CHAPTER 2
THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter discusses an explanation of what pragmatics is and the types of implicatures. This chapter also discusses cooperative principles which have several types, namely maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner. Also to knowing what the contextual meaning in character of the movie and discusses previous studies to find out what research has been done.

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of language use in relation to context. Pragmatics is typically defined as the study of how statements make sense in a given context. According to Crystal (1987, p. 62); Pragmatics is a factor that governs the language of what you want to choose in a language pool that you may meet whenever used in social interactions, and that is the other factor. It deals with the impact on people. Therefore, the pragmatic factor that influences the choice of grammatical structure is the meaning we create by presenting vocabulary through such sound patterns and procedures intended as a means of communication (Crystal (Crystal). 1987, p.62). Associate it with the meaning of words that people use in social situations and the choice of words in context. The study of speaker meaning is called pragmatics. Students study pragmatics to learn how to interpret the speaker's meaning.

According to the Yunia Nirsita Aqidatul Izzah (2019, p.26), stated that the study of meaning in a situation or context is known as pragmatics. It is a platform where we may investigate the many methods in which individuals convey meaning because of the diversity of persons there. They take a pragmatic viewpoint on the social sciences and the facts era, particularly in the areas of economics, politics, and education. From a realistic perspective, language use and interplay is the number one consumer of language , now no longer using language as a machine of symbols and rules. The pragmatic method now no longer simplest examines man or woman words, sentences, or remoted texts, however additionally examines the complete social hobby or language sport withinside the real social context, the modern scenario and previous. And next actions.

Based on Adi Ansori (2021, p.25), Pragmatics assist speakers and listeners in avoiding meaning misunderstandings. Additionally, pragmatics needs to be well explored. This is due to the fact that studying pragmatics helps us to comprehend language's meaning in the context in which the speaker is conveying it to us. It also aids the listener in understanding the meaning, ensuring that the intended meaning is understood. We can help, after all. Based on the Jajasdharma that The study of how language is used in particular contexts is known as pragmatics. With this information, one may comprehend the characteristics of language and how it is applied in communication. I can. In other words, pragmatics leads to the investigation of what speakers intend when they speak, as well as the meanings of the individual words and phrases they use. Based on the explanation above, pragmatics refers to the meaning or vocabulary spoken by a speaker to a listener. The presence of pragmatics helps listeners understand the meaning and context of the speaker's speech.

2.2. Implicature

2.2.1. Definition of Implicature

The term implicature was originally introduced by Grice (1975) to explain the speaking act. By using the language, the speaker accomplishes it. However, when we say that the root of negation has implicature, we apply the term implication to the proposition. Implicature means that an action refers to something else or the object of that action. Implicature are information that is implicitly or in directly transmitted by the speaker, Grice made a distinction between what is said by speaer of a verbal utterance and what is implicated.

Yule said that something in the conversation needs to be not only the meaning of the word, but also an additional transmitted meaning called suggestion. It is accomplished when the speaker strives to say more than just what the term means. Implicature are alternative types of inclusion that have additional meaning in the logical and informal language. Usually to convey a specific purpose, but through utterances that do not directly express it, this can be done through utterances that include the true meaning of the intended speaker. Yule said there is a second communicated meaning called implicature that is used to describe the conversation that something had to be more than just the word's

meaning. When a speaker wants to say more than just what a word signifies, they have succeeded.

According to Levinson (Achmad & Ale Abdulloh, 2012, p.139), the existence of theories implied in speech conversation is required: It (1) provides functional explanations of linguistic facts not available in structured language theory, (2) bridges communication processes between speakers, and (3) explains how language users express their messages. Do you understand? Entailment is the outcome of the listener's inference as the most likely interpretation of a statement in a specific context. Please provide a precise and explicit description. Meaning remains implicir. Listener must develop meaning based on phonetic input and world knowledge. Implicature are part of pragmatics. That is, unlike what the speaker says, it implies or explains what the speaker means, recommends, or intends to .

2.2.2. Types of Implicature

It is important to understand the implicature of the utterance to prevent misunderstanding and to know what the meaning that speaker wants to address in communication. While discussing implicature, Grice (1975) distinguishes that implicature has two types: Conventional Implicature and Conversational Implicature.

1. Conventional Implicature

Grice explained that the traditional meaning of the words used helped determine the meaning and what was said. Grice is about to start: "In some circumstances, the terms' traditional meanings will govern what is implied in addition to influencing what is said. I could smugly claim that because he is English, he is fearless. I've promised, by the meaning of my words, that it's true that his bravery is a result of (derives from) his nationality as an Englishman. (Grice 1975, p.44)

This means the resulting connecting two sentences together. This relationship does not, however, add to the criterion that the statement is true, as if a sentence is true because p, then q, then p and q must be true as well. The contribution of *therefore* is thus non-truth-conditional.

Using current terminology, Conventional implicature are common and customary. In other words, everyone already generally knows and understands the meaning or implicature of a particular case. Listeners or readers who understand the meaning of traditional assumptions have a shared experience of knowledge already understood by people themselves.

2. Conversational Implicature

The maximum conversational implicature can be used to extract conversational implicature, which is created from a general principle of conversational plus a number of maxims that speakers would typically follow. Contrarily, conversational implicature are those that come up while a dialogue is being passed. A crucial component of pragmatics is implicature. It is the theory of expression, meaning, and the relationship between the speaker's intentions and their implicature (Grice, 1975). As Meyer (2009, p. 58) states, "conversational implicature must be a compilation of incorrect utterance,"

Verschueren (1999, p. 34) also states that the conversational implicature derive from the apparent disregard of the aphorism of conversation combined with the hypothesized adherence to the principle of cooperation. Therefore, implicature treat the speaker's intent as an additional meaning of the utterance by ignoring the norms or maxims of the conversation. In short, When speakers deviate from the maxim, it indicates that they are acting out the conversation's implications. The concept of conversational implications is one of the most important ideas in pragmatics. Conversational implications are also commonly referred to as short form implications. Grice (1975) also stated that Implicate meanings are derived from what is expressed in an indirect or suggestive manner. Grice (1975) distinguishes between generalized and particularized conversational implicature, two different kinds of conversational implicature.

2.a. Generalized Conversational Implicature

The implications of a generalized conversation are only to show that it frequently shows up in a variety of settings, thus the context's specifics don't seem to matter much.

Yule (1996, p.41) hypothesizes that many other generalized conversational implications are generally transmitted on a value scale and are therefore known as scalar implications. This is especially evident in expressing the implications of generalized conversation, as shown in the value scale. Here you can recognize everything, most, many, some, few, always, often, and sometimes.

Grice also states that the implications of generalized conversation are "Unless there are unusual conditions, the usage of specific kinds of words in utterances is usually accompanied with such implications or certain implications."

The occurrence of generalized conversational implications in conversation does not require a specific context. In other words, the additional meaning is communicated without the need for any specialized background knowledge or deductive reasoning. For example:

A	Hi,mate. I hope you bring the umbrella and jacket.
B	Ah,yeah. I bring the umbrella.

Table 2.a Example of Generalized Conversational Implicature

Based on the example above, this means that A doesn't have a jacket. A said she would bring only an umbrella. Without any special background knowledge of the conversation, B can understand what A is implying. Another example as the same in above as following:

A	Did you invite Bella and Riko in your party tonight?
B	I invited Bella.

Table 2.a Example of Generalized Conversational Implicature

From the utterance of A and B there is no special context of the B statement. Yet, when A ask to B about whether B invite Bella and Riko in her party. B only say if she invite Bella, she does not say invite Riko also. It means that B does not invite Riko, she only invite Bella. This is talking about generalized conversational implicature when no special knowledge is required in the context to compute the conveyed meaning.2.b. Particularized Conversational Implicature

2.b Particularized Conversational Implicature

The particularized conversational are one of Grice's conversational implicature. According to Peccei (1999, p. 38), the point is that certain implicature often require the physical context of the utterance, as well as general knowledge specific to or "local" to the speaker and listener.

In the other hand, particularized conversational implicature is expressions that always calculated using specific knowledge in a particular context, but in most cases conversations take place in a very specific context where locally accepted conclusions are accepted.

According to Yule, entailment reasoning, especially in conversation, is necessary to resolve the meaning being conveyed. A particular context is needed to relate the meaning of what is being said. Yule gives an example:

| **A** | Are you watching Harry Potter tonight? |
| **B** | I've got an exam tomorrow. |

Table 2.b Example of Particularized Conversational Implicature

A didn't see the movie because A assumed that B spends the night with his family. Based on the above description, the authors can infer that a certain conversational reasoning criterion is conversational reasoning whose meaning lies outside the speaker's utterance, and as a result, the listener interprets the speaker's meaning. In another sense, the implication of a given dialogue is the conclusion; the listener is responsible for carrying out this interpretation and completely elucidating it in the unique context of the statement.

2.3. Cooperative Principle

Cooperative principles are the basic assumptions that speakers and listeners make when speaking to each other in order to have cooperative conversations that lead to meaningful conversations. A successful conversation between a speaker and an interlocutor requires adherence to the rules of the cooperative principle. According to Grice (1975), the principle of cooperation is to contribute to the conversation as needed, at the stage in which it takes place, according to the accepted purpose or direction of the conversational exchange.

Grice explained that the speaker and listener are intended to be cooperative in the conversation so that there are no ambiguous answers. In a conversation, this idea highlights the collaborative efforts that the speaker and the other person make. Language is a factor in the teamwork in question. Therefore, presenters always work to keep their talks relevant, intelligible, short and to the point, and always open to discussion. The principles of cooperation consist of four principles. Quantity quotes, quality quotes, relationship quotes, social quotes. Each of these maxims has its own role in making the conversation as collaborative as it needs to be. More on this below.

2.3.1 Maxim of Quantity

Grice (Yule, 1996) explained that the maximum amount is to make your contribution to the conversation as useful as necessary. That is, when someone asks about something, the listener should respond with a useful answer. So enough said, don't overdo it. This should be the answer or information the questioner needs. Providing more information may help, but the Cooperative Principles rules require only the necessary information.

A	Have you done your assignment?
B	Yes, I have.

Table 2.3.1 Example Maxim of Quantity

Conversation in the example above is clear speech and very informative content. It can be said that the meaning of language can be understood well and clearly by the language partner without further information.

2.3.2 Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality is to say something that you can believe to be true. means that it is not allowed to the interlocutor must state that the answer is certain or true.

A	When is physics exam?
B	This Saturday.

Table 2.3.2 Example Maxim of Quality

The above conversation revealed the phenomenon of the quality maxim. The answers given in letter (B) are of the highest quality and comply with the rules. Character (B) answered the truth that he believed to be true.

2.3.3 Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation are one of the most common maxims in conversation. Some give good answers, some don't. According to Grice (Cited in Yule, 1996), the relational maxim rule only states what is relevant to the question. The relationship maxim is to stay on topic and not stray from it.

A	Where is my guitar?
B	In your study room.

Table 2.3.3 Example Maxim of Relation

Conversation in the example above follows and maintains maximum relevance. This is because, upon closer examination, character (B)'s line "in the study" is a response to character (A)'s conversation "where is my guitar?" In other words, this speech adheres to Grice's principles of adequacy in cooperation.

2.3.4 Maxim of Manner

A maxim of manners when speech is short, clear and unambiguous.
 According to Grice (quoted in his Yule in 1996), there are some rules to the manner:

a. Avoid obscurity of expression
b. Avoid ambiguity
c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
d. Be orderly

A	Who is your Footballer friend?
B	Messi.

Table 2.3.4 Example Maxim of Manner

Conversation in the example above, it can be said that in conversation both the speaker and the interlocutor keep their speech direct, clear and not blurry, thus the maxims of the implementation of the Grice cooperation principle are observed and adhered to.

2.4 Flouting Maxim

Thomas in Mey (2001, p.77) states that maxim ignorance occurs when people blatantly ignore one or more maxims. But sometimes we break maxims by giving more information or having irrelevant or unhelpful conversations called disregarding maxims. According to Levinson (1983), maximal disregard occurs when the speaker deliberately stops applying the maxim in order to persuade the listener to infer the hidden meaning behind the statement. That is, the speaker uses suggestion.

2.4.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

The speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity appears to provide excessive information. For example in the journal by Zulfah Ibrahim, M. Bahri Arifin, Ririn Setyowati (2018, p.84)

Jimmy	How are we getting here?
Linda	Well, We're getting there in Dave's car

Table 2.4.1 Example Flouting Maxim of Quantity

In this case, Linda emphasizes the word us to let Jimmy know he's not there. This is communicated to Jimmy by Linda's friend of hers, Dave, arranging her car for her and suggesting that Jimmy not travel with her to her destination. address. It is clear that the above information is not clearly understood. Linda doesn't give listeners enough information.

2.4.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality

A speaker violates the maxim of quality due to a lack of contribution when the contribution they are making is incorrect and they are say something for which there is not enough evidence or lie. To make fun of such a saying, the speaker can employ hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and ridicule. For example in the journal by Zulfah Ibrahim, M. Bahri Arifin, Ririn Setyowati (2018, p.85)

Student	Teheran's in Turkey isn't it, teacher?
Teacher	And London's in Armenia I suppose. (cited in Levinson, 1983

Table 2.4.2 Example Flouting Maxim of Quality

In this example, the teacher indicates that what the student said earlier is wrong without saying "no", but saying that London is in Armenia, indicating that Tehran is not in Turkey. I'm talking about I know that London is in England, so the student's statement is false. That is why teachers ignored the principle of quality.

2.4.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

Based on Cutting (2002: 39), when the speaker disobeys the maxim of the relationship, the listener imagines that the listener is not saying the utterance and creates a relationship between their utterance and the previous utterance. I expect. That is, if either the speaker or the listener provides an irrelevant response, the relationship is ignored. For example in the journal by Yuni Wulandari Prihatini (2018: 16):

Policewoman	They were found on site, not far from your daughter's body. Can you positively identify them as hers?
Mr. Quan	Who did this?

Table 2.4.3 Example Flouting Maxim of Relation

The interview took place at Mr. Quan's Happy Peacock Restaurant. The police officer showed Mr. Quang the objects and asked, "Can you confirm that they are yours?" Did you do this?" Mr. Quang was supposed to answer the given question. answered the question of Since there is no relationship between the policewoman's question and Mr. Quan's answer, Mr. Quan's utterance belongs to the connotation of the conversation by defying the maxim of relation. Based on the context, Mr. Kuan's remarks imply that his things belonged to a fan, who did not believe his daughter was gone. So he just looked and asked the police..

2.4.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

Flouting maxim of manner occurs when speaker contribution is not perceptive and may be cryptic, unclear, or not logically direct. For example in the result of Yunia Nirsita's research (2019: 46):

Jasmine	Are we in trouble?
Aladdin	Only if you get caught. Down that alley. Monkey knows the way. You'll be fine

<center>**Table 2.4.4 Example Flouting Maxim of Manner**</center>

The above conversation took place while Jasmine and Aladdin were being chased by the market keeper. Aladdin tricked Bender by giving Jasmine's bracelets instead of the bread Jasmine would give to hungry children. I'm here. When Aladdin answers Jasmine's question, Aladdin ignores the maxim of manners.

2.5 Previous Studies

Related to this research, there are some previous studies which are similar or related to this research. Those are presented below:

First, Muhamad Vikry (2014) conducted a study titled "Analyzing Speech Entailment in Iron Man 3". Descriptive qualitative methods are used by researchers to describe and identify implications of conversations. This study is a practical study aimed at classifying the types of conversational entailments that arise from the characters' disregard for maxims in Iron Man 3 and explaining their meaning. He used Grice's theory to analyze the dialogue implications found in the dialogue of the characters in the film. In this study, the researchers found that the character's 8 disregard maximal utterances were (1) 2 disregards of quantity, (2) 2 disregards of quality, (3) 2 disregards of relation, and (4) I found that conversational implications arise because Five ignoring behavior maxims, (1) Negative behavior maxims, (2) Negative quantity and behavior maxims, (1) Harmful quantity and behavior maxims. He also found the existence of two types of colloquial entailment: (1) two generalized colloquial entailments and (2) 13 specific colloquial entailments.

Second, Yunia Nirsita Aqidatul Izah (2019) conducted his research in a term paper entitled "Conversational Implicature Analysis in "Aladdin" movie". Descriptive qualitative method is used by the researcher. This research focuses on Types of maxims of cooperative principles that are ignored in utterances, how maximal ignoring occurs in utterances, and types of conversational implications

embedded in utterances. These are the five non-compliance principles. Ignore maxims, violate maxims, violate maxims, opt out, suspend maxims. There are two types of conversational implications: generalized conversational implications and specialized conversational implications. From this study, the most common maxim found unobserved by researchers because most characters give more or longer answers than required is the ignore quantity maxim. It looks like you are. There are types that are not found in data analysis that reject and maximize. The type of conversational entailment discovered by Grice's theory in this film is generalized specific conversational entailment. Researchers found an unbalanced amount of entailment. Researchers often find more general conversational implications. That means he's on 21 of the 25 dates that researchers have found.. The results of this study are (1) there are 8 utterances flouting maxim of quantity, (2) there are 3 utterances flouting maxim of relation, (3) there are 4 utterances flouting maxim of manner. And there are (1) 1 utterance violating maxim of quantity, (2) 3 utterances violating maxim of quality, (3) 5 utterances violating maxim of relation, (4) 1 utterance violating maxim of manner. And there are 1 utterance that infringing maxim of quantity.

The third is Mr. Lut Husaini Widi Hidayati from the National University of Yogyakarta in 2015. The title of the paper is "A Practical Analysis of the Main Character's Ignorance of Maxim in The Devil Wears Prada". Analyzing the disregard for the adage in The Devil Wears Prada. This includes his four types of maximal ignorance based on Grice theory. They are quality maxims, quantity maxims, relationship maxims, wise maxims. This study used Austen's theory used by the characters in the film to analyze the strategies and functions of cutting maxims, using the theory of cutting that the main character uses to defy maxims. Also examine strategies to.

From some of the previous studies mentioned above, there are similarities and differences between these previous studies and this study. All the above surveys are intended for descriptive qualitative use like this survey. Three of his previous studies have used Grice's theory of conversational entailment, but in the third prior study, Sube used Cutting theory as well as Grice's theory to create characters We analyzed strategies and functions that ignore the maxims of

Austin's theory, while this research used two theory from Cutting's theory to analyze flouting maxim and from Grice's theory to analyze types of conversational implicature and have different from the first and the second previous studies. Every research has different purpose, and the different between this research and the first and the second previous studies is because in the first and the second previous studies also analyze opting out maxim, violating maxim and infringing maxim. And the different between this research and the third previous studies is because in the third previous studies don't analyze the types of conversational implicature and this research analyze the types of conversational implicature. However, the aim of this study is nevertheless different from the third study, which focused only on neglected maxims and types of implicature while the third research,not only analyze the flouting maxims but also others non-observance maxim suxh as opting out, violating and infringing out.