

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter will discuss the theoretical framework and previous related studies. In the theoretical review, I present the theories related to the topic of the research. It explains pragmatics definition, cooperative principles, the non observance maxims, conversational implicature.

2.1 Pragmatics

There are many definitions of the notion of pragmatics that linguists describe. Yule (1988: 9) defines pragmatics as the study of contextual meaning. Pragmatics is concerned with studying meaning as communicated by a speaker (or a writer) and interpreted by a hearer (or a reader). It involves analyzing what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. Meanwhile, Levinson (2008: 24) defines pragmatics as the study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate. According to Levinson, pragmatics is defined as the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language (2008: 9). In another word, pragmatics is the study of those aspects of the relationship between language and context that are relevant to the writing of grammars. From the definitions above, pragmatics always includes the aspects of participants and the context in which the conversation takes place. It is assumed that the speaker and hearer involved in the conversation generally cooperate. Context becomes an essential aspect in pragmatics because the same utterances may have more than one pragmatic meaning when uttered differently.

Relating to meaning, as Widdowson (1996: 61) says, pragmatics is concerned with what people mean by the language they use, how they actualize its meaning potential as a communicative resource. This does not happen in semantics, which concerns on meaning in language. Yule (1996: 4) differentiates the two subjects by stating that pragmatics concerns with the relationship between linguistic forms and the users. While semantics concerns with the relationship between linguistic forms and entities in the world, that is, how words literally connect to things. Studying pragmatics makes it possible for us to know what

might be meant by an expression in an actual utterance or when we hear or read it in a particular context. The intended meaning of an utterance is gripped, as Widdowson (1996: 62-66) mentions, by considering some aspects of pragmatics. There are reference-the pointing or indexical function, propositionthe symbolic conventions of the code to key us into a context of shared knowledge. Widdowson added that there is an occasion when speaker is also doing something while he is saying an utterance. The speaker performs some kind of illocution or communicative force. Clearly, when people seek to communicate, they enter into a kind of contract which is subscribed into a cooperative principle. Cooperation does not interfere and generate conflict. Indeed, only by adhering to the cooperative principle can one express disagreement or create conflict situations.

2.2 Cooperative Principles

In essence, as humans, they will always meet and interact with other people in carrying out their activities. In interacting with other people, humans use language as a medium of communication. In good communication, there are speakers and interlocutors involved, and they will try to convey practical and efficient speech. This is similar to the opinion of Wijana (1996: 450), who explains that the speaker will try to produce their speech always relevant to the context, concise and understandable, dense and clear, and always on the issue so as not to waste the other person's time.

In order for utterances to be expressed and accepted by the interlocutor, speakers usually carefully consider the various pragmatic factors involved or may be involved in a communication process (Wijana, 2004: 54).

Grice (1975:45-47) suggests that a reasonable discourse can occur if the speaker and the listener obey the cooperative principles of communication. As Grice (1975: 45-46) states, speakers intend to be cooperative in conversation. In communication, participants are required to say the truth, be relevant and try to be as clear as possible (Yule, 1996: 37). For this reason, Grice (1989: 42) formulates a general "Cooperative Principle" which is elaborated in four sub-principles called maxims. This principle can be briefly described as "make your conversational

contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice, 1989:26). This is a pragmatic rule in conversation so that communication can run both effectively and efficiently. These rules are elaborated into four maxims, they are:

Maxims of Quantity: (a) Convey enough information, no more or less; (b) Do not make utterances that are more informative than listeners need.

Maxims of Quality: (a) Do not say what you believe is wrong; (b) Do not say anything that is not based on facts.

Maxims of Relation: Make your contribution according to the topic of conversation. Do not say anything unrelated.

Maxims of Manner: Be clear; Avoid ambiguity of expression, Avoid obscurity, Be concise (avoid unnecessary prolixity). (Yule, 1996:37).

Yule (1996:37) mentions, “it is important to know these maxims, as unwritten assumption we have in conversation.” Below is an example of a dialogue that obeys the rule of the cooperative principle:

A: “Where’s the kitten?”

B: “In the living room, in a cardboard box.”

The dialogue above is cooperative according to the conversational maxims theory proposed by Grice because it fulfills all of the maxims described above. B provides enough information about the existence of the kitten, no less and no more than A needs (quantity), provides true and real information (quality), provides relevant answers to A’s question (relation), and provides clear answer, unambiguous, brief, orderly (manner).

2.3 The Non-observance Maxims

There is another theory of conversation with cooperative principle as the basic theory. It is the non-observance of the conversational maxims Theory proposed by Cutting (2002: 37). It is classified into 5 categories:

2.3.1 Flouting the Maxims

Flouting the maxims is defined as when the speaker seems to disobey the maxims but expects the listener to produce the implications of the utterance itself, not taking the words to their true meaning. Cutting (2002: 37) also states that the speaker that flouts the maxim of relation expects the hearer to understand the meaning behind the utterance. Flouting the maxim is divided into flouting quantity, flouting quality, flouting relation, and flouting manner.

A. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Flouting quantity is when the speaker gives less or more information than is required. According to Yule (1996: 35), implicature is used to communicate something which must be more than just what the words mean. There is one example from Cutting (2002:37):

A: "Well, how do I look?" (2)

B: "Your shoes are nice..."

In (2), B gives an answer to A in which it is expected that A understands the implication that only shoes are good, which means others are not. A might expect B to give an answer about the overall appearance, and B might expect A to understand by providing less information that is needed.

B. Flouting Maxim of Quality

Flouting quality is defined as conveying or stating something that does not represent the truth at all. Thomas (cited in Fami 2015:15) states that flouting maxim of quality occurs when the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue or for which they lack adequate evidence. Here is one example:

Sarah: I think I am the most pretty girl in the world. (3)

Johnny: Yeah, and I am the son of the king's descendant.

In (3), Sarah is boasting around. Then Johnny's answer does not mean that he is boasting around too, but he wants Sarah to stop boasting around by saying something really wrong. He wants Sarah to look for the message behind the line, in which Johnny is not the son of the king's descendant. In the section on flouting quality, it is stated that the maxims of quality can be flouted not only by saying something that does not represent reality but also by using hyperbole, metaphor, irony, banter and sarcasm.

The two ways of flouting the maxim of quality are the application of irony and banter in the utterances. Cutting (1992: 38) states that irony is a friendly way of being offensive while banter is an offensive way of being friendly. In the case of irony, the speaker expresses the positive sentiment that implies negative to distance themselves from the addressee and show a lack of friendship or relationship. On the other hand, banter expresses negative sentiment and implies the positive, which they are trying to show a strong friendship or relationship. It may sound like a mild aggression, but it is intended to signify a bond and a friendship. Here is an utterance representing irony:

Jay: You have to clean it first before going out or I'm telling dad

Kevin: Thanks for ruining my daaay!(7)

From this dialogue, Jay told his brother Kevin to clean the mess before he goes out of the house. In this conversation, Kevin states his opinion by saying "Thanks for ruining my daaay!". This utterance is irony which according to Cutting (2002:38) that it serves as a friendly way of being offensive in which the speaker expresses a positive sentiment and implies a negative one. Kevin's utterance shows that he is overtly thanking Jay by giving a long intonation on the word "day". However, it has the negative meaning, in which he is actually complaining and judging Jay.

C. Flouting Maxim of Relation

Cutting (2002: 39) states that "if speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and

make the connection between their utterance and the preceding one(s)”. It means that the speakers who flout the maxim of relation give responses that are intentionally irrelevant or related to the topic being discussed in the conversation. The following is an example that represents this type of flouted maxim :

A: So what do you think of Mark?

B: His flatmate’s a wonderful cook. (8)

(Cutting, 2002:39)

Answer B in (8) concludes that she is not too impressed with Mark by not answering A's question regarding Mark. Instead, she compliments the flatmate of Mark. So, she has implied the answer to the question.

D. Flouting Maxim of Manner

The last category in flouting the maxims is flouting manner. Flouting the maxim of manner happens when the speaker is appearing to be obscure and ambiguous (Cutting, 2002: 39). Here is the example:

A: Where are you off to?

B: I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.

A: OK, but don’t be long – dinner’s nearly ready. (9)

(Cutting, 2002:39)

B's utterance in conversation (9) “that funny white stuff” refers to ice cream and “somebody” refers to a third person named Michelle. B tries not to be clear because he doesn't want Michelle to know that B is leaving and plans to buy her ice cream.

2.3.2 Violating the Maxims

The next category of the non-observance of the conversational maxims is violating the maxims. Violation, according to Grice (1989: 28), takes place when speakers intentionally refrain to apply certain maxims in their conversation to cause misunderstanding on their participants’ part or to achieve some other

purposes (deception). A speaker is said to have violated the maxim by giving blatantly wrong information so that the interlocutor only knows the literal meaning of the utterance. According to Grice's basic theory, there are four categories of violation of maxims. They are: violating the quality, violating the quantity, violating the relation, and violating the manner.

A. Violating Maxim of Quality

Violation of maxim of quality occurs when the speaker says something untrue or for which they lack adequate evidence information for reasons best known to them. Cutting (2002: 40) says, a speaker can violate the maxim of quality by not being sincere and tend to give wrong information to a hearer. If a speaker violates the maxim of quality, they are not being genuine and providing the listener the wrong information. Consider the following example:

Father: How much did that new Iphone cost, honey?

Daughter: Four hundred and fifty dollars. (10)

The daughter has violated the maxim of quality because the price of the new Iphone is more expensive than the price she has said. Maybe she does it because she doesn't want her father to know that the new Iphone costs a lot.

B. Violating Maxim of Quantity

According to Cutting (2002: 40), violating towards maxim of quantity happens when a speaker does not give enough information to a hearer about the whole picture or the topic being discussed. Here is the example:

Father: How much did that new Iphone cost, honey?

Daughter: It's not too much different from before. (11)

In (11), the daughter has violated the maxim of quantity because she does not mention the price of the new Iphone. She has given less information than is required.

C. Violating Maxim of Relation

Cutting (2002: 40) defines that violating in maxim of relation happens when speakers try to distract and change the topic to another one. Let's see one

example below:

Father: How much did that new Iphone cost, honey?

Daughter: I'll tell you, anyway, we haven't had dinner out with mom lately. Let's find some restaurant tonight. (12)

The daughter's answer in (12) is considered as violating relation because her answer is irrelevant to the question. It is definitely that she is trying to avoid the topic.

D. Violating Maxim of Manner

Cutting (2002: 40) defines that violating towards maxim of manner happens when someone gives obscure reference, and vague reference, in order to avoid a brief and orderly answer in a conversation. Here is one example:

Father: How much did that new Iphone cost, honey?

Daughter: A small part of my savings and birthday money, although maybe a large part of my friend's savings that sold to me. But don't worry, there's still some left, though not much. (13)

The daughter's answer above in (13) has violated manner because her answer is too long and obscure. She probably intends to avoid the trouble because she spent a lot of money to buy that new Iphone by saying it all. The other forms of the Non-observance of the Conversational Maxims are infringing the maxim and opting out the maxim. These two categories occur without any implied meaning and are not done intentionally.

2.3.3 Opting Out the Maxims

According to Cutting (2002: 41) a speaker opting out of a maxim indicates that he/she is unwilling to cooperate. However, the speaker does not want to appear uncooperative. They cannot reply on the way the other person expects them to, sometimes for legal or ethical reasons they do. In addition, Black (2006: 24) explains that opting out the maxim means making clear someone is aware of the maxim but he/she is prevented for some reason from observing it. The

following example explains the occurrence of opting out the maxim:

Performer: I've also worked with this person who wasn't easy to manage and always wanted to be a smarty-pants, that was very hard.

Host: Who is it?

Performer: It's definitely a person whom I have did a collab ages ago and I can't say the name. (15)

In (15), the performer is not being concise in responding to the question, so she is opting out a maxim. The performer refuses to give the person's name probably because of ethical reason. Therefore, she does not observe the cooperative principle of conversational maxim.

It is believed that the non-observance of the conversational maxims in the serial script makes the story more interesting to read but needs to be analyzed to understand its intent and purpose. In addition, it is interesting to find the categories of non-observance to the theory of conversational maxims used in the series, the implied meaning, and the purpose of applying the theory of non-observance maxims.

2.4 Implicature

In everyday conversation, humans often imply certain utterances in their conversation, which contain implied meanings that are not in accordance with the literal words being spoken. The word implicature comes from the verb "to imply." Imply means when we communicate with the other person and want to express our ideas, opinions or feelings, but we do not say it directly. Mey (2001: 45) states that implicature comes from the verb "to imply" while the noun is "implication." The verb comes from Latin word, which means there is no fold, so to understand what is folded or stored must be done by opening it. Understanding the implied meanings conveyed by the speaker, the interlocutor must interpret an utterance for themselves to find out the implied meaning contained in the utterance. Consider the following dialogue:

Nancy: Can you cook?

Erica: I have bought something to eat for movie tonight. (17)

Erica's answer in the dialogue (17), shows the existence of conversational implicature where Nancy is asking about whether Erica can cook or not. Instead of answering the question, Nancy responds by giving another topic that she has bought food for dinner. It implicates that Erica cannot cook, so that is why she has to buy something to eat. In addition, Thomas in Plaritdge (2006: 70) explains an implicature is generated intentional by the speaker and may (or may not be understood by the hearer).

According to Brown and Yule (cited in Sakoikoi, 2018: 22), the term implicature refers to what the speaker might mean or suggests that is different from what the speaker said. This study describes how listeners can make inferences about what the speaker wants to convey so that it can be understood by the message implied in his/her utterance. This opinion focuses on meanings that are different from the literal meaning of speech.

Grice distinguishes two different types of implicature, namely conventional implicature and conversational implicature. They both have in common the trait in which both convey the implied additional meaning of the utterance beyond the semantic meaning of the spoken words. Yule (1996: 227) explains that conversational implicature is pragmatic implication implied in a conversation. Conventional implicature is a type of implicature obtained directly from the meaning of the word, not from the principle of conversation. In this study, I only focus on conversational implicature. So, I will only explain a little about the definition and its application of conventional implicature.

2.4.1 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is obtained directly from the meaning of words that can be generated from logical reasoning, and not from the principle of conversation. According to Grice 1975 (cited in Rani, 2004:171) in the use of language there is implicature called conventional implicature. It is the type of implicature which is determined by the "conventional meaning of the words used". Conventional implicature does not relate to any particular context to its

implied meaning, also it does not have to be in conversation because it is not based on Grice's maxim or cooperative principle. Now, consider the following example: "That man's heart is made of rock". If we take the literal meaning of the statement, of course, the man's heart is not really made of rock. The speaker seems to indirectly imply that the man is a tough and strong person because he has a strong heart. We all know that rock is a hard natural substance, and the heart is always associated with feelings which is one of the important elements that exist in humans. We can feel hurt, happy, angry, and so on. In this case, the speaker uses a metaphor to emphasize the implied meaning in their utterance.

Based on the explanation and example above, conventional implicature occurs because the additional meaning is conveyed to common words and general knowledge we apply every day. Conventional implicature is not rely on particular contexts, it is non-temporary to interpret the meaning of an utterance.

2.4.2 Conversational Implicature

Grice (1975: 42) states a theory of implicature has started the concept of maxims. The maxims are the explicitness of a principle known as the cooperative principle – a principle that is required to account for pragmatic interpretations, saying: "Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (1975: 45). For example, if speaker A says, "Has the kitten found?", and speaker B responds, "There is a cat screaming near the bush". One can conclude under the right circumstances and based on the shared assumption between the interlocutors, that the kitten has been found. Grice observed that conversational exchanges consist of cooperative efforts recognized by each participant. Grice (1975: 45) divides cooperative principle into four basic conversational maxims that governs the principles of conversation: (1) quantity: don't make your contribution more informative than necessary; (2) quality: don't say what you believe to be wrong or that you lack evidence for; (3) relation: be relevant; and, (4) method: be clear, brief and orderly.

The implicature that is produced by violating the cooperative principle is a

conversational implicature. To understand the meaning of conversational implicature, we have to relate it to the context or situation in which it occurs. Grice observed that conversational implicatures are typically connected to what is said rather than the way it is said, so that “it is not possible to find another way of saying the same thing, which simply lacks the implicature in question” (1975: 39).

2.5 Context

When conveying and understanding speech, both the speaker and the listener in communication are influenced by several elements outside the language itself, which are behind the occurrence of speech. This is known as context. This refers to the background knowledge shared by the participants, which includes the physical and social environment (Leech in Nadar, 2013: 6). This helps the speaker make references, and the listener identifies possible conclusions. Moreover, Leech (1983: 13) states that context is the background knowledge that is assumed to be shared by the speaker and listener, then contributes to the listener's interpretation of what the speaker means by a particular utterance.

2.6 Previous Related Studies

There are several related studies with a similar discussion that is provided in this study. The first related study entitled “An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Iron Man 3” by Vikry (2014) aimed to classify the types of conversational implicature resulted from the non-observance maxim which have been done by the characters in the movie's script of “Iron Man 3” and explain their meanings. This study also further examined the most frequent non-observance maxim used in the script. The data analysis is in the form of utterances taken from the movie's script “Iron Man 3” with descriptive qualitative method to describe and identify the conversational implicature. The result of this study shows that conversational implicatures rising because of the non-observance maxims in the characters' utterances, they are; flouting maxim of quality (2), flouting maxim of quantity (2), flouting maxims of manner (5), opting out maxim of manner (1), opting out maxim of quantity and manner (1), flouting maxim of

relation (2) and violating maxim of quantity and manner (1). Also, there are two types of conversational implicature found in this study, those are generalized conversational implicature (2) and particularized conversational implicature (13).

The second related study entitled “Conversational Implicature of The Presenters in Take Me Out Indonesia” by Nanda (2012) aimed to investigate conversational implicature that the presenters of Take Me Out Indonesia operate within their utterances along with the possible implications that lie behind the implicature. This study mainly reviews how the presenter of this game show applies conversational implicature by choosing the sample of the episode XXII of the show. Qualitative method is employed in processing the data through identifying, classifying, calculating and then separately analyzing based on conversational implicature theory proposed by Grice (1975). The result shows that the presenters tended to use generalized conversational implicature (59, 8%) rather than the particularized (40,2%). This study concludes that various types of implicature used in the conversation by the presenters to make interaction flows smoothly.

Another previous related study entitled “The Non-Observance of The Conversational Maxims: An Analysis of The Dialogues in Arthur Miller’s The Crucible” by Yuvike and Winiharti (2009), aimed to describe the application of non-observance of the conversational maxims in the play of Arthur Miller’s The Crucible. This study used qualitative and quantitative methods. The data from the analysis are collected and the categories of the non-observance maxims are determined, then it will be calculated which ones occur most often. The non-observance maxims occurred in the play “Arthur Miller’s The Crucible” mostly used figures of speech, which greatly enriches the insight of the implicature itself, specifically for this study.

There are some similarities and differences with the previous related studies reviewed above in this study. What they have in common is how conversational implicature uses non-observance maxim in its application. The discussion discusses the types of conversational implicature used to implicate the meaning of the speech. The second and third related studies above used analytical

materials from TV show dialogues and drama, while this study used scripts from the series on Netflix. Also, this study uses newer series released in 2020, in which the data analyzed will be more in a broader context and no one has done thesis research on this latest series.

