information, Entertain the Audience, and the last is lack of Specific Information. From all of the function of conversational implicature, the most dominant was Power and politeness and the minimum function was to entertain the audience. The conversational implicature helped the teacher in process teaching and learning especially in teaching speaking.
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