CHAPTER 2
THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I will explain theories based on experts as sources and basic knowledge for solving problems in analysing the "A Man Called Otto" (2022) movie script. The theories put forward by experts including the definition of pragmatics, definition of context, definition of implicature, definition of conversational implicature and the types of conversational implicature. Apart from that, in this chapter there are several previous studies that I used as comparison with this research.

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. Yule (1996:3) states that pragmatics is related to the think about of the meaning of speaker communication and audience translation. Communication using a language can make it easy to identify a word in a sentence. Sometimes the use of language can also cause the listener to misinterpret a meaning.

According to Yule (1996: 4) Pragmatics is the study of the interactions between language forms and their users. Only pragmatics admits people into the analysis in this three-part distinction. The benefit of studying language via pragmatics is that one may discuss people's intended meanings, assumptions, intentions or aims, and the kind of activities (for example, requests) that individuals execute when they speak. The major drawback is that all of these highly human ideas are incredibly difficult to assess consistently and objectively. A discussion between two friends may indicate certain things and infer others without offering any obvious linguistic evidence that we can refer to as the explicit source of 'the meaning' of what was communicated.

According to Fromkin (2003:207) pragmatics describes interpretation in the meaning of a linguistic context. Words in English that we do not know if the word is spoken until we understand its meaning or context, such as talking to the speaker with a different context and meaning. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies speech or language use and also studies the context of an utterance in the speech of the interlocutor. From the explanations above, pragmatics means a study about the relationship between language, meaning and situation which originates from spoken or utterances made by the interlocutor.

According to Kiefer and Bierwisch Black (as citied in Levinson 1983:6), "Pragmatics is one of those words (society and cognition are others) that gives the impression that something quite specific and technical is being discussed when, in fact, it has no clear meaning." Understanding people's intended messages, presumptions, purposes, or goals as well as the kinds of behaviours they engage in when speaking is made possible by studying language through the lens of pragmatics. But first, we need to grasp what context is in order to understand how pragmatics functions.

2.2. Context

Context is a dynamic, not static, idea. It should be viewed as the constantly shifting environment in the broadest sense that allows the communication process's participants to interact and in which the language representations of their interaction become understandable. The speaker's use context of language can be influenced by the circumstances. Yule (1996: 21) states that context simply means the physical environment in which a word is used. The importance of taking of context into account is also well expressed by Hymes (in Brown and Yule, 1983: 37) who views the role of the context in interpretation as, on the one hand, limiting the range of possible interpretation and, on the other hand, as supporting the intended interpretation.

According to Mey (2001: 39), context is a dynamic phrase as opposed to a static one. It should be understood as a dynamic set of conditions that facilitate communication between the parties involved and render the language used to convey their interactions understandable. An utterance's context is the condition of

the conversation at the moment it is uttered, including the topic of discussion, the participants, earlier statements made, and so forth. The collection of conditions or scenario in which the message is sent, the recipient is placed, and the communication process takes place is known as the context.

Furthermore, context is defined by Mey (2001: 41) as being more than just a reference. Action is determined by context. Understanding context is essential to understanding why things exist. It also gives our words their true pragmatic meaning and qualifies them as genuine pragmatic acts. Because cultural differences and variations in language suggest that what is appropriate for one person may not be appropriate for another, context is crucial in communication. Thus, context is among the most crucial things to take into account whether having a conversation, reading a book or article, watching a movie, or listening to music.

2.3. Conversational Implicature

Implicature is the indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance made by the speaker. Implicature occurs when a speaker wishes to communicate something in a discussion in an implicit or indirect manner. Implicature, according to Grice (1975: 372), can refer to the act of meaning, indicating, or suggesting one thing by stating another, or it can relate to the result of that process. Implicatures can be part of a phrase's meaning or depend on the context of the discourse. They can be conventional (with clear definitions) or unusual. The listener may understand words in the implicature to signify something different than what the speaker intends.

According to Yule (1996: 40) something must be more than just what the words mean. It is a conveyed meaning, called an implicature. In addition, implicature may enable the speaker and the interlocutor connect through discussion without directly communicating their goal, rather they can communicate each other implicitly as long as both of them understand what the speaker speaks about. Yule (1996: 36) stated by stating the implicature, the speaker expects that the listener will be able to work out, on the basis of what is already known, the implicature intended in this context. Implicatures are key examples of more being transmitted than is expressed, yet they must be interpreted in order to be understood.

Grice divides implicature into two types: conversational implicature and conventional implicature. Some implicatures are conventional implicatures, while others are conversational implicatures (Grice, 1989: 26). Conventional implicatures are determined by the meaning of a sentence. Conversational implicature is a pragmatics inference that is based on contextual circumstances and grasp of convention witnessed in conversation rather than specific words and phrases in an utterance. It is a typically given implicit or indirect speech from the speaker to the hearer in which the meaning is assumed and predicted. Furthermore, it is critical that we get to know each other while we are conversing in order to minimize any misunderstandings or problems that may arise as a consequence of communication errors (Grice, 1975: 25).

According to Grice (as cited in Amalia 2008:11), conversational implicature is a theory about how someone uses language, in other words how someone communicates. Conversational implicature is intended so that the speaker can understand what the speaker says in the sense of the speaker's utterance which is intended to interpret, suggest or explain something through implied meaning. There are two types of conversational implicature, namely generalized implicature and particularized implicature. Generalized implicature is a conversational implicature without referring to any specific context. Particularized implicatures is conversational implicatures that only occur in certain contexts.

2.4. Types of Conversational Implicature

Grice, as cited by Levinson (1992: 126), distinguished between generalized and particularized implicature in conversational implicature. According to Grice (as cited in Amalia 2008: 12), the distinction between particularized and generalized conversational implicatures is critical because if all implicatures are particularized, a person cannot express his or her position or argument. Implicature is defined as the recipient's assumption in appropriately reacting to a statement in regard to the context. Meanwhile, generalized implicatures have little or no relevance to an utterance's comprehension.

2.4.1. Generalized Conversational Implicature

According to Grice (1989: 37), this sort of implicature is defined as "the application of a certain form of words in an utterance that would normally carry such implicature in the absence of special circumstances." Levinson (1983: 126) describes generic conversational implicature as occurring without regard to any specific context elements. In other words, no extra information or conclusions are necessary to calculate the additional transmitted meaning. Generalized implicature is a type of conversational implicature that does not have to see any particular context that requires one to see the special background, knowledge of the context of utterance is required in order to make the necessary inferences. The example of generalized implicature:

> Doobie: Did you invite Bella and Cathy?
>
> Mary: **I invited Bella**.
>
> (Yule, 1996: 40)

According to the illustration above, speaker B does not invite Cathy, and the utterances are informative as necessary for the speaker. The same process of calculating the implicature would occur if Doobie ask Mary about inviting her friends, Bella and Cathy, to a party, and get her answer, but the general process of identifying the implicature. When no specialized knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional meaning conveyed, it is called generalized conversational implicature (Yule, 1996: 41).

2.4.2. Particularized Conversational Implicature

The implicatures are estimated without any prior knowledge of the context. However, most of our talks occur in relatively particular circumstances in which locally known conclusions are assumed. According to Peccei (1999: 38), particularized implicature demands not just general information but also local knowledge that is distinctive to the speaker and hearer as well as, in many cases, the physical setting of the speech. It emerges from the communication engagement that occurs in the specific

context in which it occurs. It does not exist in the context of everyday communication or the more general communication categories to which it belongs. Such conclusions are necessary to deduce the transmitted meanings resulting from specificized conversational implicatures (Yule, 1996: 42), as an example:

> Rick: Hey, coming to the wild party tonight?
>
> Tom: **My parents are visiting.**
>
> (Yule, 1996: 43)

Rick must draw on some assumed information that one college student in this environment expects another to have in order to make Tom's response meaningful. Tom will spend that evening with his parents, and because time spent with his parents is quiet, Tom will not attend the party. Particularized conversational implicatures are commonly referred to as implicatures since they are by far the most prevalent.

2.5. Previous Related Studies

There are various past studies that corroborate this research and have parallels and contrasts with this research. This demonstrates the presence of research that employs the same theory and technique with diverse language objects.

The first research by Saiful (2020) is entitled "Conversational Implicature Analysis in "Kingdom of Heaven" Movie Script by William Monahan". His research analysing conversational implicature and using qualitative design is used to explain conversational implicature in communication the Kingdom of Heaven's movie script and he analyse the non-observance maxim of cooperative principal categories recurrently found in conversational implicature in Kingdom of Heaven's movie script. He analysed the types of conversational implicature and the non-observance maxim based on Miles and Huberman's theory (2014). As a result, according to his research, particularized implicatures are the most common conversational implicatures in the movie screenplay, with 14 occurrences, followed by generalized implicatures with 6 occurrences. The discovery also indicated that the frequent usage of flouting the quantity maxim occurred more frequently in 14

of the total 20 samples, with the standard being violated just three times in the movie screenplay.

The second research by Puspitasari, et. al (2022) with the title "Conversational Implicature to Hide Meaning in the Dialogue Script of Alice Through the Looking Grass" their research was conducted to analyse and identify all variants of conversational implicature meaning in the conversation of the characters in Alice Through the Looking Glass, they used conversation analysis by Wooffitt (2001) and the theory of dialogue by George Yule (1996), and the results are general conversational implicature was accomplished in 8% of cases, scalar implicature in 52% of cases, and specific conversational implicature in 8% of cases. Despite the fact that particular conversational implicatures are a sort of conversational implicature separate from general conversational implicatures, the results provided above show that particularised, generalized, and scalar implicatures are related and complimentary in implicatures.

The third research by Yulianti, et. al (2022) with the title "Conversational Implicatures on Saturday Night Live Talk Show" their research was conducted to analyse and identify all types of conversational implicature meaning through the utterances in conversation, they used Grice's principles by examined the types of conversational implicatures that found in the Saturday Night Live Talk Show and using a qualitative method with the pragmatic approach. The result is there are two types of conversational implicatures found in Saturday Night Live Talk Show, namely particularized and generalized implicatures. 21 data were containing generalized conversational implicatures and 29 data containing particularized conversational implicatures. We concluded that particularized conversational implicature was the most dominant implicature used in Saturday Night Live talk show Season 46 Episode 5.

Based on the previous related studies above, the researchers are mostly focused on finding conversational implicature in the utterances. The similarity of my research compared to the three previous studies mentioned above is we use the same approach which is a pragmatic approach and using the same theories from Grice to elucidate the types of conversational implicature. The differences between my

research and other researchers are the object I used in this research is "A Man Called Otto" movie script and I only focus on the context and the meaning of the character's utterances in the conversation.