CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter consists of many important aspects in finishing this thesis. They are the implicature, conversational implicature, types of conversational implicature, cooperative principle and the maxims (maxim of quantity, quality, relation and manner), Context and some of previous studies which are similar to the research.

2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1.1 The Implicature

Implicature can be considered as an additional conveyed meaning (Yule, 1996). It is attained when a speaker intends to communicate more than just what the words mean. It is the speaker who communicates something via implicatures and the listener recognizes those communicated meanings via inference. In other words Implicature is analyzing the activities of the hidden meaning of a speech that delivered by Speaker. Implicatures are inferred based on the assumption that the speaker observes or flouts some principles of cooperation (different authors have identified different principles), The most famous one: Grice – 4 principles (so called "maxims"). Furthermore, Grice suggests that Implicature basically related to the cooperative principles of pragmatic. Cooperative principles are the cooperation between speaker with hearer in a conversation. It meant that between

speaker and hearer expect the implications for the meaning of the speech can be understood by the hearer. The implicature is the utterance has differences with the action in fact.

Implicature is divided into two kinds, they are Conventional Implicature and Conversational Implicature. Conventional Implicature in contrast to all the conversational implicature, convensional implicature is not based on the cooperative principle or maxim. They have not to occur in conversation and they do not depend on special context for their interpretation. Conventional implicature derived directly from the meaning of the word (which is heard), instead the principle of conversation. It means that the conventional implicature is the literal meaning as expressed with the formal elements of structural sentence. While conversational implicature is which one type of implicature that focuses in study of implied meaning based on context of conversation. Through the implicature theory, we have known two kinds of theories. In the natural meaning and unnatural meaning (George Yule, 1996).

2.1.2 Conversational Implicature

People exchange meaning and their intention in their communication. They express their ideas and feeling. They do this to get information from their surroundings. They need communication to interact with other people in their social life. Put in another word, they do conversational implicature. In their conversational implicature, they provide meaning. There are two ways in

expressing meaning, explicitly or implicitly. Expressing meaning explicitly means that the actual conversation is stated. While expressing meaning implicitly means that there are more hidden meaning in that conversation. In this case, the conversation which carries meaning more than what is stated in the speaker's utterance. It is what is called by implicature (Horn, Laurence R, 2004).

Conversational implicature is related to the knowledge of what the speaker and the listener in understanding the utterances said that the speaker and the listener must also comply with all rules. It can be said that the speaker has conveyed more than he said via conversational implicature, while hearer recognizes the meaning via inference. This is in line with Grice (1975) who defines implicature for the case in which what speaker means or implies is different from what is said.

There are two types of conversational implicature those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature which will be explained in the following point.

2.1.2.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized Conversational Implicature is type in which the interlocutors do not require special knowledge to know the meaning of a conversation because the context used in this type is a general conversation that makes an interlocutor directly understand the meaning of the conversation (Grice, 1975). As an example of generalized conversational implicature, Grice suggest the

14

use of a/an X, which carries the implicature that X is only remotely related in

a certain way to some person indicated by the context. When someone says

"John is meeting a woman this evening", he certainly means that is,

conversationally implicates "The women John is meeting this evening is not

his mother, his sister or his wife".

Another linguist distinct generalized implicature to be drawn with very

little "inside knowledge" (Mey, 1998) As the example, the researcher presents

a conversation adopted from Carston:

A : Did the children's summer camp go well?

B: Some of them got the stomach flue.

The conversation above can be interpreted or implicated +> "not all the

children got stomach flue" it is usually called as scalar implicature. So that, it

can be concluding that the criterion of generalized conversational implicature

are two sign such as, using the word "some" to implicate noot all called scalar

implicature and the second in the use of article a/an X which implicates not

speaker's X.

Another example of generalized conversational implicature adopted from

Grice (1975) can be seen under below:

"Freed thinks there is a meeting tonight"

+> Freed doesn't know for sure that there is a meeting tonight.

15

"Mary has 3 children."

+> Mary has no more than 3 children.

From example above, the researcher summing up that generalized

conversational implicature one which does not depend on particular features

of the context but, it is typically associated with the preposition expected.

2.1.2.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is a type in which the

interlocutors indirectly require more assistance to understand the meaning of

a conversation because the context used in this type is not general in nature.

Some assumed knowledge which is required in very specific context during

conversation is called particularized conversational implicature. As an

illustration, consider an example where Lara's response does not appear on

the surface to adhere to relevance. It is simply relevant answer would be

"yes" or "no".

Carol : Are you coming to the party tonight?

Lara: I've got an exam tomorrow.

In order to make Lara's response relevant, Carol has to draw on some

assumed knowledge that Lara will be spending that evening with his parents,

consequently, she is not at the party.

16

Another example,

A: Will Sally be at the meeting this afternoon?

B: Her car broke down.

+> Sally won't be at the meeting.

B "flouting" (speaker is flagrantly violating a rule)

As in above example, the proposition Sally's car broke down would ordinarily not convey anything about Sally going to a meeting, so the implicature, in this case, depends on the context as well as the utterance itself.

Based on the description above, the researcher is capable of summing up that the criterion of particularized conversational implicature is conversational implicature that its meaning is out part of the utterance so that hearer should need knowledge more to interpret what speaker mean. In another word, particularized conversational implicature is the inferences of hearer which only can be work out or interpreted while drawing totally on the specific context of the utterance. Implicature and its types are able to use by speakers in order to create hidden context in some utterances of any kind of situations and conditions.

According to Levinson (2000), this implicature focuses on violation of maxims. If the speaker violates these maxims intentionally, the speaker must observe the cooperative principle on adeeper level or the hearer cannot understand the speaker's intentions.

The conclusion of both generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature is that, if a speaker utters a sentence with implicit meaning and the hearers can interpret it well it means that the utterance is generalized conversational implicature. Conversely, if a speaker utters a sentence with implicit meaning and the hearers cannot interpret it well it means that the utterance is particularized conversational implicature. Levinson (1995) has clarified clearly that some conversational implicature seem context-bound, while others have a very general currency, a single utterance-form might suggest fundamentally different propositions (PCIs) in two different contexts, while at the same time implicating something else (a GCI) in both these contexts. People have their own purpose in uttering a sentence. Moreover, a sentence with intended meaning but do not show by the speakers.

2.1.3 Grice's Cooperative Principle and Maxims

Brown and Yule (1983) clarified that conversational implicature is derived from a general principle of conversation plus a number of maxims which speakers will normally obey. Yule (2010) added an underlying assumption in most conversational exchange seems to be that the participants are cooperating each other. The general principle is called cooperative principle which Grice in Brown and Yule (1983) mentioned in the following terms:

"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 divides cooperative principle into four basic maxims which are support these principles are as follows:

• The maxim of quality – be true

Maxim of Quality indicates that participants should not say what they believe to be false. And of course they may not say that for which they lack adequate evidence (Levinson, 1983).

• The maxim of quantity – be brief

Maxim of Quantity means that the participants' contribution in a conversation is a informative as it is required (for the current purpose of the exchange). In this case, the participants should not contribute on saying something to the hearer more than its required (Levinson, 1983).

• The maxim of relation – be relevant

Maxim of Relation is used when the participants just the convey in a relevant information. The participant should not reply or saying something that does not relevant from the other participants' dialogue (Levinson, 1983).

• The maxim of manner – be clear

Maxim of Manner is that the participants have to be perspicuous and also they have to avoid obscurity of expression and also avoid the ambiguity when reacted to the other participants. The utterances of the participant produces are brief and must be orderly (Levinson, 1983).

In most situations, the assumption of cooperative is so pervasive that in can be stated as a cooperative principle of conversation and elaborated in fpur sub-principles, called maxims. The cooperative principle is a principle of conversation stating that participants expect that each will make a "conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage in which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange". Violating cooperative principle usually happened in daily communication to create favorable conversation. In this case, it is called implicature.

2.1.4 Violation of Maxims

Grice, to explain how these implications are to be understood, presents four ways in which maxims may be unfulfilled. These four ways are violation, opting out, being faced with a clash, and flouting. There may be a violation; Grice writes that a person "may quietly and unostentatiously *violate* a maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead" (Grice, 1975, p. 30).

The participants enable to disobey one of maxim and violate other maxim or they could possible to violate all of maxim. As Grice states that there are various ways of participant does not fulfill maxim (Grice, 1975, p.49):

- 1. The speaker may quietly and unostentatiously violate of maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead.
- 2. The speaker may opt out from the operation both of the maxim and the CP; he may say indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires.
- 3. The speaker may be face by a clash: they may be unable.
- 4. The speaker may flout a maxim.

Maxim is a rule that people must fulfill in a good conversation, but in communication the speaker utterances usually do not always follow the rules. There might be violation of cooperative principles.

1. Violation Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality, which says that speakers are expected to be sincere in saying something that they believe correspond to the reality. This maxim can be violate if the speakers do no tell the truth or the information is lack of evidence, and something in the meaning is not literally true (Hu, 2006: 194).

2. Violation Maxim of Quantity

According to (Hu, 2006: 194). this maxim implies that a speaker should give neither too little information or too much. People who give too little information risk their hearer not being able to identify what they are talking about because they are not explicit enough. Those who give more information than the hearer needs risk boring them.

3. Violation Maxim of Relevance

According to (Hu, 2006: 194). the next is maxim of relevance which says that the speakers are assumed to something that is relevant to what has been said before. This maxim is a little harder to find because it is hard to construct responses that must be interpreted as irrelevant.

4. Violation Maxim of Manner

According to (Hu, 2006: 194), maxim of manner governs about clarity (avoid ambiguity). Clarity means the quality of expressing ideas or thought in a clear way. This maxim violates either for humor, as in the case of puns, and double engenders, where rival meanings are deliberately tolerated, or in the order to establish solidarity of the speakers or exclude an over hearer from the conversation.

2.1.5 Context

Speech is always realized in a particular context. Context holds an important role in interpreting the meaning of the speech because the meaning of the speech is variety in different contexts. in other words, an utterance can mean completely different from that intended by speaker that due to differences in the context of utterance in progress. The ability to interpret the meaning of the speech is in many ways dependent on the hearer's ability to connect the speech with the surrounding context (Holmes, 1992).

2.1.6 Advertisement

Advertisement is an audio or visual form of marketing communication that employs an openly sponsored, nonpersonal message to promote or sell a product, service or idea (Dirksen CJ and Arthur K, 1968). Sponsors of advertising are often businesses who wish to promote their products or services. Advertising is important for the seller and companies producing the products. Advertising plays very important role for the producers and the sellers of the products, because advertising helps increasing sales. And also advertising helps producers or the companies to know their competitors and plan accordingly to meet up the level of competition. If any company wants to introduce or launch a new product in the market, advertising will make a ground for the product. Advertising helps making people aware of the new product so that the consumers come and try the product.

2.2 RELATED STUDIES

2.2.2 Previous Studies

In this part, the researcher discovers four previous studies, are:

Firstly, the researcher with titled *Implicature analysis on cigarette* advertisement slogans by Mutmainnah University of Brawijaya Malang (2013). This research uses Grice's conversational implicature theory to conduct the research. This study uses qualitative approach in relation to the use of clear and systematic description about the phenomena being studied. Descriptive study in textual analysis is applied in this study to analyze the cigarette advertisement slogans. The data are downloaded from the internet and selected from ten cigarette advertisements that appear on television most frequently. The collected data are then analyzed in terms of the message conveyed in the generalized and particularized implicature of cigarette advertisement slogans. In this research, the researcher found all generalized and particularized implicature of the data. The researcher also found most of the intended meanings of the cigarette slogans. In conclusion, all the cigarette companies have different styles of making the slogans to attract the consumers to buy the products.

Secondly, the previous studied that is *A study of conversational implicature in Sentilan Sentilan Talk Show on Metro TV* by Reyfa Arfiyah University of Wijaya Putra Surabaya (2014). This research focused in utterances by presenter and intervieweer Sentilan Sentilun, the data is the

conversation between two main character; Sentilan Sentilum and the guest star. This research find the utterances that flouting the maxim. From this research, the researcher continue the theory, but the researcher want to identifying the implied meaning of the utterances that flouted the maxim. This research used qualitative descriptive method, she was find the utterances occur in conversational implicature. After that she find the utterances that being flouted. The result of this study in one sentences or utterances it can have more than one flouted a maxim.

Third is *An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Smart Fm's Radio* by Irma B. Pakpahan (2012). Her study focuses on the wording of Smart Fm talk show. The writer interested to discuss her study, because conversational implicature make us to infer what people talk especially in radio talk show. This study is intended to discover the types of conversational implicature used by the interviewees. The similarity between Irma and the researcher in theory, both of them used Implicature and Conversational Implicature based on Grice's Theory. Subject of them also used talk show. Both of them also focuses in utterances that consist of conversational implicature. And the differences from Irma's thesis the researcher want to find flouting of maxim and what kind of maxim that being flouted. Meanwhile in Irma's thesis, the study only focuses on find out the utterance that has conversational implicature and divided the utterance into two kind "generalized and particularized conversational implicature".

The result of this research shows that the two types of conversational implicature were occured in the four editions of *Smart Fm's Talk Shows*. They were Generalized Conversational Implicature (25) and Particularized Conversational Implicature (15). The total number of conversational implicature was 40. The most dominant types of conversational implicature were Generalized Conversational Implicature (62.5%). It means that when the interviewees answer the question, they usually used the clear answer to make their partner and listeners understand what he/she talked about.

The last previous studied is *Conversational Implicature of the Presenters* in Take me out Indonesia by Sheila Nanda University of Indonesia (2012). This research is a pragmatic study that aims at investigating conversational implicature that the presenters of Take Me Out Indonesia operate within their utterances along with the possible implications that lie behind the implicature. The researcher divided into two categories, generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. This research used qualitative and descriptive with the presence of a simple statistical data for describing the occurrences of the intended features. The finding show that in one episode taken as simple of this study, implicature occurs in the show 204 times. The occurences are divided into two categories, generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. This categorization is based on the inferences to figure out the conveyed meaning which is then matched with the Gricean Maxims.

The result of this research may just reflect a part of the conversational implicature that the presenters apply in the show but it perhaps will give more references and further considerations for language students in their studies and even broadcasters within their communication.

Based on the previous researchers above, it is very clear that most of all previous researchers on conversational implicature almost relate to the use of maxims and its violation on a talk. Therefore, in this present study the researcher focused on the types of conversational (generalized and particularized conversational implicature) implicature in advertisement and how conversational implicature used in advertisement.