

CHAPTER 2

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistic theory. They said that pragmatics is the study of interpreting the meaning influenced by context (Kushartanti, et.al, 2005, p. 104). In his book, Leech argues that pragmatics is generally limited to the study of linguistic communication in terms of the principle of conversation, which is a model of pragmatic rhetoric (Leech, 1983, p.11). A person's rhetoric is to produce a sense of language and power that can make the listener do something he wants. Over time, languages change and develop. Language has been influenced by outside context, so we find words that have different meanings. Before pragmatics was recognized as a linguistic theory, Chomsky discovered Syntax to analyze the meaning of speech structurally, but he considered it too messy for serious reflection. Then, the semantic approach is used as the center of linguistic theory. But that still cannot separate meanings and different contexts.

One field of linguistics that studies the phenomena of communication is pragmatics. Pragmatics is closely related to the conditions that determine whether language is used appropriately in communication. Harmony is needed to convey the intended meaning of speech; this is essential for good communication between the speaker and the interlocutor. Until now, linguistic studies have examined language without considering its use, or in other words, who uses it. In pragmatics, language is studied according to its

use or how it is used in social life. Levinson (1983:9) explains that "pragmatics is the study of those relationships between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language." According to Levinson, pragmatics is a study that discusses aspects of the relationship between language and context, according to the language's explanation. This means that to understand language use, we are required to also understand the context in which that language is used.

The study of pragmatics is primarily concerned with meaning and its definition as well as different communicative tasks that are provided by the speaker in a way that a reader or listener can interpret (Siti & Santi, 2025). Pragmatics is the study of characteristics of utterance meaning that cannot be fully explained without referring to the truth conditions of the spoken sentence (Tarigan, 2015:31). Yule (1996:3) proposes many pragmatic definitions. First, pragmatics is the study of how a speaker communicates and how a listener interprets speech. Second, pragmatics is the study of contextual meanings. This necessitates an examination of how speakers organize what they intend to convey. Third, pragmatics is the study of how listeners interpret implied meaning from a speaker's words. Finally, pragmatics is the study of terms that indicate relative distance. Pragmatics is thought to be the study of the interaction between language forms and their users.

Indeed, according to (masterclass, 2021), pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that investigates what a speaker indicates and what a listener deduces from supporting aspects such as situational context, individual

mental state, past conversation, and other elements. Leech (1983) defines pragmatics as the study of meaning in conversational circumstances, which encompasses social conventions and etiquette standards that influence how people communicate. Morris (1938) regards pragmatics as a branch of semiotics that investigates the interaction between symbols and their users in the context of communication. Grice (1975) has claimed that language is used not simply to communicate information, but also to execute activities and convey meanings that are not always explicit. Thus, these numerous theories and research demonstrate that pragmatics is concerned with how meaning is generated and understood through context, speaker intentions, societal norms, and listener interpretation.

Based on the numerous expert definitions offered above, it is possible to conclude that pragmatics analyzes the intended meaning of a conversation to the listener for the meaning and purpose to be understood. To understand the meaning of a spoken utterance, one must first understand the context based on the situation and conditions surrounding that utterance.

2.2 Implicature

Implicature is one of the topics of pragmatic research. Grice (1975) first developed the concept of implicature in 1967, at his James Lectures at Harvard University, to address the seemingly insoluble problem of linguistic meaning. In his article "Logic and Conversation," Grice claims that an utterance can suggest notions that are not part of the utterance itself. Implicature is the meaning implied in the context of a speech (Miftah and Rohimi, 2025:1). Implicature refers to an unsaid aim, desire, or emotional

manifestation. In addition, implicature refers to the concealed purpose behind a statement. In other words, what someone says or writes does not always reflect what they mean.

Mey (2001:45) explains that the word implicature comes from the verb "to imply," which means to fold something into something else. Meanwhile, the noun is "implication." The verb "to imply" comes from the Latin "plicare," which means to fold. This means that what is folded or stored must be unfolded. This means that to understand what the speaker is saying, the interlocutor must always grasp the meaning of the speaker's utterances.

Here, implicature is something implied in an utterance, meaning that an utterance is allowed to be implicit in the actual use of language. This means that implicature is a process of forming meaning based on the situation and context. By using implicature theory, we can interpret the implied meaning in a speaker's utterance.

Yule (2014:62) also explains that the term implicature is used to describe what a speaker might interpret, suggest, or otherwise mean that differs from what the speaker actually said. This implies a meaning that differs from the literal meaning of the utterance. This implicature is a pragmatic unit of an utterance, whether spoken or written, while in conversational implicature, it is the pragmatic implication contained in the utterances made by the speaker to the addressee. Yule also emphasizes that implicature is an additional meaning present in an utterance. Implicature occurs when the speaker and addressee do not implement the principle of

cooperation, resulting in more information being conveyed by the speaker than what the speaker himself or herself says.

Grice (1975) distinguishes between two sorts of implicatures: conventional implicatures and conversational implicatures. Conventional implicatures are those that are familiar to everyone, whereas conversational implicatures are only recognized by those who comprehend the context of the statement. Context refers to the components or factors that enable both the speaker and the listener to communicate effectively. Aside from everyday life, the goal of implicature is to expose the meaning of language by discriminating between what is said and the intention behind it (Istiana et al., 2022:13).

According to Levinson (Lubis, 2015: 73), there are four types of implicature concepts, which are discussed below.

- a) It should be able to clearly explain how the language user's intentions differ from the external differences.
- b) Can clearly explain how the language user's intent differs from the exterior differences.

For instance, as in the discussion between Q and R that follows.

Q: "Has your father left yet?"

R: "The newspaper hasn't even arrived."

Conventionally speaking, the two sentences are structurally unconnected. However, someone who understands and knows how to utilize language in that situation will grasp the second sentence. R did not respond to whether the father had left or not, merely stating that the

newspaper had not yet arrived. The second sentence implies that Father will leave once the newspaper vendor arrives.

- c) It should be able to provide a basic semantic description of the relationship between sentences linked by the same conjunction.

“The child hopped on their bike and rode to school.”

The two clauses in that statement cannot be changed to form the following.”

“The child went to school and rode his motorcycle.”

However, the next line states:

"Jakarta is the capital of Indonesia, and Manila is the capital of the Philippines."

Both clauses can be flipped to read:

"Manila is the capital of the Philippines, and Jakarta is the capital of Indonesia."

The two instances above demonstrate the difficulties in distinguishing the relationship between the two components of the sentence using traditional structural and semantic methods. In this situation, we can overcome the dilemma by acknowledging that phrases (2) and (3) are based on two separate pragmatic patterns or sets of implicatures: in (2), there is a 'then' link, and in (3), 'likewise'.

- d) It should be able to present various facts that outwardly appear unrelated, even contradictory (like a metaphor). For example, a mother feels overheated inside a room. The mother said, "It's so cold in this room (while fanning her hand in front of her face)," implying the contrary.

Based on the professional explanations provided above, it is possible to conclude that implicature is the implied meaning of a discussion that the speaker wishes to impart to the listener to achieve the communication goal.

Based on Nababan (as cited in Hariyo, 2014: 18), implicature has the following characteristics:

- a. A conversational implicature can be cancelled in specific situations, such as by adding a phrase expressing that someone does not wish to utilize the implicature or by providing a context for cancelling the implicature.
- b. There is usually no other way to say what is being said while retaining the appropriate implicature. Grice refers to this quality as the "non-detachability" of implicatures from the way something is said.
- c. Conversational implicatures require prior awareness of the sentence's conventional meaning. As a result, the substance of a conversational implicature is not part of the sentence's meaning.
- d. The veracity of the content of a conversational implicature is not determined by the reality of what is spoken. As a result, the implicature is determined by the process of speaking what is said rather than what is stated itself.

Based on the foregoing qualities, it is possible to assume that implicature can be cancelled by the appearance of fresh, explicit implicatures. In a conversation, if a person does not have a more appropriate way to state something, they may utilize speech with an implicit meaning to communicate the message. In a conversation, what is said can be correct,

but what is inferred can be incorrect. Meaning, if the speaker and listener do not share the same interpretation of the discourse, the message received will lead to misunderstanding.

2.2.1 Conventional Implicature

In a conversation, someone exchanges intentions, meanings and express their ideas, and feelings in the conversation. This shows that a person communicates to interact with other people to build their social life to get information from people around them. In the conversations they do, they include meaning in them, both explicitly and implicitly. Saying the meaning explicitly is giving an actual stated statement. While saying the meaning implicitly is giving a speech that has a hidden meaning or deeper meaning in the utterances. As explained by Saragi (2011) that utterances contain hidden meanings or utterances that have more meaning than what is spoken by the speaker is called implicature.

Grice (1975) explains that conversational implicature occurs because of the context or general features of a discourse that can occur because of things done by the speaker such as when the conversation participant does not adhere to the cooperative principles. Hence, the listener considers that the speaker's words are contrary to its meaning because cooperative principles govern a conversation, so the speaker should not violate these principles so that communication is appropriately established. Then, Grice divides conversational

implicature into two types that are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

According to Mulyana (2005: 12), conventional implicature is a general and conventional meaning. No specific background knowledge is required in the context of the requested utterance to draw certain conclusions. In general, in this conventional implicature, both the speaker and the addressee are aware of and understand the meaning or implication of the speech. This customary implicature is founded on shared experience and knowledge.

Example:

Camille: "So?"

Romain: "**The Scénic is better. It is more spacious than La Mégane.**"

Romain: "La Scénic is better. She's wider than La Mégane."

Camille: "But less than l'Espace."

Romain: "Forget l'espace. He's taller than our garage."

Camille: "So, I chose La Mégane. He has the best performance."

The bolded sentence is an example of conventional implicature. Renault produces multi-purpose vehicles (MPVs) such as the Scénic and Espace. These MPV-type vehicles are normally offered in two configurations: one for carrying passengers (with rear passenger seats) and one for carrying cargo (without windows or rear

passenger seats), which is specifically built for moving products. Unlike the La Mégane, which is a vehicle designed for modest families. In dialog “So?”, the speaker and addressee are already aware that La Scénic, La Mégane, and L'Espace are four-wheeled automobiles. The conversation is about what type of car they will buy.

Yule (2014:78) also explains that conventional implicature is the opposite of conversational implicature, which is not based on the cooperative principle or maxims. This is emphasized by Brown and Yule (1983:31), who state that "conventional implicatures, according to Grice, are determined by the conventional meaning of the word in use." This means that, implicatures, such as conventional and lexical presuppositions, are associated with specific words and result in additional meanings conveyed when those words are used. Conventional implicatures are also not temporary, meaning that their meaning is already established and will persist over time. The conjunction "but" is one example of a word containing conventional implicature. For example:

(P) Mary suggested black, but I chose white.

Mary recommended black, but I chose white.

(Yule, 2014:78)

The meaning of the utterance of choosing black over white can be based on the conjunction 'and' plus an implicature of the opposite information. In this case, the fact that Mary suggested black

contradicts my choice of white. This means that the situation at that time or the desired choice was different, or perhaps the opposite, from what was expected. This proves that conventional implicature does not depend on context to interpret the intended meaning of the utterance.

2.2.2 Non-Conventional Implicature

Non-conventional implicatures have a broader meaning and comprehension. Understanding "what is meant" is heavily influenced by the precise context in which the communication occurs (Mulyana, 2005: 13).

Bertrand: "Fanny, we can't go to Arcachon!"

Fanny: "And why?"

Bertrand: "Because they don't bring dogs."

Fanny: "That's not a problem. Leave the choucroute to your parents."

Bertrand: "My father doesn't like dogs. Why not your mother? She loves animals!"

Fanny: "**My mother has cats, birds, and a husband. That's a lot!**"

The bolded sentence is an example of non-conventional implicature. The phrase implies that Fanny refuses to have her puppy looked after by her parents because she does not want to bother them. Here are some further examples of non-conventional implicatures (Yule, 2014: 74).

Rick: “Hey, are you going to that noisy party tonight?”

Tom: “**My parents are going to visit me.**”

One example of a non-conventional implicature is the sentence that is bolded above. According to Tom's statement, his parents are visiting him tonight; therefore, he will not be at that boisterous party. Since spending time with his parents will undoubtedly be peaceful, Tom will be spending the evening with them. The example leads us to the conclusion that in order to prevent misconceptions in the necessary conclusions, non-conventional implicatures require context and unique information between the speaker and the listener.

a. Generalized Conversational implicature

Yule (2014:70) explains that general conversational implicatures are implicatures that do not take additional meaning into account, meaning that these general conversational implicatures do not require context to interpret their implied meaning. Cummings (2007) (in Niatri, 2016:22) also explains the same thing, namely that general conversational implicatures do not require context to realize the implicature. Therefore, speakers involved in the speech process produce conversational meaning simply by observing the word structure used and not based on context. For example:

(G) Did you invite Bella and Cathy?

Did you invite Bella and Cathy?

(H) I invited Bella.

I invited Bella. (Yule, 1996:43)

In the conversational utterance above, no special knowledge is required to understand the meaning conveyed by (H). Although (H)'s answer is concise, (G) can certainly understand that (H) did not invite Cathy. This utterance is called general conversational implicature, because it doesn't require any special knowledge to understand and can easily grasp the meaning of the speaker's answer to the question. From the example above, it can be seen that general conversational implicature arises because certain sentences in an utterance don't require additional meaning or context to understand the utterance. Therefore, simply by observing the words used by the speaker, the interlocutor can understand the utterance.

b. Particularized Conversational Implicature

According to Yule (2014:74), conversations or utterances often occur in very specific contexts where locally known information can be interpreted. Specific conversational implicature differs from general conversational implicature in that specific conversational implicature takes into account specific knowledge of the context so that the meaning contained in the speaker's utterance can be understood by the addressee. Therefore, an utterance is needed as a connecting link. To understand information in such situations, a context containing specific knowledge, relationships between speakers, and shared knowledge is required.

For example:

(I) Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?

Hey, are you going to the rowdy party tonight?

(J) My parents are visiting.

My mom is coming to visit me. (Yule, 1996:40)

The utterance in the dialogue above can be explained as meaning that (I) must know the relationship between (J) and his mother. For example, if (I) knows that (J) is not close to his mother and tries to avoid her, the resulting conversational implicature is "yes," or "she will go to the party." However, if we want to make (J)'s answer relevant, that is, her mother is visiting and (J) wants to spend time with her, the resulting conversational implicature is (J) not going to the noisy party. Based on the examples explained, we can conclude that recognizing and producing specific conversational implicatures requires shared knowledge between the speaker and the addressee to avoid misunderstandings.

2.3 Previous Related Studies

Several previous studies related to my research include the following: Research Akmal and Yana, (2020) entitled "Conversational Implicature Analysis in "Kingdom of Heaven" Movie Script by William Monahan". The purpose of this study was to identify the different types of conversational implicature and the non-observance maxim of cooperative principles articulated by the characters in William Monahan's Kingdom of Heaven movie script. Grice's theory was utilized to study the conversational implicature, and a qualitative technique was employed to describe it. After

studying the film, we determined that particularized implicatures were the most common conversational implicatures in the script, with 14 occurrences, followed by generalized implicatures, which appeared six times. The findings also revealed that 14 out of the entire 20 excerpts had a higher frequency of breaching the quantity maxim, with only three violations discovered in the movie script. According to the findings of this study, the reason for the frequent use of flouting maxims versus violating maxims in conversational implicature is that the speaker assumes they will be in a safe position and expects the hearer to understand their points, as the speaker did not intentionally manipulate or mislead the hearer.

Fattah research (2024) entitled “A Pragmatic Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Bernard Shaw’s: Arms and the man.” The purpose of this paper is to explore the language used in Bernard Shaw's play Arms and the Man. It investigates how the characters employ implicature to express their messages. Throughout the play, the characters do not always adhere to the four Gricean maxims: quantity, quality, manner, and relationship. They occasionally violate the maxims in order to express a certain message. The I collects data using a mixed approach (qualitative/quantitative). The data are some samples from the play, chosen specifically because the characters transmit their messages covertly by breaching conversational maxims. The findings indicate that the characters violated all four conversational maxims. However, the frequency of transgression varies from one maxim to the next. Furthermore, the results suggest that the characters frequently violate conversational norms in order

to direct the listener's attention to a certain point in the discourse. To summarize, the characters in the play use implicature and breach the maxims to deliver their messages.

Miftah and Rohimi conducted research in 2025 entitled “Implicature Messages in Conversation in the Ready or Not Movie script, Journal of Communication Research and Science”. The purpose of this study is to examine conversational implicature in the movie script Ready or Not and determine how these implicatures add to the narrative and characterization. This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach to assess the dialogs in the movie script that have suggested meanings. The analytical results suggest that the conversational implicatures in the movie script Ready or Not are classified into three categories: general, particular, and scaled. General implicature generates tension and intrigue through talks that are not totally honest. Specific implicature reveals hidden meanings that are only known to select family members. Meanwhile, scaled implicature is employed to generate a chilling environment by providing quantitative descriptions with connotative implications. The conversational implication in this movie script not only enhances the characterization of the characters, but also strengthens the conflict and creates an intense horror atmosphere. This study concludes that implicature is a useful strategy for transmitting implicit meanings in films and offering a better knowledge to the audience. Conversational implicature is the acquisition of meaning from a speech that is not expressly expressed in the utterance; hence, the meaning is established by the context linked with each maxim in the cooperative principle. This

study focuses on the style of conversational implicature influenced by the maxims of the cooperative principle and their non-observance in Philippe Falardeau's movie script *Monsieur Lazhar*. The research employs a qualitative research design. The objectives of this study are: 1) To describe the types of conversational implicatures found in the characters' conversations in the movie script "Monsieur Lazhar" by Philippe Falardeau; 2) To explain the meaning of the types of conversational implicatures found in the characters' conversations in the movie script "Monsieur Lazhar" by Philippe Falardeau; and 3) To examine the non-observance of maxims in the cooperative principle that occurs in the characters' conversations. The subject of this study is the utterances in the characters' talks in the movie script *Monsieur Lazhar*, and the object is the film's conversational implicatures. This study collects data using the SLBC technique (observe, free, involve, and capable). The determinant element sorting (DES) approach was employed to analyse the data, followed by the comparative relationship technique (CRT). The findings of a study on the conversational implicatures of characters in the movie script *Monsieur Lazhar* reveal that there are five categories of general conversational implicatures and forty types of particular conversational implicatures. In this study, the maxim of style influenced conversational implicatures in up to 19 utterances, with a maxim being flouted 28 times. This study has the potential to contribute significantly to the enrichment of pragmatic knowledge, particularly with conversational implicature.

Research Putri, (2020) entitled “The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in “Midnight Sun” Movie”, This study aims to investigate the types of conversational implicature and maxims that have been violated or flouted by Katie and Charlie in the Midnight Sun movie. In this study, the types of conversational implicature, along with hidden meanings and violating or flouting maxims based on Grice's (1975) theory. It uses descriptive qualitative methods. It is collected by downloading the Midnight Sun movie script from the website. After collecting data, it outlines the utterances included in the type of conversational implicature and gives the code for the data. Then I interpret the hidden meaning and classify the utterances into violating or flouting the maxim. The results of this study show that particularized conversational more often used by the two main characters rather than generalized conversational implicature. Besides that, both Katie and Charlie are violating the maxim more often than flouting the maxim. By studying the conversational implicature and cooperative principle, I am in a position to express the meaning hidden by the two main characters in the Midnight Sun movie, so that one might pay more attention to the hidden meaning actually conveyed by the speakers.

Research of Darmayani, et.al, (2023) entitled “Conversational Implicature Analysis in “Turning Red” MovieScript. This study aims to analyze the conversational implicature in the Disney movie, Turning Red which was released in March 2022. The theory is using conversational implicature proposed by Grice (1989) to identify the types of implicature namely Generalized Conversational Implicature and Particularized

Conversational Implicature and its implied meaning. This research uses qualitative descriptive method. The data was taken in the form of phrases. The results showed that there were implied conversational data found in conversations that occurred between characters in the film, 10 data classified as generalized conversational implicature, meanwhile, 8 data found in a particularized type of conversational implicature with their implied meaning analysis from the context of situation.

Research of Cheikh & Rabab'ah, (2025) entitled "From the American sitcom 'Seinfeld' to Modern Standard Arabic: Implicature translation by Arabic EFL students. Comprehension of conversational implicature, a crucial component of pragmatics, is vital for effective communication, specifically in translation between languages with distinct linguistic and cultural structures. This dimension of pragmatic competence, which involves understanding the implied meaning, has been largely ignored in education settings, particularly for Arabic-speaking EFL learners. This study analyzes the implicature translation of 30 senior students majoring in English Language and Literature at a university in the United Arab Emirates. The participants were asked to complete an online test administered by the researchers to translate into Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) contextualized conversational implicatures created by the characters of the American sitcom Seinfeld. The results indicated that the participants used different translation strategies: word for-word translation, literal translation, idiomatic translation, faithful translation, and free translation. The translation strategy used solely depended on the participants'

comprehension of implicature, which could be attributed to their level of proficiency in the language. It was particularly interesting that a positive relationship existed between the understanding of implicatures as a reflection of pragmatic competence and the quality of their translations. This suggests that identification and interpretation of conversational implicatures should be part of the training of Arabic-speaking EFL learners. Better pragmatic competence, therefore, could enhance the students' translation accuracy. Implications of such findings indicate requisite instructional approaches that incorporate pragmatic awareness in translation training programs among Arab EFL learners.

Research of Seikhan, (2024) entitled "Responses to conversational humour: An analytical framework. Conversational humour, which broadly encompasses (sequences of) utterances that are designed to 'amuse' participants or are treated as 'amusing' by participants across various kinds of social interaction, is an inherently social phenomenon involving not only the speaker but at least one recipient. An episode of conversational humour includes (at least) a humour bid proffered by the speaker and the response to it by the recipient. This study focuses on the recipient's responses to humour and introduces a framework for analysing responses to humour bids which is grounded in a close analysis of the sequential trajectory of humour episodes. Drawing on data from intercultural initial interactions in English, and focusing on the sequential trajectory of humour episodes through the lens of interactional pragmatics, this study proposes a typology of responses to humour bids, offering a basis for operationalisation in talk-in interaction.

Within this framework, there are five sequentially distinct types of responses that can follow a humour bid: 1) disattending humour, 2) minimal response to humour: sequence closure, 3) minimal response to humour: serious response, 4) minimal response to humour: agreement, and 5) post-expanding humour.

Based on previous related research, it can be said that previous studies generally discussed general and specific conversations. In this study, the focus is on conversational implicature, referring to implied messages that are not explicitly articulated but are inferred from contextual understanding.

