

CHAPTER 2

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter deals with the assembly of theories that aim to provide applied concepts from this research. These concepts lead to improved research, which helps researchers limit the scope of the research problem.

2.1. Pragmatics

Yule (as cited in Khoiroh, 2017, p. 1) defines pragmatics as the study of the connection between language forms and their uses. Pragmatics is a field of linguistics that studies the meaning of utterances in context. Pragmatics can help speakers and listeners avoid misunderstandings about what they are saying to one another during direct or indirect conversations. In everyday life, pragmatics is also highly important because it enables us to interpret speech in a conversation between the speaker and the listener in order to avoid misunderstandings of meaning.

Pragmatic reasoning entails investigating what people mean when they use words, as well as the meaning of the word or phrase in the words themselves. Moreover, Djajasudarama (as cited in Febridaya, 2018) says that pragmatics is the study of the meaning of utterances in certain circumstances so that the characteristics of language, especially how language is used in communication, can be understood. Furthermore, Levinson (1983, p. 9) stated that pragmatics is the study of those relationships between language and context that are grammaticalized or contained in a language's structure.

Yule (1996, p. 3) also defines pragmatics as the study of meaning in context. This form of study involves the interpretation of what people mean in a specific situation and how the setting influences what they say. It requires speakers to consider how they organize what they want to say in relation to who they are speaking to, where they are speaking, when they are speaking, and in what settings they are speaking. So, pragmatics is concerned with implicit meaning. It

could be viewed as an investigation into the hidden meaning. For instance, someone may say to another person in the room, "Isn't it cold in here?" Semantically, the sentence above wants confirmation that the room is cold. But pragmatically, the sentence might have a different meaning. In contrast, the speaker may be indicating that they want the heating turned on or the window shut. This would be more obvious in context.

The pragmatic, multipurpose conceptual framework has opened up new prospects and perspectives in the arts and humanities, philosophy, cognitive science, computer science, and social sciences. They have accepted a pragmatic knowledge technology and social scientific method, particularly in economics, politics, and education. Language use and relations, rather than language as a system of symbols or a set of laws, are the primary users of language from a pragmatic perspective. The reason to study language through pragmatics is that it allows you to understand people's intended message, assumptions, intents, or goals, as well as the types of behaviors (for example, requests) that they make when they talk. To understand how pragmatics works, however, we must first comprehend what context is.

2.2. Context

Mey (2001, p. 39) defines context as a dynamic rather than a static term. It is to be regarded as constantly changing circumstances that allow the participants in the communication process to communicate and make the language expressions of their interaction comprehensible. The context of an utterance is the state of things in the conversation at the point the utterance is made: what the topic is, who is in the discussion, what has previously been said, and so on. The context of a communication process is the set of circumstances or situation in which the sender and receiver are located and the message occurs.

Mey (2001, p. 41) also defines that context is more than merely a reference. Context determines action. Context is about knowing why things exist; it is also what gives our utterances their real pragmatic meaning and allows them to be

considered as true pragmatic acts. Context is important in communication because variations in the same language and cultural differences imply that what is appropriate for some may not be appropriate for others. So, context is one of the most important factors to consider while conversing with another person, listening to music, watching a movie, or reading a book or article.

Yule (2006, p. 114) states that there are different types of context. Linguistic context, often known as co-text, is one type. A word's co-text is the group of other words used in the same phrase or sentence. The surrounding context has a strong influence on what others believe the word presumably means. In other words, various settings may have specific meanings, and this influences the meaning. For instance, "*Sarah is talking from her room with her fellow Danielle and has her phone busy.*" We realize that the context is Kirana's room and the position of the talk. However, it is incomplete, even though we do not know where Danielle is or who gets the message.

2.3. Implicature

Grice (1991, p. 372) states that implicature refers to either the act of meaning, implying, or suggesting one thing by saying another, or the object of that act. Implicatures can be conventional (in distinct definitions) or unconventional, and can be part of a phrase's meaning or depend on conversational context. Words in the implicature may have a different meaning than the speaker conveys to the message's listener. This helps to explain why linguistics has so many practical uses in our daily lives. According to Paul Grice, a philosopher of language, implicatures are pieces of information conveyed by speakers implicitly or indirectly, and they can be conveyed because speakers anticipate each other participating in conversation.

In addition, Gazdar (1979, p. 38) explains that an implicature is a proposition that is implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context even though that proposition is neither a part of nor an entailment of what was actually said. The implication itself can appear in the form of the speaker's perspective conveyed

through utterance, as long as there is no offense related to the topic under discussion. Usually to convey a specific message, but it can also be done indirectly through utterances that convey the speaker's true intent. Yule (1996, p. 35) also said that something must be more than simply the words themselves. An Implicature is an additional meaning conveyed. When a speaker tries to convey more than merely the meaning of a word, it is achieved. When a listener creates implications because a speech is likely to have meaning in a specific circumstance, this is referred to as implicature.

When discussing implicature, Grice (as cited in Mey, 1998, p. 365) suggests two types of implicature: conversational implicature and conventional implicature. Conversational implicature is an indirect or implicit word that describes what a speaker means by an unspoken utterance. Meanwhile, conventional implicature is intrinsically tied to the literal meaning of the words spoken.

2.3.1. Conventional Implicature

Mey (2001, p. 49) states conventional implicatures that are not subject to the fickle finger of conversational fate and do not depend on a particular context of language use. Certain expressions in language implicate, by themselves, or "conventionally," a certain state of the world, regardless of their use. When certain words are connected with conventional implicatures, additional meanings are communicated when those words are employed. Conventional implication is distinguished from conversational implication by a certain type of actual meaning. Such implicature is established by convention and cannot be changed even if the context changes.

Grice (as cited in Mufidah, 2022, p. 16), conventional implicatures are implications triggered by linguistic meaning but differ from (ordinary) entailments in two ways: (a) the exact content of what is implied is not readily made explicit, and (b) the content of the implication does not appear to be at issue in the way that truth-conditional content typically is. Furthermore, Grice (1975) argues that in certain cases, the conventional

meaning of the words used will determine what is involved in addition to assisting in determining what is stated. For instance:

“Even Josh knows that’s ridiculous.”

Implying that Josh is the most likely person (among multiple relevant groups of people) to know that the action in question is ridiculous. You cannot void the implicature: *“Even Josh knows that's ridiculous, but it's not that weird or surprising that he does,”* However, you can detach it: *“Josh knows that's ridiculous too.”*

2.3.2. Conversational Implicature

In a conversation, someone may communicate meaning to convey feelings and thoughts. This suggests that a person talks in order to engage with others, have a social life, and learn from the people around him. They give their conversation meaning, either directly or indirectly. Grice (1975) states those who have observed that what is meant in conversation frequently extends beyond what is expressed, and this additional meaning is inferred and predicted. He also suggests that participants in interaction and communication follow rules that specify how to use language as effectively and efficiently as possible in order to accomplish logical communication.

Grice (1975) explains that it is citing the concept of cooperative or mutual understanding in conversational implicatures, which is the agreement that the topics raised by the participants should be connected. Grice asserts that the cooperative guiding principle is as follows: add your word to the exchange when needed and in accordance with the goal or direction of the conversation. Grice creates influential theories to explain and predict the consequences of conversations, and also creates the definition of the term *“implicature”*. For instance, someone says: *“Look, there is a lot of trash strewn on the floor,”* which contains hidden meanings that the speaker indirectly asks the addressee to clean the floor. Grice categorizes

conversational implicature into two types: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

2.3.2.1. Generalized Conversational Implicature

Yule (1996, p. 41) states when the additional conveyed meaning can be calculated from the context without the need for specialized knowledge, this is known as generalized conversational implicature. It shows that, as the logical conversation implies, conversational implicature typically refers to more important subjects. In addition, Levinson (1983, p. 126) suggests that a generalized conversational implicature is one that occurs in communication but does not require a specific context of the conversation's situation. The listener enables the speaker's hidden meaning to be instantly comprehended without the need for additional thinking. For instance, "Noah has four children," That implies Noah has four children exactly, not more or fewer.

Grice (as cited in Putri, 2020, p. 17), the listener does not require specialized knowledge to comprehend the meaning of a conversation because the general context is used, allowing the listener to do so. In other words, the speaker delivers an utterance, but the listener just reacts to a part of the phrase, requiring no special knowledge to calculate the message conveyed. According to Grice, the type of conversational implicature is the use of specific word forms in an utterance (without any specific requirements) that typically convey the implicature characterizes. For example:

Jennie : Hey, Rose. Did you invite Mary and Chloe?

Rose : I invited Mary.

Rose's reaction implies that she just invites Mary and does not invite Chloe. This implies that understanding the specific is not

required to calculate conveyed meaning in generalized conversational implicature.

2.3.2.2. Particularized Conversational Implicature

Peccei (1999, p. 36) defines that particularized conversational implicatures are inferences that demand this type of mutual understanding between the speaker and hearer. Peccei (1999, p. 38) further illustrates that particularized implicature necessitates not just general knowledge but also local knowledge that is specific to the speaker and the hearer as well as frequently to the physical context of the speech. A conversational implicature that may only be formed in certain circumstances is known as a particularized implicature. It develops out of the communicative interaction that happens in the very particular circumstance in which it happens. It does not exist in the context of daily communication or the use of more generic communication categories, to which it belongs. For instance:

Edward : Do you want Anna's telephone number so you can go out with her?

Nate : Anna is quite tall.

According to the conversation above, Edward offers Anna's number to Nate to ask him out, but the response that Nate conveys in his utterance has a hidden meaning, which is Nate does not want Edward to give him Ana's phone number so he does not date her. He turned down Edward's offer by saying "*Anna is quite tall*" because he does not like tall women either.

Grice (1991, p. 39), states that particularized conversational implicature depends on the particular feature found in the context to be able to understand the utterances. In addition, Yule (1996, p. 42) also states that, most of the time, our conversations occur in relatively particular circumstances where locally known conclusions

are presumptive. To understand the information being conveyed, such inferences are needed. For instance:

Rick : Hey, Coming to the wild party tonight?

Tom : My family is visiting.

Rick must draw on some assumptions that one college student in this circumstance expects the other to hold in order to make Tom's response relevant. Tom will spend the evening with his family, and family time is usually quiet (consequentially, Tom is not at the party).

2.4. Previous Related Studies

This study has several previous studies as research reinforcement. There are similarities and differences between my research and other studies. I hereby prove that there are five studies that use the same theory and approach with different linguistic objects as follows:

The first research by Vikry in 2014 is entitled "An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Iron Man 3". His research was conducted to analyze and clarify the different conversational implicatures that the character's Iron Man 3 movie's non-observance maxims led to. He examines the conversational implicature in the dialogue of the movie's characters using Grice's theory. As a result, his research reveals that conversational implicature has been rising of the character's non-observance of the following maxims, which are: flouting the maxim of quantity (2), flouting the maxim of quality (2), flouting the maxim of relation (2), flouting of manner (5), opting out the maxim of quantity and manner (1), and violating the maxim of quantity and manner (1). He also finds two types of conversational implicature: generalized conversational implicature (2) and particularized conversational implicature (13).

The second research by Ansori in 2021 is entitled "An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in The Maleficent 2: Mistress of Evil". His research was conducted to analyze and identify on the conversational meaning in the film Maleficent 2: Mistress of Evil. As a result, he reveals that there are 15 types of conversational implicatures in Maleficent 2; Mistress of Evil. Then, generalized conversational implicature (5) and particularized conversational implicature (10).

The third research by Izah in 2019 is entitled "Conversational Implicature Analysis in "Aladdin" Movie". Her research was conducted to analyze and classify the types of conversational implicature, the types of non-observance maxim, and the ways of occurrence of non-observance which produced by the characters in Aladdin's movie. She uses Grice's theory to analyze the conversational implicature contained the conversation of the characters in the movie. As a result, she finds conversational implicature has been increasing because of the utterances of the character's non-observance maxims, which are: flouting the maxim of quantity (8), flouting the maxim of relation (3), flouting the maxim of manner (4), violating maxim of quantity (1), violating maxim of quality (3), violating maxim of relation (5), violating maxim of manner (1), and infringing maxim of quantity (1). Additionally, she finds the presence of conversational implicature, those are generalized conversational implicature (21), and particularized conversational implicature (4).

The fourth research by Khoiroh in 2017 is entitled "The Analysis of Implicature in Bridge to Terabithia Movie". Her research was conducted to analyze the context of situations, the types of implicature, the types of maxims, and the relation between the implicit meaning of the utterances of the three main characters and the value of Islamic religion in Bridge to Terabithia movie. Furthermore, she uses the implicature theory by Grice. As a result, there are conversational implicatures (38) and conventional implicatures (25). Whereas she finds the types of conversational implicature: particularized conversational implicature (28), and generalized conversational implicature (10).

The fifth research by Putri in 2020 is entitled "The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in "Midnight Sun" Movie". Her research was

conducted to analyze the types of conversational implicature along with hidden meanings and maxims that have been violated or flouted by Katie and Charlie in the Midnight Sun movie, and using Grice's (1975) theory. As a result, she finds 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 the flouting maxim.

Based on the previous related studies above, the researchers are mostly focused on finding conversational implicature in the utterances. This research is having similarities with the previous researchers, the research is using the same theories from Grice to elucidate types of conversational implicature. The difference between my research and other researchers is that the object I used in this research is "To All The Boys I've Loved Before" Movie Script and I only focus on the context and meaning of the character's utterances in conversation.

