

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **2.1 Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that studies language to communicate. Levinson (1983, p.5) defines pragmatics as the study of language use. The study of the relation between language and context is essential to an account of language understanding. Pragmatics can solve the problem between the speaker and the hearer to avoid misunderstanding. Pragmatics allows people to understand people's implicit intentions, such as their purposes, assumptions, and actions.

Moreover, Yule (1996, p.3) adds four definitions of pragmatics. First, pragmatics is the study of the speaker's meaning. Pragmatics is concerned with studying the meanings communicated by the speaker and interpreted by the hearer, as well as the speaker's utterances and the hearer's attempts to interpret those utterances. Second, pragmatics is the study of the contextual meaning in the utterance. This definition concerns the speaker's interpretation of the speaker's utterance related to a particular context and how the context influences what the speaker says. In this case, both the speaker and the hearer must be aware of the context that follows the speaker's utterances. The utterance spoken by the speaker requires considering how speakers organize what they want to say according to whom they are speaking to, when, where, and under what circumstances. Third, pragmatics is the study of what is unsaid is still included as part of what is communicated. The hidden meaning of the utterance explores how a hearer can assume the speaker's utterances to gain a correct interpretation. The last, pragmatics, is a study of the relationship

between linguistic forms and their uses.

Kroeger also presents another definition of pragmatics. Kroeger (2018, p.4) states that pragmatics deals with aspects of meaning that depend on the context in which sentences are used. Pragmatics involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what the speaker says.

From all the explanations above, it can be understood that pragmatics is the relation between language, meaning, and context, representing the foundation of understanding language to make compatible sentences with a context. Through pragmatics, we can study the contextual meaning and reveal the implied meaning behind an utterance or the meaning created when an utterance is uttered. Through pragmatics, we can also pay attention to the time, place, who is speaking, and to whom the utterance is addressed.

## **2.2 Context**

To find out how pragmatics plays a role in language phenomena in everyday life, we must also study context. According to the Oxford Dictionary (2011, p.93), context is the situation in which an event occurs. Context is an essential factor in the interpretation of utterances and expressions. Understanding the contextual meaning means understanding the situation of the language is taking. Mey says (2001, p.41) that context is about understanding what something is for and includes who, what, when, where, and how the speaker produced the language.

Understanding the contextual meaning is understanding the context of speech that can be used as all background knowledge that is assumed to be shared and understood by the speaker and the speech partner, which supports the interpretation of the speech partner on what the speaker intended in the whole process of

speaking. In addition, Alan states (2006, p.35) that context has important aspects. First, before and after utterances and expressions. Second, direct physical situation. Third, the wider situation, including social relations and power relations. Fourth, share knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. Like Alan described before about the definition of context, Finegan also explains (2008, p.6), context refers to a social situation in which spoken expression has been previously expressed in its situation. Context relies on a share of knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. DeVito describes (2012, p.8), there are four dimensions of context: 1) physical context is the actual or concrete environment in which communication takes place, 2) the socio-psychological context, which includes status relationships between participants, culture, and the rules of the society in which people communicate. The socio-psychological also includes friendliness or unfriendliness, formality or informality, and seriousness or the cuteness of the situation, 3) temporal context, includes the time of day, time in history where the communication takes place, and how the message fits in with the sequence of communication events, 4) cultural context relates to people's culture: beliefs, values, and ways of behaving shared by a group of people and inherited from one generation to the next. Cultural factors influence every interaction and influence what people say, how people say it, and how people respond to what other people say.

From the theories above, it can be understood that context is everything that plays a role in interpreting an utterance. Context provides related information linking each other. The situation where the speech takes place relates to the meaning indicated by an utterance. In communication, understanding the contextual meaning of the conversation will help the hearer to understand the information and prevent the hearer from misperceptions of information uttered by the speaker. When linked to context, it is

easier for the hearer to understand the speaker's intended message. Therefore, when communicating, humans need to understand the context to support and clarify a situation that has to do with an event.

### **2.3 Implicature**

The implicature was first introduced by Grice (1975) to solve the problem of language meaning that cannot be solved by ordinary semantic theory. One of the most important concepts in pragmatics as a branch of linguistics is the concept of implicature. The concept of implicature is used to explain the difference that often exists in everyday life between "what is said" and "what is implied." Mey says (2001, p.45), implicature comes from the verb "to imply" while the noun is "implication." The verb comes from the Latin *plicare*, which means to fold. Thus, people have to interpret an utterance by themselves to find out the implied meaning contained in the utterance. Likewise, in terms of communicating, to understand and know what a speaker means, the speech partner must interpret the speech spoken by the speaker. The term "implicature" is used by Grice to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean as distinct from what the speaker actually says. According to Grice (2008, p.1), an utterance can imply a proposition that is not part of the utterance. An utterance can imply a proposition, which is not actually a part of the sentence and is not a logical consequence of the utterance. In a real speech, speakers and hearers can communicate smoothly because they both have some kind of background knowledge about what is being said.

According to Brown and Yule (as cited in Sakoikoi, 2018, p.22), the term implicature refers to what the speaker might mean or suggests that is different from what the speaker said. This approach explores how the hearer can make inferences about what

they say in order to be understood with the interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. This opinion rests on a meaning that is different from the literal meaning of speech.

Consider the following example: "This room is very hot." The snippet of the speaker's utterance, "this room is very hot," means that the speaker expects the hearer to turn on the fan. However, the hearer has another purpose in interpreting the speaker's speech by acting "open the room window."

Grice (as cited in Khoiroh, 2017, p.14) distinguishes two different sorts of implicature; they are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. They have something in common in their use. Both conventional implicature and conversational implicature convey an additional meaning of the words uttered. Conventional implicature, the same implicature is always conveyed, regardless of anything and whatever the context. Whereas, in the case of conversational implicatures, what is implied varies according to the context of the utterance. Sakoikoi also adds (2018, p.25), implicature is the implication of meaning in the form of a pragmatic unit of an utterance, both oral and written.

It can be understood that implicature is an indirect meaning or implied meaning contained in an utterance that frees the hearer to interpret the speaker's utterance. Implicatures provide some explicit explanation of how it might mean more than what is actually said.

### **2.3.1 Conventional Implicature**

According to Mey (2001, p.65), conventional implicature is not bound to a specific language context. Yule also explains the same thing. Yule states (2006, p. 78), conventional implicature does not occur in conversation and does not depend on a particular context to interpret it. Another definition from Grice (as cited in Brown & Yule, 2012, p.31) states that conventional implicature has the

conventional meaning of the words used. Like lexical presuppositions, conventional implicatures are associated with the words they are used and contain messages that are obtained directly from the meaning of the word heard, not from the cooperative principle.

For example, in a speech that says, "Christiano Ronaldo is a sharpshooter." Of course, the meaning of a sharpshooter in that utterance is not a sniper from the military or the police. However, everyone knows that Christiano Ronaldo is a football player who often scores goals against the opponent with a free kick or a penalty kick in a progress soccer game. The word "shooter" has the implicature of inserting the ball into the goal. The word "shooter" has nothing to do with the world of football ball. The movement of entering the ball towards the goal in football can be by kicking and dribbling. The word "shoot" has a convention in football, and it is scoring goals against the goal.

Based on the definitions above, conventional implicature happens with the common words or common knowledge and produces additional conveyed meanings. Conversational implicature is not very dependent on the specific context, which is non-temporary to interpret the meaning of an utterance.

### **2.3.2 Conversational Implicature**

The term of implicature was introduced by Grice, which refers to implied meaning from what is said. According to Levinson (1983, p.97), implicature explicitly explains the difference between what is actually said and what is interpreted. Mey defines (2001, p.46), conversational implicature concerns the way we understand an utterance in conversation according to what we expect to hear. It means that the hearer should interpret what the speaker says in order to get the meaning by making inferences.



Mey also adds (as cited in Khoiroh, 2017, p.15) that conversational implicature is how people understand an utterance in conversation by interpreting it. However, sometimes interpreting can be misunderstood by both speakers and hearers. A conversational implicature is implied in conversation or something that is left implicit in the actual language use. In communication, people exchange information, and people tend to speak unclearly or implicitly, which has an implied meaning.

Grice (as cited in Sakoikoi, 2018, p.24), conversational implicature is one aspect of pragmatic studies whose main concern is studying the "meaning of an utterance" according to the context. Conversational implicatures are used to explain the implicit meaning behind "what is said or written "as" something that is implied" in an utterance. Conversational implicatures are pragmatic implications contained in the lingual form spoken by the speaker to the speech partner.

Furthermore, Mey explains (2001, p.50), conversational implicature is an implicit utterance that does not depend on a particular context of the language use. To understand the meaning of conversational implicature, sometimes we must relate it with the situation or context where it is happening. So, the role of context is very important to limit the implicature of meaning in an utterance.

In the experts' opinions above, it can be understood that conversational implicature is something implicit in the people's utterance where the meaning is temporary, related to the context. The speaker can say something and imply something else by relying on the ability of the other person to understand what is meant by what is said.

## **2.4 Types of Conversational Implicature**

Grice (as cited in Prakoso, 2020, p.46) distinguishes two kinds

of conversational implicatures: generalized conversational implicatures and particularized conversational implicatures. Generalized conversational implicatures are implicatures whose presence in a conversation does not require a special context. Particularized conversational implicature is implicature whose presence requires a special context.

#### **2.4.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature**

According to Levinson (1983, p.126), generalized conversational implicature is an implicature that does not require a specific context or the same background knowledge to understand the implied meaning. Yule defines (2006, p.74), general conversational implicature does not require special knowledge in the context. In other words, generalized conversational implicature does not take into account additional meanings, but rather the speech process assumes the meaning of the conversation only by observing the structure of the words used. People who play a role in the speech process assume the meaning of the conversation only by observing the structure of the words used. Cummings (2007, p.19) also states the same thing. He states that general conversational implicatures do not require context to produce implicatures. Kroeger states (2018, p.146), generalized conversational implicatures are the type of inference that does not depend on particular features of the context but is typically associated with the kind of proposition being expressed. Look at the example below:

A: "Did you buy jam and milk?"

B: "I buy milk."

The example above means that B does not buy jam and only buy milk. It can be understood even though A does not give more information about that. There is no need for special background



knowledge of the implicature.

Through the explanations above, general conversational implicature does not require specific knowledge in its interpretation. In general conversational implicature, people can interpret the meaning through the sentence structure spoken by the speaker even though the particular context of the conversation does not influence it.

#### **2.4.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature**

According to Yule (2006, p.74), particularized conversational implicatures occur in very particular contexts and specific knowledge to interpret the meaning of an utterance. Particularized conversational implicatures occur in very special contexts. Therefore, most of the time, people take place when communicating in a very particular context. Particularized conversational implicature arises because of some special factor inherent in the context of utterance. Therefore, Grice states (as cited in Cummings, 2007, p.19), particularized conversational implicatures are implicatures that depend on a particular context. Kroeger also states (2018, p.146), particularized conversational implicatures are the intended inference depending on particular features of the specific context of the utterance. Consider the following example:

A: "Where should I return this coat?"

B: "I live at Camila's house."

The example above implies that A did not immediately return the coat that B lent him because it was already evening. B gives A a chance to use and bring his coat home, and B tells him where he lives so that A can return the coat he borrowed. A must-have specific knowledge to understand B's speech. The specific

knowledge with the particular context happened in this conversation. The address B' lives in is indirectly the context and specific background knowledge that A as the speaker and B as the speech partner know.

In my opinion, particularized conversational implicature is the intended meaning of the conversation by knowing the context of the conversation between the speaker and the hearer. Particularized conversational implicatures really need context and special knowledge to conclude what is needed. Between the speaker and the hearer must have the same background knowledge as what is said to understand the meaning of the conversation.

## **2.5 Previous Related Studies**

Before getting into the analysis, there are several previous related studies to support my research. The first paper is "The Analysis of Implicature in Bridge to Terabithia Movie" by Khoiroh (2017). This research aims to describe the types of implicature used by three main characters (Leslie Burke, Jess Aarons, and Mey Belle), 2) to explain the way the three characters use the implicature (Leslie Burke, Jess Aarons, and Mey Belle). She used implicature theory from Grice for analyzing the implicature found in the dialogue by the three characters in the movie. This research used a qualitative method with documentation technique to describe the implicature types and explain how the three main characters use the implicature. The results of this research show 25 data of the types of conversational implicature. The most common is conversational implicature. It consists of 28 particularized conversational implicatures and 10 generalized conversational implicatures. She found that the three main characters use the implicature in the imagination condition and actual condition with an angry expression, smile expression, passion, lowered voice, and

shrinking the head while revealing the implicature honestly and clearly.

The second paper is "The Conversational Implicature of the Characters in *Tenggelamnya Kapal Van Der Wijck* Movie by Buya Hamka" by Sakoikoi (2018). This research aims to describe the form of implicature, describe the types of implicature, and describe the implicature meaning contained in the conversation between the characters in the "*Tenggelamnya Kapal Van der Wijck* Movie by Buya Hamka." She also used Grice's theory to analyze the conversational implicature. This research used a descriptive qualitative method with a listening technique to get the research data. She found 4 the form of implicature in the form of speech acts: 1) representative speech implicatures, 2) expressive speech implicatures, 3) directive speech implicatures, 4) commissive speech implicatures. Another result of this research shows 52 data of the general conversational implicature and 8 particularized implicature. There are 15 of the implicature meaning shows in this research: 1) disclose, 2) give, 3) testify, 4) report, 5) mention, 6) show, 7) speculate, 8) admit, 9) criticize, 10) praise, 11) complain, 12) suggest, 13) ask, 14) urgently, 15) threatening.

The third paper is "The Conversational Implicature in a Dialogue *Yowis Ben 1* and *Yowis Ben 2* Movie" by Prakoso (2020). This research aims to describe the forms of violation of the cooperative principle that exists in the "*Yowis Ben 1* and *Yowis Ben 2*" movie, to describe the form of violation of the politeness principle in the the "*Yowis Ben 1* and *Yowis Ben 2*" movie, to describe the form of implicature that appears based on the violation the cooperative principle and politeness in the "*Yowis Ben 1* and *Yowis Ben 2*" movie. He used Grice's theory to support his research. This research used a descriptive qualitative method. In the results of this study, the researcher found that 6 of the form of conversational implicatures appeared based on the violation of the

cooperative principle and politeness; accusing implicatures, mocking implicatures, joke implicatures, advise implicature, rejection implicature and boast implicatures.

My research has similarity and difference with the three previous related research above. The similarity between the three previous research above with my research is the study of the conversational implicature and the theory used to analyze the data; Grice's theory. The difference between my research with the three previous research is in the object of the research. The first research used "The Analysis of Implicature in Bridge to Terabithia Movie," the second research used "The Conversational Implicature of the Characters in Tenggelamnya Kapal Van Der Wijck Movie by Buya Hamka," the third research used "The Conversational Implicature in a Dialogue Yowis Ben 1 and Yowis Ben 2 Movie," while in my research, I use "A Conversational Implicature of the Characters in The Kissing Booth 2 (2020) Movie Script." The novelty that I will do in my research compared to the three previous research above is that I will analyze and explain the contextual meaning of the conversational implicature found in "The Kissing Booth 2" movie script.