

## CHAPTER 2

### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I am going to explain the theories based on the experts as guidance and basic knowledge to solve the research problem for the analysis of the “Tall Girl” (2019) movie script. The theories of the experts in this research are the definition of pragmatics, the definition of implicature, conventional implicature, and conversational implicature. Moreover, there are also some previous related studies that I use as a comparison in order to prove the novelty of this research.

#### 2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one component of the study of human language, and can therefore be described as a branch of the academic discipline of linguistics, according to Chapman (2011, p.1). By this theory, it means that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics about how humans can interact through language which is supported by the understanding of meaning in context. Different from semantics as context-independent where the literal meaning is associated with grammar, vocabulary, and exact response without any hidden meaning from the listener. While pragmatics is context-dependent which depends on the meaning of the context involved in a conversation between speakers and listeners who have background knowledge and experience. Then, pragmatics as one of the main linguistics disciplines aims to influence someone through language, learn about how someone feels towards something, can affect others to do something, and many others. Accordingly, pragmatics has several study in which it consists of *implicature, presupposition, speech acts, deixis, reference, and context*, according to Huang (2017, p.2). Those are the specific study of pragmatics that often exists in human interaction. Therefore, in this research, there are two types of implicatures as one of pragmatics study that will be discussed, namely conventional and conversational implicature.

## 2.2. Context

One core notion in linguistic research is the notion of context (Meibauer, 2012, p.9). The branch of linguistics which used context is pragmatics. Because pragmatics as a separate research is defined as a field of linguistics that deals with context-dependent aspects of meaning. It is important to have context while in a conversation in order to get the understanding the utterances. Therefore, there are three kinds of context, namely *situational context*, *background knowledge context*, and *co-textual context*, according to Cutting (2002, p.3). However, the two kinds of context to be observed are situational context and background knowledge context. Below is the example of the situational context:

**Lecturer** : Forty-nine? Why do you say forty-nine?  
**Pupil** : Cos there's another one here.  
(BNC: jjs Bacons College Lesson, n.d)

Based on the conversation above, the situational context is in the classroom and it is likely that both the lecturer and the pupil are pointing at the blackboard or exercise book, as declared by Cutting (2002, p.4). We can see that 'there' and 'here' are included as demonstrative adverbs which referring a figure of equation. It concludes that the situational context can be seen based on the situations, then the participants will respond what the speaker intend about something they are talking about. It does not run well without context, the participants there can connect the communication toward their lecturer because they have context in it. However, if the context does not appear so that the participants will get confused about how to respond the speaker toward the topics conveyed. Besides that, the background knowledge context is applied in a conversation as stated by the following below:

- **Cultural** general knowledge that most people carry with them in their minds, about areas of life. It has depicted by Cutting (2002, p.5):

In the hill-walking-in-Arran excerpt, AF and DM share about the low mountains on the island; AF does not surprise that DM and his friends went 'hill walking' that they could walk for eight hours there, or that the walk was strenuous enough to make somebody's knees swell.

Based on the depiction above, between AF and DM have cultural background knowledge about low mountains on the island. It can be assumed to know the mountains that they are British people, or people have visited/studied British isles.

- **Interpersonal** knowledge, specific, and possibly private knowledge about the history of the speakers themselves. The example is taken from US television advertisement as stated by Cutting (2002, p.8):

**Her** : How are you  
**Him** : OK.  
**Her** : Did you have friends in and get a video last night?  
**Him** : Oh, I had friends in, but we just watched a little TV.  
**Her** : Ah right.  
**Him** : That was great. How do you feel?  
**Her** : OK.

Based on the conversation above, it is between a husband and wife who are watching television. She says “OK” at the end that there is a flashback if she won a gold medal in an Olympics event. Then, from his utterance says ‘Oh, I had friends in, but we just watched a little TV’ means that ‘I had friends in to watch you playing on TV and I know you won’. Therefore, the interpersonal knowledge from a husband and wife is obviously enormous; this is why reference to any part of it can be so vague, implicit, and minimal (Cutting, 2002, p.7).

### 2.3. Implicature

Implicature is about the meaning of the speaker's utterances that constitutes what is intended by the speaker without telling what is said, as stated by Horn (2004, p.3). Characteristically, what the speaker wants to communicate is more important than what is expressed directly. This is related to linguistics meaning which essentially reduces the message conveyed and understood. The speaker indirectly uses pragmatic principles to connect the gap and relies on the listener to use the same principle for the purpose of speech interpretation. Linguistics meaning crucially minimizes the message conveyed and understood about what has been

intended by the speaker while communicating is actually more than what the speaker directly expresses (Horn, 2004, p.3). It means that implicature can help the speaker and the interlocutor get connected through conversation without conveying their intention directly, whereas they can communicate each other implicitly as long as both of them understood about what the speaker says about. Furthermore, the conversation will contain the hidden meaning in which only those who have connection or close person can understand and respond them well. If they do not know each other, there will be a gap between them about how to get the message and also the way to respond the utterances. According to Amrullah (2015, p.59), there are several characteristics of implicature:

- (a) The implication is not stated directly
- (b) It does not have any absolute relationship with utterances realized
- (c) It includes extra-linguistic linguistics
- (d) It is open to interpretation
- (e) It occurs due to obedience or disobedience to the cooperative principles in the conversation

Those characteristics are considered as implicature that commonly happen in a conversation. Moreover, it is clear to be recognized while understanding the conversation between the speaker and the interlocutor.

## **2.4. Types of Implicature**

Grice distinguishes implicature into conversational and conventional implicature. Some implicatures are conventional implicatures and non-conventional implicatures known as conversational implicatures (Grice, 1989, p.26). The conventional indicates if the meaning of the words in certain utterances happen and determine about how it is implicated. On the other sides, the conversational implicature is about indirect implication that comes from the speaker. Between two types of implicature have important way to examine and understand the utterances while communicating with others. In knowing that types

of implicature can also avoid any miscomprehension. Here are the types of implicature, as stated by Grice (1989):

#### **2.4.1. Conventional Implicature**

According to Huang (2017, p.56), conventional implicatures are not derived from the co-operative principle and its component maxims, but are attached by convention to particular lexical items or linguistic constructions. It is a general implication that everyone has understood the meaning of a case as well as the speaker and the listener have general knowledge and experience with each other. Below is the example of conventional implicature, according to Amrullah (2015, p.59):

John is handsome, but he rides CD 70.

- John is handsome
- John rides CD 70

This statement refers to contradiction towards John that he rides CD 70 or also known as old motorcycle. We can see the words “but” to show the speaker’s intention of John that he has handsome face and CD 70 is not suitable with his appearance. Therefore, this utterance is stated as a conventional implicature in which the speaker and listener know about the meaning of the utterance even though it is not implied directly. Another examples, as stated by Chapman (2005, p.101):

She was poor, but honest.

- She was poor
- She was honest

This statement from the speaker’s utterances about someone with pronoun ‘she’ as a ‘poor’. It has supported by the words ‘but’ that indicates another side of her as an honest person. This utterance is included as a conventional implicature in which the listener understand about what the speaker uttered without saying it directly. Moreover, it also contains the facts that have been conveyed by the speaker as direct implications.

### 2.4.2. Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is pragmatics inference that does not depend on particular words and phrases in an utterance but on the contextual factors and understanding of convention observed in conversation, according to Grice's Theory of Conversational Implicatures (n.d.). It is an implicit or indirect utterance that is commonly delivered by the speaker to the hearer in which the meaning is inferred and predictable. Moreover, it becomes important to know each other while we are in a conversation in order to avoid any misunderstanding or problem that appears as a result of making mistakes in communication. That means, the conversation will occur if there are at least the speaker and the interlocutor joined to make interactions. Below is an example as stated by Allott (2018):

**Benjamin** : Are you having some of this chocolate cake?  
**Amelia** : I'm on a diet.

Based on the conversation above, Benjamin asks Amelia about whether she is having chocolate cake or not. Then, Amelia says that she is on a diet. Her response implicates about the meaning that she is not having this chocolate cake.

However, there is something in which it is called as *flouting maxims* in conversational implicature. Grice proposed maxim in order to make communication more effective, then flouting maxim is another way to ignore it. Flouting occurs if the speaker blatantly fails to fulfil the maxim, as stated by Grice (1989, p.30). According to Grice's Theory of Conversational Implicatures (n.d.), here are the examples of flouting maxims:

#### (a) Flouting Quality

It occurs when an utterance cannot be interpreted literally (Noertjahjo et al., 2017, p.197).

A: What if the USSR blockades the Gulf and all the oil?  
B: Oh come now, Britain rules the seas! [sarcasm]  
+> There is nothing Britain can do about it.



B's utterance is an exaggerated statement, it does not really mean that Britain rules the seas. The implied meaning of B's utterance is the expression of optimism about Britain.

#### (b) Flouting Quantity

It occurs when a speaker gives too much or too little information (Noertjahjo et al., 2017, p.197).

War is war.

+> Terrible things happen in war. It is nature and no use lamenting in this tragedy.

This is included as an extreme example that provided by utterances of patent tautology, according to Grice (1989, p.33).

#### (c) Flouting Relevance

It occurs when a speaker changes the topic of conversation, but still expects the hearer to realize and know about the alteration (Noertjahjo et al., 2017, p.197).

A: (Letter Recommendation) What qualities does John have for this position?

B: John has nice handwriting.

+> B finds A's response inappropriate (for some reason or others).

A expects B to understand the implied meaning of A's utterance although A flouts the maxim of relevance.

#### (d) Flouting Manner

It occurs when a speaker says something unclearly and ambiguous (Noertjahjo et al., 2017, p.197).

Miss Singer produced a series of sounds corresponding closely to an aria from Rigoletto.

+> Miss Singer did not perform well.

This statement is implying that Miss Singer does not sing well, however, it does not directly offense her by saying that her singing voices resembles aria from Rigoletto (Opera singer).

## 2.5. Previous of Related Studies

In supporting this research, there are several previous studies that have similarities and differences with this research. Hereby proves the existence of research that uses same theory and approach with different objects of linguistics.

The first research by Syafryadin et al. (2020) with the title “Maxim Variation, Conventional, and Particularized Implicature On Students’ Conversation”. In their research, it was concluded that conversation that happened in some occasions can follow and flout of the maxims even though most of people follow the maxims. Conversational implicature is proven that it can be understood by the interlocutor because they have prior experience and background knowledge. To sum up, there are two types of implicature that has been occurred in this conversation, namely conventional and conversational implicature.

The second research by Haiyan Wang (2011) with the title “Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension”. In his research, it was concluded that conversational implicature theory by Grice greatly influences listening comprehension, especially in understanding conversation. Both non-English and English learning majors need to study linguistic theory to guide learners' listening comprehension. The pragmatic theory of implicature can help learners better understand the implied meaning in English listening.

The third research by Jiyon Cook (2014) with the title “Context, Expectation and Conversational Implicature: A Pragmatic Analysis of *Good*”. In her research, it was concluded that different types of conclusions can be involved in good interpretation and should not be interpreted exclusively. The meaning of context is rediscovered as implicature I (and/or implicature Q) by listeners who are aware of the speaker's expectations or who have their own expectations. This observation shows that it is not enough to fix the meaning of 'Good' like the principle of Q which is not sufficiently able to handle the complexity of the pragmatic meaning of 'Good'.

My research has similarities with the previous research that contains the conversational and conventional implicature, especially in the first research



contains more about the use of maxim. However, the differences are in the object and the last two researches that they only focused on conversational implicature. The first research entitled “Maxim Variation, Conventional, and Particularized Implicature On Students’ Conversation” by Syafryadin et al. (2020) with the object ‘Students’ Conversation’. The second research entitled “Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension” by Haiyan Wang (2011) with the object ‘English Listening’ only refers to the conversational implicature. The last research entitled “Context, Expectation and Conversational Implicature: A Pragmatic Analysis of *Good*” by Jiyon Cook (2014) with the object ‘Good as an utterance of words’ only refers to conversational implicature. Therefore, the novelty of my research is proven by a different object in which it is obtained from the movie script of “Tall Girl” (2019) as well as the analysis that is more complete with the types of implicature, namely conventional and conversational implicature.