

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

This study set out to identify the types of presupposition and the communicative functions realized in the dialogue of “Up” (2009), and to examine how the two are related. Based on the findings and discussion in Chapters IV and V, three conclusions can be drawn. First, all six types of presupposition identified by Yule (1996) existential, factive, lexical, structural, non-factive, and counterfactual are present in the dialogue of “Up”, each carried by a distinct and identifiable linguistic trigger: proper names and definite descriptions for existential presupposition; factive verbs such as know and achievement predicates such as made it for factive presupposition; single lexical items such as last and met for lexical presupposition; WH-question structures for structural presupposition; verbs of mistaken belief and negative existential constructions for non-factive presupposition; and hypothetical modals and irrealis conditionals for counterfactual presupposition. Rather than being evenly scattered, each type tends to cluster around a particular narrative function existential presupposition around sustaining Ellie's presence after her death, non-factive presupposition around the belief-versus-reality motif, and counterfactual presupposition around Russell's imaginative, aspirational speech patterns.

Second, all six communicative functions identified by Jakobson (1960) referential, emotive, conative, phatic, metalingual, and poetic are likewise present, and their distribution across the two main characters is patterned rather than random: referential utterances are concentrated in Russell's fact-oriented dialogue, emotive utterances in Carl's grief-oriented dialogue, conative utterances in moments of urgency, phatic utterances at points of social opening, metalingual utterances at moments of clarification (both verbal and non-verbal), and poetic utterances in recurring, character-defining catchphrases.

Third, and most centrally to the aim of this study, presupposition and communicative function are shown to be interdependent rather than separate layers of meaning. Several data points analyzed in this study carry both a specific presupposition type and a specific communicative function simultaneously, demonstrating that Yule's (1996) and Jakobson's (1960) frameworks describe complementary dimensions of the same utterances what is assumed to be true, and what communicative purpose that assumption serves. This integrated approach addresses the gap identified in Chapter I, where previous studies tended to apply one framework in isolation from the other.

B. Suggestion

Based on these conclusions, the following suggestions are offered. For future researchers, this study's integration of Yule's (1996) and Jakobson's (1960) frameworks, combined with a progressive/saturation sampling approach, could be extended to other animated films particularly those with different genre conventions, cast structures, or emotional registers to examine whether the

character-linked patterns observed here (e.g., referential dialogue concentrated in one character, emotive dialogue in another) are specific to *Up*'s dual-protagonist structure or reflect a broader tendency in animated storytelling. Researchers using this sampling approach should also consider supplementing it with inter-rater verification of transcribed dialogue against the film's official script or subtitles, to avoid the kind of transcription inconsistencies encountered during this study's data collection.

For lecturers and pragmatics instructors, the analysis presented in this study may serve as accessible teaching material for illustrating both Yule's (1996) six presupposition types and Jakobson's (1960) six communicative functions using familiar, non-technical film dialogue, and in particular for demonstrating to students how a single utterance can be legitimately analyzed through more than one pragmatic framework at once.

For students of English language and literature, this study shows that animated films often assumed to be linguistically simple because of their intended young audience in fact contain layered pragmatic phenomena worth serious analytical attention, and that combining complementary theoretical frameworks can reveal connections between linguistic form and narrative meaning that a single-framework analysis would miss.