

Implicature in Emily in Paris Season 1 from the Perspective of Relevance Theory

* Luh Putu Krissiana Permata Dewi, I Nyoman Suparwa, I Gusti Ayu Gde Sosiowati

Master Program in Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities, Udayana University, Jl. Pulau Nias No. 13, Dauh Puri Klod, Kec. Denpasar Barat, Kota Denpasar, Bali 80114, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author e-mail: krissianapermata@gmail.com

Received: December 2024; Revised: March 2025; Published: March 2025

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the utterances of the characters in the Emily In Paris season one series. Implicatures in the utterances are analyzed using the relevance approach as proposed by Sperber and Wilson. This study is a qualitative study. Data were collected using the observation and note-taking method. The data source used in this study was the dialogue from the Emily in Paris series. This study will use informal methods in presenting the results of data analysis. The results showed that in this series, the utterances of the characters in it contain various implicatures or implicit meanings, namely related to the differences in working hours culture between Emily and her co-workers, differences in clothing preferences between Emily and her boss, differences in perspectives on an advertisement between Emily and her co-workers, acceptance of a new culture between Emily and her co-workers, rejection of a new culture between Emily and her boss, Emily's comments on other people, namely Pierre Cadault, and Pierre Cadault's comments on himself. The implicatures of these utterances can be understood because of the relevance that connects the knowledge possessed by the speaker with the interlocutor about what is being said.

Keywords: Implicature; Relevance Theory; Emily in Paris

How to Cite: Dewi, L. P. K. P., Suparwa, I. N., & Sosiowati, I. G. A. G. (2025). Implicature in Emily in Paris Season 1 from the Perspective of Relevance Theory. *International Journal of Linguistics and Indigenous Culture*, 3(1), 11-23. <https://doi.org/10.36312/ijlic.v3i1.2504>



<https://doi.org/10.36312/ijlic.v3i1.2504>

Copyright© 2025, Dewi et al
This is an open-access article under the CC-BY-SA License.



INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, communication and information technology allows people to easily access entertainment shows. These shows can be in the form of vlogs, talk shows, reality shows, drama series, or films. The ease of access makes interesting entertainment shows very quickly famous in society and get a very large number of viewers. One of the shows that gained popularity among the public is the Emily in Paris series, the first season of which aired on October 2, 2020. The popularity of this series can be seen from the number of viewers and nominations it has received. Reported from the harpersbazaar.com page, Emily in Paris was watched by more than

58 million households worldwide in 2020. In the Netflix release, this series became the most watched show in 2022 (Bond, 2024).

Emily in Paris series presents various utterances that are not only informative but also contain implicit meanings that depend on the context of the conversation. The character utterances' meaning can be examined using the relevance theory in order to understand how the audience perceives the message being conveyed. However, there is still not much research that specifically analyzes the implicature of the utterance contained in the series by using relevance theory approach. This study will reveal more deeply how the interpretation of the characters' utterances based on relevance theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson.

Emily in Paris is a romantic comedy drama that raises many issues of adaptation in a new environment and job. The main characters are cheerful, open to new things, and willing to learn, making this series inspiring to many people. Of the many intention and meaning contained in messages conveyed in this series, many of them are conveyed implicitly in the utterances spoken by the characters in it. These utterances contain contextual implicatures and are interesting to be examined further. In order to understand the implicatures contained in the series, a study using relevance theory will be very helpful in interpreting the utterances. Furthermore, as a communication medium, this series has a big impact on its audiences, whether socially, culturally and psychologically. Therefore, it is important to understand how characters' speech in the film reflects reality and is influenced by various contexts as in the real world.

Several previous studies examined objects with different methods and results. Research conducted by Xu and Zhou (2013) examined advertisements and their interpretation using relevance theory. Advertisements used as objects include Maybelline cosmetic advertisements. This descriptive research used a case study method. The results showed that relevance theory is needed in advertising to create effectiveness, ensure that messages are delivered, attract attention, and produce the desired impact. Another study conducted by Majeed (2022) examined news interpretation in Iraq, such as Iraqiya, MBC Iraq, and UTV Iraq using relevance theory. The method used is descriptive analysis. The results showed that human language is a form of communication driven by reasoning. English news translation is a form of interpersonal communication. This emphasized that news interpretation can be explained through relevance theory. Wu's (2024) conducted a research on electronic product advertisements that also uses relevance theory. The method used is qualitative descriptive analysis. The results showed that the cognitive considerations of the target audience, as studied in relevance theory, can be used to optimize the relevance, effectiveness, interest, and purchasing decisions of viewers.

Compare to the previous studies, this study will focus on studying objects in other forms, namely series, and with titles that have never been analyzed using relevance theory before. The interpretation of the utterances in the Emily In Paris series, especially the first season studied in this study, needs to be studied further using relevance theory so that viewers get a better understanding. Further, it will also increase linguistic insight for viewers of the Emily in Paris series in particular and readers in general. This research only focuses on one research question namely "what

is the meaning of implicature contained in Emily in Paris based on relevance theory framework of analysis?"

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Relevance Theory

Relevance is the relationship between an assumption or information with a certain context that is determined by the presence of contextual effects. Sperber and Wilson (1986) proposed the opinion that an assumption is considered relevant in a context if the assumption has a contextual effect in that context. What is called a contextual effect is the impact produced by a new assumption that is added to the assumptions that already exist in a person's mind. Contextual effects determine whether or not a conversation is relevant in a communication situation. Contextual effects are a requirement for relevance. The greater the contextual effect, the greater the level of relevance (Sperber and Wilson, 1986).

The principle of relevance is one of several principles in conversation. This principle was introduced by Sperber and Wilson (1986) as a response to the theory put forward by Grice regarding the maxims in the principle of cooperation. Previously, Grice (1975) stated that there are four maxims in the principle of cooperation that apply in a conversation, namely the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and implementation. According to Sperber and Wilson (1986), the most important of the four maxims is relevance. This is because the theory of relevance plays an important role in realizing understanding between speakers and interlocutors.

Sperber and Wilson (1986) stated that humans have intuitions about relevance. They can consistently distinguish relevant information from irrelevant information, or in some cases, distinguish more relevant information from less relevant information. However, intuitions about relevance are context-dependent and relative. Therefore, context is essential in the analysis of relevance.

Comprehension Process

In order to gain an understanding of a speech, there are three stages required to carry out the process of understanding. Sperber and Wilson (2006) revealed the three stages, namely the comprehension process consists of three stages, explicature, implicature premises, and implicated conclusions. Sperber and Wilson (1986) also revealed the definition of implicature and explicature. Implicature is an assumption that is conveyed implicitly, while explicature is an assumption that is conveyed explicitly. It is said that the smaller the contextual contribution in a speech, the more explicit the explicature of the speech.

For example, in one of the utterances from the following data:

Episode 1

17:15 – 17.20 (In front of the office)

Julien: "What are you doing?"

Emily: "I've been here since 8:30."

Julien: "Pourquoi? We open at 10:30."

Emily: (sighs)

In the utterance, the apparent explication is that Emily came at an inappropriate time. Then, Julien's statement contains certain implicatures with a level of relevance that can be understood by Emily.

METHOD

This research is a qualitative research, which is a method that aims to present the results of descriptions, explorations, and understanding of the meaning of social and humanitarian problems (Creswell, 2016). This method was chosen because the utterances in Emily in Paris series show that there are implicatures and relevance that need to be understood, explored and described holistically. Qualitative research allows for a more comprehensive analysis of the verbal interactions in the series, resulting in a deeper insight regarding the use of language in the series. The data in this study were obtained using the observation and note-taking method. The data obtained are qualitative data in the form of dialogue from the Emily in Paris series. The data sources in this study are divided into two, namely primary data in the form of dialogue transcripts from the Emily in Paris series and secondary data in the form of literature and previous research that is relevant to this study.

The data selected for analysis is data that meets the criteria, namely containing explicit meaning and depending on the context of the speech so that interpretation is needed. The data is presented with its context, then analyzed to find out the implicature premise and the implicature conclusion. This study will use informal methods in presenting the results of data analysis. Informal methods are methods using descriptive sentences that are easily understood by readers in presenting the results of data analysis (Sudaryanto, 2015). Linguistic analysis often depends on social, cultural, and situational contexts. Informal methods allow researchers to understand the meaning of utterances in their natural contexts without having to restrict the data to a rigid format.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Several conversations in each episode of Emily in Paris show implicatures related to the relevance of the speaker and the interlocutor. There are 8 data from 9 episodes. Some of them are explained as follows.

(4-1)

Episode 1

17:15 – 17.20 (In front of the office)

Julien: "What are you doing?"

Emily: "I've been here since 8:30."

Julien: "Pourquoi? We open at 10:30."

Emily: (sighs)

Context

Emily Cooper is an American who, for some reason, has to work in Paris for 1 year. On her first day at work, she arrived at office too early, and found out that the door is locked. She meets Julien in front of the office. He looks confused and wonder why she is so early and asked her as shown in data above.

Implicated Premise

The office is not opened yet

The time when Emily arrived at office is not right.

Culture of office hour is different between France and America.

Implicated Conclusion

Julien intentionally tells Emily that she is too early, because the office is open at 10:30 and, in Paris, People don't go to work as early as Emily who is an American.

Data (4-1) shows the explicature that Julien tells Emily about the office hours. The implicated premise shows that the utterance is multi-interpretable and can be assumed to have many meanings, such as telling the office hours. Meanwhile, the context of the utterance is Emily's condition who has just moved from America to France. From this context, it can be concluded that the implicature of the utterance is to show that Emily came too early and the cultural differences in working hours between America and France. Regarding the relevance of the utterance, the context of this utterance gives a high contextual effect on the utterance so that the level of relevance of the utterance is also high and easy for Emily to understand.

(4-2)

Episode 2

4:30 – 4:32 (In front of the office)

Emily: "Any tips on what to wear?"

Sylvie: "Not that."

Context:

Sylvie and Emily talk about the campaign they will use to promote the product. Then, Sylvie tells them that a party related to the campaign will be held that night. Emily is surprised because she was not told beforehand. She asks Sylvie for advice on what she should wear to the party.

Implicated Premise:

"That" refers to Emily's casual clothes.

Sylvie does not recommend that Emily wears that outfit.

The casual clothes that Emily wears to work are not suitable for attending a party.

Sylvie does not want Emily to wear those clothes to the party.

Implicated Conclusion:

Sylvie tells Emily to wear other clothes that are more appropriate and suitable to wear to the party.

Data (4-2) shows an explicature regarding Sylvie's comment toward Emily regarding what to wear to the party by saying "Not that". The word 'that' used in the utterance can refer to many things, such as Emily's behavior, Emily's promotional campaign idea, or the clothes Emily is wearing. However, the context of Sylvie's utterance can be key information that helps understand the implicature and relevance of this utterance. The word 'that' used by Sylvie in her utterance refers to the clothes

worn by Emily. The utterance is used to answer Emily's question about what to 'wear' so that the answer refers to clothes. Then, the 'clothes' referred to the clothes worn by Emily during the conversation, namely casual and semi-formal clothes that she wears to work. These clothes certainly do not reflect elegance and are not suitable for wearing to a party. The interpretation of the word 'that' shows the implicated premise of Sylvie's utterance. Indirectly, Sylvie tells Emily to wear other clothes that are more appropriate and suitable to wear at the party. Emily has information about the party culture in France so she can understand the meaning of Sylvie's statement about the clothes that should be worn according to the implicated conclusion. Regarding the relevance of the utterance, the context of this utterance gives a high contextual effect on the utterance so that the level of relevance of the utterance is also high and easy for Emily to understand.

(4-3)

Episode 3

16:24 – 16:30

Emily: "Okay, that doesn't make sense."

Julien: "It's a perfume commercial."

Context:

Emily and her co-workers are in a meeting. They watch a video draft of a perfume commercial and discuss about it. After watch the video, Emily says her opinion about the video, as shown on the data above.

Implicated Premise:

Perfume commercial is a thing that is not supposed to make sense.

For Julien, commercial perfume commercial can be made to be unreasonable and it is not a serious matter.

Implicated Conclusion:

Julien implied that he disagrees with Emily's opinion because perfume commercial is not supposed to make sense.

Data (4-3) shows the utterance which is an explicature said by Julien to Emily regarding perfume commercial. Julien's utterance informs Emily that the advertisement that Emily considers unreasonable is an advertisement promoting perfume. The understanding that shows that the advertisement is a commercial perfume advertisement is the implicated premise of this utterance. Then, the utterance can basically be used for various purposes, such as informing Emily about the type of commercial. However, if we consider the context and the implicated premise of the utterance, then the implicated conclusion that can be understood from the utterance is Julien's disagreement with Emily's opinion. The utterance also indicates that unreasonable commercial perfume advertisements are commonplace. Emily has information about the perfume advertisement that Julien means so she can understand the meaning of Julien's utterance according to the implicated conclusion. Based on the contextual effect given by the context of the speech, the relevance of this speech is high so that it can be easily understood.

(4-4)

Episode 4

01:45 – 01:50

Camille: "And how do they feel about that?"

Emily: "A lot like that flower lady."

Context:

This incident happened on the way to Emily's office. Emily, who was buying flowers to take to the office, had a hard time making a transaction with a florist. She couldn't speak French properly so she had a hard time asking the price, so Camille who was walking around saw Emily struggling and helped her carry on the transaction. After that, they walked together while talking how Emily's experience and feeling in her new office.

Implicated Premise:

The florist was unfriendly to Emily.

The people at Emily's new company were same as the florist.

Implicated Conclusion:

The people at Emily's new company are as hostile and resistant to accept new ideas, perspectives, or cultures, same as the florist.

The data (4-4) from the conversation above is shown by Emily's utterance when answering Camille's question about the people in her new company. This data shows an explicature contains implicature which needed to be understood by knowing the context. Emily answered that the people in the company a lot like the florist that Emily had met before. Emily's utterance can basically be interpreted from various perspectives. Emily could equate the people in her new office with the florist in terms of physical appearance or social status. However, the context of this utterance can help understand the implicated premise of Emily's utterance, namely that the florist was unfriendly because Emily could not speak French properly. Then, the relationship and relevance between the florist and the people in Emily's office can be known, namely having the same attitude. Then, the implicated conclusion is known by reconnecting the implicated premise and context. It is known that the implicated conclusion of Emily's utterance is that the people in the new company where Emily works are unfriendly and reject the new thoughts, perspectives, or cultures that Emily brings. Emily's job is to provide a perspective based on American culture that is often not considered or appreciated by her colleagues. Their attitude is like the florist who is unfriendly to Emily who cannot speak French well. The florist's attitude shows a lack of tolerance for cultural differences. Emily's colleagues do the same. Camille has information about the florist's background so she can understand the meaning of Emily's statement about the people in her new company according to the implicated conclusion. In this case, the contextual effect given by the context is quite high so that the relevance of this utterance is also high.

(4-5)

Episode 5

06:05 – 06:07

Emily: "Can I get a big one like Cashmere?"

Lucien: "Oh, let me check. Not enough followers."

Context:

Emily attended an event organized by Olivia Thompson. The event was related to marketing and was attended by many influencers. When she was about to enter the room where the event was taking place, Emily saw an influencer carrying a dog named Cashmere. It turned out that the dog also had social media and quite a lot of followers. When she was about to enter the room where the event was taking place, Cashmere was given a fairly large package by Lucien, Olivia Thompson's secretary. When Emily was about to enter the room, she also received a package, but not as big as the one given to Cashmere. Emily asked for the same package as Cashmere and Lucien answered as shown in conversation above.

Implicated Premise:

Cashmere is an influencer with a large number of followers.

Emily is an influencer with a small number of followers.

Influencers with a large number of followers or equal to Cashmere are entitled to a large gift.

Influencers who have a lot of followers can be said to be popular.

Implicated Conclusion:

Emily doesn't have as many followers and isn't as popular as Cashmere so she doesn't deserve the big gift that Cashmere got.

The data (4-5) is shown by the utterance which is an explicature said by Lucien, Olivia Thompson's secretary, who said that Emily did not have enough followers. The utterance was said when Emily was about to enter the room where the event held by Olivia Thompson was taking place. The utterance can basically be interpreted as a random utterance by someone who comments on Emily's popularity as an influencer. However, from the context that has been mentioned, it can be understood that the utterance has an implicated premise that Emily's followers are not enough and not as many as Cashmere's. If the implicated premise is reconnected with the context, then the implicature of the utterance can be concluded, namely that she does not deserve a big gift like Cashmere, a dog who has many followers on her social media. The utterance also implies that Emily is not as popular as Cashmere. As an influencer, the number of followers certainly influences the view of how popular the influencer is. If the number of followers is quite a lot, then the influencer can be said to be popular. Conversely, if the influencer does not have many followers, then the influencer can be said to be less popular. Emily has information about the criteria for an influencer's popularity and the same understanding as Lucien so she can understand the meaning of her statement according to the implicated conclusion. The context of this utterance also gives a high contextual effect and makes the relevance of this utterance high so that Emily can understand its meaning easily.

(4-6)

Episode 9

01:06 – 01:09

Emily: "Well, Camille invited us to an art opening at her gallery in the Marais tonight, and there will be lots of champagne."

Sylvie: "I'll wear a raincoat."

Context:

Emily showed Sylvie and Luc the idea of selling champagne, which was selling champagne sprays. Emily intended to present the luxury of spraying champagne like an athlete celebrating his victory. However, Sylvie commented that Emily's idea was a typical American culture full of waste. Then, Sylvie asked when they would meet the client, Camille. Emily replied that they could meet Camille because Camille invited them to come to her gallery opening that night. Emily also told her that there would be a lot of champagne. Sylvie responded as in the statement above.

Implicated Premise:

Sylvie will wear a raincoat to keep from getting wet.

The raincoat can protect Sylvie from liquids, including champagne spray.

Sylvie doesn't like getting wet from champagne.

Implicated Conclusion:

Sylvie shows her attitude that indicate she still disagrees with Emily's sales idea.

Data (4-6) shows Sylvie's utterance which is an explicature contains certain implicature. The utterance states that Sylvie will wear a raincoat. Basically, the utterance can be interpreted as an utterance that informs that it is raining that day so Sylvie will wear a raincoat. The implicated premise shown by the utterance is that a raincoat can protect Sylvie from liquids so that she does not get wet. However, by considering the context of the utterance and connecting it with the implicated premise, the implicated conclusion of the utterance is that Sylvie still does not like Emily's idea of spraying champagne. Previously, before the conversation above, Sylvie thought that the idea of spraying champagne seemed like an American culture that often wastes money. So, when Emily said that there would be a lot of champagne at the party they were going to, Sylvie said she would wear a raincoat. Because Camille is Emily's friend, Sylvie assumes that the champagne might be sprayed as Emily explained. Emily has sufficient and the same information as Sylvie about champagne and the function of raincoats so that she can understand the meaning of Sylvie's utterance according to the implicated conclusion. The context of this utterance also gives a high contextual effect and makes the relevance of this utterance high so that Emily can understand its meaning easily.

(4-7)

Episode 9

02:28 – 02:40

Judith: "Do you think that Pierre would donate a dress to be auctioned for the AFL?"

Emily: "Well, first of all, Pierre is wonderful and... and very charitable, but, um, well, he's also very particular about his image."

Judith: "Oh, of course. I mean, it's gonna be a big to-do. It'll be a whole lot of press coverage."

Context:

Emily meets Judith Robertson at a restaurant. Later, Judith tells her that Emily works for Pierre Cadault and mentions the dress Pierre Cadault made. Judith asks Emily about the possibility of Pierre Cadault donating his dress to be auctioned for the AFL. Emily answers as in the conversation above, that Pierre Cadault is a generous person and cares about his image. Judith responds that Pierre Cadault's actions will be something big and will be widely covered by the media.

Implicated Premise:

Pierre Cadault is a kind person because he is generous.

Pierre Cadault is also a person who cares about other people's opinions of him because he cares about his image in the eyes of the public.

Implicated Conclusion:

Pierre Cadault will donate his dress to be auctioned for the AFL and may use it as a means of polishing his image.

The data (4-7) shows the existence of explication and implicature in Emily's speech answering Judith Robertson's question. Basically, Emily's view of Pierre Cadault can be interpreted as a compliment to someone with a good attitude or a good impression from someone who works with them. The premise of the implicature that can be understood from the speech is that Pierre Cadault is a good person because he is generous. In addition, Pierre Cadault is also a person who cares about other people's opinions about his image. However, if we consider the context that Emily answered Judith's question, then it can be seen that the conclusion of the implicature from the speech above is that Emily thinks that Pierre Cadault will donate his dress to be auctioned for the AFL. Emily thinks this way because Pierre Cadault is a good person and generous. Moreover, he also cares about his image in the public eye. By donating his dress to be auctioned for the AFL will improve his image in the public's eye. This also makes it possible that the purpose of making donation was not solely because of Pierre Cadault's generosity, but also to improve his image. Judith has information about Pierre's background so she can understand the meaning of Emily's statement as an answer to her question according to the implicated conclusion. Regarding the relevance of the utterance, the context of this utterance gives a high contextual effect on the utterance so that the level of relevance of the utterance is also high and easy for Emily to understand.

(4-8)

Episode 9

13:41 – 13:46

Mathieu: "She looks beautiful, doesn't she?"

Pierre: "Of course she does. She's wearing Pierre Cadault."

Context:

At the auction, Emily appeared wearing a dress designed by Pierre Cadault. Everyone in the audience was excited because Emily looked so beautiful, including Mathieu. Mathieu stated that Emily was beautiful to Pierre Cadault. Pierre Cadault responded by agreeing with Mathieu and saying that Emily was wearing a dress made by him. Pierre Cadault himself was an influential designer in the fashion industry in Paris.

Implicated Premise:

All of Pierre Cadault's dresses look beautiful
Anyone wearing Pierre Cadault looks beautiful
Emily's wearing Pierre Cadault's dress
Emily looks beautiful in a dress designed by Pierre Cadault.

Implicated Conclusion:

Pierre indicates that his dress can affect the appearance and beauty of those who wears it. Pierre Cadault proudly credits himself as the designer of the clothes used by Emily.

Data (4-8) shows an utterance containing explicature, namely Pierre's utterance saying that Emily is wearing a dress designed by Pierre Cadault, namely himself. The premise of the implicature understood from Pierre's utterance is that Emily looks beautiful when wearing the dress, he designed. Pierre uses his name to call himself, instead of using the pronoun "I" or the possessive pronoun "mine" or possessive adjective "my", to give the impression that Pierre is the person he admires. When Pierre says that Emily looks beautiful when wearing the dress, he designed, the utterance can be interpreted with various purposes. For example, the intention of the utterance is intended to praise Emily or just joke with the person he is talking to. However, if we consider the context in which the utterance occurs, it can be said that the conclusion of the implicature from Pierre's utterance is that the dress he designed can affect the appearance and beauty of those who wear his dress. By wearing the dress he designed, a person will look more beautiful and attractive. This utterance shows that Pierre's dress can affect the appearance and beauty of those who wear it. In addition, this utterance also confirms that Pierre is aware of his influence as a designer on the fashion industry. Mathieu has information about Pierre's background so he can understand the meaning of Pierre's statement according to the implicated conclusion. Regarding the relevance of the utterance, the context of this utterance gives a high contextual effect on the utterance so that the level of relevance of the utterance is also high and easy for Emily to understand.

CONCLUSION

The Emily in Paris series is one of the popular series and watched by many people because of its interesting and exciting story. In this series, the characters' utterances actually show a linguistic phenomenon related to the concept of pragmatics, namely the existence of implicatures in the utterances. The utterances analyzed show other implied intentions or implicature.

Among them is a data related to the differences in working hours culture between Emily and her coworkers. There is a data that shows a shared knowledge about working hours between Emily and her colleague. The relevance of this utterance is high so that Emily understands that the meaning of her colleague's statement is that Emily came too early. Next, there is a data that show differences in clothing preferences between Emily and her boss. It shows that There is a shared knowledge between Emily and her boss. The relevance of this utterance is high so that Emily understands that her clothes are inappropriate for attending a party. There are also data that shows differences in perspectives on an advertisement between Emily and her coworkers. It shows that there is a shared knowledge between Emily and her partner. The relevance of this utterance is high so that Emily understands that commercial perfume advertising is not a serious matter. Moreover, there is a data that shows acceptance of a new culture between Emily and her coworkers. Based on the data, it shows that there is a shared knowledge between Emily and Camille. The relevance of this utterance is high so that Camille understands that Emily means that her office friends are not friendly. There is also data that shows rejection of a new culture between Emily and her boss which also shows that there is a shared knowledge between them. The relevance of this utterance is high so that Emily understands that her boss disagrees with her idea. There is a data that shows Emily's comments on others that shows a shared knowledge between Emily and Judith. The relevance of this utterance is high so that Judith understands Emily's meaning regarding Pierre Cadault's character. Finally, a data shows that Pierre Cadault's comments on himself. It shows that there is a shared knowledge between Perre and Mathieu. The relevance of this utterance is high so that Mathieu understands Pierre's meaning that he is bragging about himself.

The entirety of the analyzed utterances shows that the relevance in the utterances is inseparable from the shared knowledge and information held by both parties related to the utterance. The shared knowledge and information is influenced by the context of the speech so that the resulting contextual effect is higher and the level of relevance is also higher. In this series, the information is largely related to the cultural background between Emily as an American and her interlocutor from another cultural background and how other characters describe themselves and their opinions. High relevance makes the character's speech understandable to the person they are talking to even though there are many things that are conveyed implicitly.

This research can contribute to the field of linguistics, especially in pragmatics, by enriching the understanding of how implied meaning is interpreted and understood in an utterance. This study can help identify relevance in utterances broadcast in popular media, provide insight into communication strategies, and expand the study of pragmatics in discourse analysis. For future research, similar studies can expand the scope by comparing implicatures in different genres, cultures, or media, and linking them to other aspects, such as social or psychological. Practically, these findings can be applied in everyday communication, language education, or even writing popular show scripts. This research helps a better understanding of relevance in verbal interactions and improves effective communication skills.

REFERENCES

Bond, K. (2024). "Du mal au bien: why we've learned to love Emily in Paris". Harper Bazaar. <https://www.harpersbazaar.com/culture/culture-news/a61853309/emily-in-paris-audience-figures> accessed on 6 October 2024

Creswell, J. W. (2016). *Research Design: Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Campuran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3, Speech Acts (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Majeed, Q.A.D.S., (2022). News Interpretation Through Of The Application Of Relevance Theory Principles. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 18(4), 1165-1177. Retrieved from <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/5118> accessed on 6 October 2024

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance Communication And Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2006). "Relevance Theory". In *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (pp. 607- 632). Oxford: Blackwell

Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Sanata Dharma University Press.

Chen Wu. (2024). Applying Relevance Theory in Advertisement Translation: A Particular Look into Electronic Product Advertisement. *Journal of Linguistics and Communication Studies*, 3(1), 35-43. Retrieved from <https://www.pioneerpublisher.com/JLCS/article/view/730> Accessed on 6 October 2024

Xu, Z., & Zhou, Y. (2013). Relevance Theory and Its Application to Advertising Interpretation. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies (TPLS)*, 3(3). Retrieved from <https://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol03/03/13.pdf> Accessed on 6 October 2024