PARTICULARIZED CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE USED BY THE CHARACTERS IN THE VAMPIRE DIARIES SEASON 2

THESIS

Submitted as Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Sarjana Degree of English Department Faculty of Arts and Humanities State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya



By: Faizatul Wardah Reg. Number: A73214036

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

2018

DECLARATION

Herewith I,

Name : Faizatul Wardah

Reg. Number : A73214036

Department : English

Faculty : Arts and Humanities

declare that this thesis entitled "Particularized Conversational Implicature Used by The Characters in The Vampire Diaries Season 2" wrote to fulfill the requirement of bachelor degree in English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya is truly my original work. It does not incorporate any material that has been written or published by prior writer but indicated in quotation. As the writer of this thesis, I am the only person who is responsible for any objection or claim from others.

> Surabaya, July 2018 The Writer



Faizatul Wardah NIM. A73214036

ADVISOR 'S APPROVAL SHEET

This is to certify that the thesis written by Faizatul Wardah (A73214036) entitled "*Particularized Conversational Implicature used by The Characters in The Vampire Diaries Season 2*" has been approved by the thesis advisor and could be examined to fulfill the requirement of strata 1 degree English Department Faculty of Arts and Humanities State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

> Surabaya, July 11th, 2018 Thesis Advisor

Raudlotu ing

NIP. 197810062005012004

Acknowledged by Head of Department

<u>Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag</u> NIP. 196909251994031002

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

2018

EXAMINERS' APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis written by Faizatul Wardah (A73214036) has been approved and accepted by the broad of examiners, English Department Faculty of Arts and Humanities, State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya, on 19th of July 2018.

The Dean of Faculty of Arts and Humanities



The Broad of Examiners:

Examiner I

pp.Ling Raudlotul Jahnah NIP. 197810062005012004

Examiner II

Endratno Pilih Swasono, M.Pd NIP. 197106072003121001

Examiner III

Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag NIP. 196909251994031002

Examiner IV

Himmatul Khoiroh, M. Pd NIP. 197612222007012021



KEMENTERIAN AGAMA UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA PERPUSTAKAAN

Jl. Jend. A. Yani 117 Surabaya 60237 Telp. 031-8431972 Fax.031-8413300 E-Mail: perpus@uinsby.ac.id

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI KARYA ILMIAH UNTUK KEPENTINGAN AKADEMIS

Sebagai sivitas akademika UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama	: Faizatul Wardah
NIM	: A73214036
Fakultas/Jurusan	: Adab dan Humaniora / Sastra Inggris
E-mail address	: ardafabiya@gmail.com
UIN Sunan Ampe Sekripsi yang berjudul :	gan ilmu pengetahuan, menyetujui untuk memberikan kepada Perpustakaan I Surabaya, Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif atas karya ilmiah :] Tesis Desertasi D Lain-lain ()
Particularia	zed Conversational Implicature used by the

characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2

beserta perangkat yang diperlukan (bila ada). Dengan Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Ekslusif ini Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya berhak menyimpan, mengalih-media/format-kan, mengelolanya dalam bentuk pangkalan data (database), mendistribusikannya, dan menampilkan/mempublikasikannya di Internet atau media lain secara *fulltext* untuk kepentingan akademis tanpa perlu meminta ijin dari saya selama tetap mencantumkan nama saya sebagai penulis/pencipta dan atau penerbit yang bersangkutan.

Saya bersedia untuk menanggung secara pribadi, tanpa melibatkan pihak Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, segala bentuk tuntutan hukum yang timbul atas pelanggaran Hak Cipta dalam karya ilmiah saya ini.

Demikian pernyataan ini yang saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Surabaya, 02 Agustus 2018

Penulis

Faizatul Wardah nama terang dan tanda tangan

)

(

TABLE OF CONTENT

Inside Cover Page	i
Declaration Sheet	
Dedication Sheet	iii
Motto	iv
Thesis Advisor's Approval Sheet	V
Thesis Examiner's Approval Sheet	vi
Acknowledgement	vii
Table of Content	viii
Abstract	xi
Intisari	xii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Research Problems	7
1.3 Objectives of the Study	7
1.4 Significance of the Study	
1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study	
1.6 Definition of Key Terms	9
	7
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
2.1 Theoretical Framework	11

2.1 Theoretical Framework	11
2.1.1 Pragmatics	11
2.1.2 Implicature	13

2.1.3 Conventional Implicature	15
2.1.4 Conversational Implicature	16
2.1.5 Generalized Conversational Implicature	18
2.1.6 Particularized Conversational Implicature	19
2.1.7 Speech Acts	20
1) Representative	
2) Directive	22
3) Commissive	22
4) Expressive	
5) Declarative	23
2.1.8 The Vampire Diaries	24
2.2 Previous Studies	26
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD	
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD 3.1 Research Design	28
3.1 Research Design	28
3.1 Research Design3.2 Data and Data Sources	28 29
3.1 Research Design3.2 Data and Data Sources3.3 Research Instrument	28 29 29
 3.1 Research Design	28 29 29
 3.1 Research Design	28 29 29 30
 3.1 Research Design	28 29 29 30 32
 3.1 Research Design	28 29 29 30 32
 3.1 Research Design	28 29 29 30 32
 3.1 Research Design	28 29 30 32 49

5.2 Suggestion	5	3
----------------	---	---

REFERENCES

APPENDICES



ABSTRACT

Wardah, Faizatul. 2018. "Particularized Conversational Implicature Used By Characters In The Vampire Diaries Season 2". English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities. State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

The Advisor : Raudlotul Janah, M.App.Ling

Key Terms : Conversational Implicature, Particularized Conversational Implicature, The Vampire Diaries

This study aimed to identify the utterances of Particularized Conversational Implicature (PCI), its implied meanings, and its functions. Particularized Conversational Implicature is a kind of conversational implicature that required specific context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. PCI appears as the result of flouting Gricean's maxim. Thus when people flout one of the maxims, they don't really want to break the conversation, but they intended to convey the special meaning behind it.

In conducting this study, the writer used descriptive qualitative method to analyze the data. The writer used two theories from Grice about particularized conversational implicature and Searle about five general functions of speech act classification. The data are collected by identifying PCI based on flouting the maxims and analyze the implied meaning by concerning to the specific context.

The results show that there are 14 utterances of PCI found in The Vampire Diaries season 2. Those utterances come from flouting the maxim of relation and manner. It shows that when the characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2 flout the conversational maxims they are not really intend to break the conversation, but they want other characters to be aware of their implied meanings. By applying PCI utterances the characters use it in order to inform, to express, to ask and to refuse something from other characters.

INTISARI

Wardah, Faizatul. 2018. "Particularized Conversational Implicature Used By Characters In The Vampire Diaries Season 2". Jurusan Sastra Inggris Fakultas Adab dan Humaniora. Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Dosen Pembimbing : Raudlotul Janah, M.App.Ling

Kata Kunci : Implikatur Percakapan, Implikatur Percakapan Khusus, The Vampire Diaries

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi ujaran implikatur percakapan khusus (PCI), makna tersiratnya, serta fungsinya. Implikatur percakapan khusus adalah salah satu jenis implikatur percakapan yang membutuhkan konteks spesifik untuk memperhitungkan maksud yang ingin disampaikannya. PCI dapat terjadi sebagai hasil dari pelanggaran maksimmaksim. Maka ketika seseorang melanggar suatu maxim, sebenarnya mereka tidak berniat untuk merusak percakapan, tapi mereka memiliki maksud tersembunyi di balik itu.

Dalam pelaksanaan penelitiannya, penulis menggunakan metode analisis deskriptif kualitatif untuk menganalisa data. Penulis menggunakan dua teori yaitu teori Grice tentang implikatur percakapan khusus dan teori dari Searle tentang lima fungsi umum dari clasifikasi tindak tutur. Data diperoleh dengan cara mengidentifikasi ujaran PCI berdasarkan pelanggaran maksim dan menganalisa makna tersiratnya dengan cara memperhatikan konteks spesifik.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat 14 ujaran PCI dalam The Vampire Diaries season 2. Ujaran-ujaran tersebut berasal dari pelanggaran maxim relasi dan cara. Hal tersebut menunjukkan bahwa ketika tokoh-tokoh melanggar maxim mereka tidak sungguh-sungguh berniat untuk merusak percakapan, namun mereka mengharapkan tokoh yang lain untuk menyadari maksud tersirat yang ingin mereka sampaikan. Dengan menggunakan ujaran PCI, para tokoh menggunakannya untuk memberi informasi, untuk mengekspresikan diri, untuk meminta dan untuk menolak sesuatu dari tokoh yang lain.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This introduction chapter presents background of the study, statement of the problems, objectives of the study, significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study, and definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

People use conversation as a tool to communicate with others. By doing a conversation, we can get a lot of information, express our feelings and share our ideas. Language takes important role in human's life, since a communication will be difficult without language.

During the process of conversation, it possibly occurs a misunderstanding between speaker and listener which finally get them into some problems. It is mostly caused by lacking of listener to understand what speaker actually means. In other words, the meaning of what actually speaker said was not delivered well to listener. Thus, the study of meaning is important to be considered in conversation. Pragmatics as one of linguistic field takes a crucial part concerning with the study of speaker meaning.

According to Yule (1996:3) pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning communicated by speaker or writer and interpreted by hearer or reader. It is quite different from semantics which also has the same case on the study of meaning. Semantics is the study of sentence and word meaning, and how words literally connect to things. Here, the study of semantics is not

enough to figure out the case of speaker's communicated meaning, especially in real conversation. Therefore we need to study on pragmatics, because by studying pragmatics we can find the meaning in a higher level which cannot be found in semantics.

A communication is called success when both parties understand each other, and the meaning of what the speaker said is delivered well to the listener. Concerning with the case of conversation, a linguist Grice proposes a known as Cooperative Principle aimed to create rule successful communication between speaker and listener, and the to avoid misunderstanding between them. He formulates four maxims that should be followed: maxim of quantity, quality, manner and relation. This maxims and principles ask the speaker to give a required contribution when the communication occurs. It should be clear, true, brief, relevant, and informative as is required.

In real conversation, people do not always follow these principles. People do not always deliver what they mean literally. In a certain situation they deliver their meaning implicitly. It means that there is a hiding meaning behind of what they literally said. In pragmatics, a study of implicit meaning explains in implicature which was proposed by Grice.

The term *imlplicature* is used by Grice to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says (Brown & Yule, 1983:31). Implicature is an additional conveyed meaning that more than just what the words mean. For example when a woman asks her

partner how she likes the hamburger she is eating in the middle of lunch, she said "*A hamburger is a hamburger*". Behind of what the speaker literally said, there is a hiding meaning that she wants to convey. We can assume that the implied meaning of her utterance is, that she has no idea about the hamburger or it can be implied that she thinks all hamburger are same.

Grice divides implicature into two kinds: conventional and conversational implicature. Conventional implicature is the implicature that have conventional meaning of the word used, they do not have to occur in conversation, and they do not depend on special contexts for their interpretation. According to Yule (1996:45) Conventional implicature associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used. For example the word *therefore*, in the utterance *"He is Englishman, he is, therefore, brave"*. The conventional implicature of this utterance is that the case of being brave is a consequence of his being Englishman (Grice, 1989:25).

Different from conventional implicature, conversational implicature is an implicature that occurs in conversation. Ariel (2008:11) explains that conversational implicatures are often generated when the encoded meaning seems to flout some Gricean maxims. In other words, conversational implicature is an implicature contained in the conversation that appears as the result of flouting the conversational principles or maxims. So that, when the speaker does not obey the maxim in a conversation, it does not always mean that they are not cooperative. Therefore, listener should analyze it and have

the assumption that the speaker wants to convey special thing behind the case of flouting the maxim.

Conversational implicature is divided into two kinds, they are GCI (generalized conversational implicature) and PCI (particularized conversational implicature). Generalized conversational implicature is a conversational implicature which does not required special knowledge in the context to calculate additional conveyed meaning. According to Yule (1996:41) when no special knowledge in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called generalized conversational implicature.

Unlike GCI, PCI or particularized conversational implicature is a kind of conversational implicature that depends on special or local knowledge in very specific context in conversation. And because they are the most common, particularized conversational implicatures are typically just called implicature (Griffiths, 2006:134). According to Levinson (1983:126), particularized conversational implicature is a type of conversational implicature which do require such specific context. Therefore, if the speaker flouts these maxims intentionally, the listener must analyze the cooperative principle on a deeper level through understanding the specific context. For example:

Man	: where is our roast beef?
Woman	: the dog is looking very happy.

The answer of the woman seems not relevant to the man's question, and it does not appear to follow the maxim of relevance. Here, the man should assume that the woman still cooperates in conversation. As we know that dogs like a kind of meat as their food, and by looking at the context of situation that the roast beef is gone, so it is possible for the dog to eat the roast beef. Therefore the woman actually implied the meaning that perhaps the roast beef was eaten by the dog.

The context is also important to determine the meaning of an utterance. Cook (1989:10) stated that context is knowledge of the world outside of the language which people used to interpret. So that, context entails the situation within which the communicative interaction takes place. In addition about particularized conversational implicature, Yule (1996:42) defines that the meanings of particularized conversational implicature can be calculated from the specific context. Thus, besides observing the flouting maxim, we also need to consider about the context when the utterance performed to calculate or interpret the implied meaning.

The study of implicature also has relation with the function of the utterance which was produced by the speaker. Levinson (1983:236) states that all utterances, in addition to meaning whatever they mean perform specific action. Thus, besides focuses on the theory of particularized conversational implicature, the writer also focuses on the function of each implicature based on the theory of speech act classification which was proposed by Searle. He introduces five functions of performing an utterance. These functions are representative or assertive, directive, commissive, declarative, and expressive.

There were a lot of studies which have analyzed about particularized conversational implicature. Among those studies, the writer found interesting study which was conducted by Kristiani and Emalia Iragiliati from State University of Malang. They analyzed particularized conversational implicature that used by two main characters in *The Duchess* movie, the most flouted maxim, and the purposes of particularized conversational implicature utterances based on the theory of politeness strategy. The results showed that there were 27 utterances of particularized conversational implicature found in *The Duch*ess movie, the most flouted maxim is the maxim of relation, and the purpose of producing the utterances is to give the listener an opportunity to interpret the speaker's intended meaning without being irritated or embarrassed.

Different from that study, the writer found another interesting study which was conducted by Anisa Inayati et al. from State University of Padjajaran Bandung in 2014. They analyzed the conversational maxims and sub cooperative principle in each maxim which were flouted in particularized conversational implicature in drama serial *Gilmore Girls*. The results showed that the maxims flouted in 10 utterances of particularized conversational implicature found in *Gilmore Girls* are the maxim of relation and manner, and most of the speakers' utterances contained irrelevant utterance, obscurity of expression, ambiguity, and unnecessarily prolixity.

As we can see, both of the previous studies have different combination of the theory they used in analyzing particularized conversational implicature. The first study combines particularized conversational implicature with the theory based on Brown and Levinson about politeness strategy, while the second study focuses on theory of flouting conversational maxim based on the explanation from Grice and Yule. Different from both previous studies, the writer combines the analysis of particularized conversational implicature with the function of each implicature by using Searle's theory of speech act classification. The writer chooses The Vampire Diaries season 2 to be analyzed because it reflects daily language in their conversation which many implicit meanings are provided.

1.2 Research Problems

Based on the background stated above, this study is conducted to answer the following questions:

- What are the utterances of particularized conversational implicature found in The Vampire Diaries season 2?
- 2) What are the implied meanings of each particularized conversational implicature utterance found in The Vampire Diaries season 2?
- 3) What are the functions of each particularized conversational implicature found in The Vampire Diaries season 2?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This study aims to:

- Identify the utterances of particularized conversational implicature found in The Vampire Diaries season 2.
- Describe the implied meanings of each particularized conversational implicature utterance found in The Vampire Diaries season 2.
- Identify the functions of each particularized conversational implicature utterance found in The Vampire Diaries season 2.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Study of implicature in conversation is important because it is the key to lead us into a successful understanding in communication. In a certain situation, people do not only convey their meaning literally. They prefer to imply their meaning especially in a conversation. It makes the communication became more vary and not monotone. Furthermore, study about particularized conversational implicature also important because it commonly occurs in a conversation. And to get the match interpretation of the implicature, it is required a particular of background knowledge in very specific situation when the conversation occurs. So that, when someone applies particularized conversational implicature on their conversation we can understand the implied meaning and avoid misunderstanding to get a successful communication.

Theoretically, the writer expects this study will be able to contribute an understanding to the reader's knowledge in particular how to investigate the utterance of particularized conversational implicature, describe the implied meaning of each particularized conversational implicature utterance and to find out the functions of each particularized conversational implicature utterance. Practically, the results of this study are expected to become an additional knowledge and to stimulate students in studying linguistic field especially about particularized conversational implicature. This research also expected to be used as additional references for further researcher related with the field of particularized conversational implicature.

1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study

In conducting the study, the writer analyzes all the character's utterances in The Vampire Diaries season 2 as the source to find the data. The writer concerns all the characters because they almost have the same portion in producing utterances and also if it is limited to focuses on one character it will prevent the writer to enrich the data.

This study focuses on particularized conversational implicature utterances which are taken from the transcript of The Vampire Diaries season 2. To limit the discussion the writer focuses on the particularized conversational implicature using the theory from Grice and the functions of each implicature based on Searle's theory of speech act classifications.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

a) Implicature

Implicature is the act of meaning or implying something by saying something else (Davis, 2007:5). It can be said that implicature is a hiding or implied meaning behind of the words mean. Therefore implicature is used to explain the differences between what is said and what is implied.

b) Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicatures are often generated when the encoded meaning seems to flout some Gricean maxims (Ariel, 2008:11). In other words, conversational implicature is an implicature contained in the conversation that appears as a result of violating the conversational principles or maxims.

c) Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is a type of conversational implicature where the interpretation of the implied meaning depend on particular background knowledge in a specific situation. According to Levinson (1983:126), particularized conversational implicature is a type of conversational implicature which do require such specific context.

d) The Vampire Diaries TV Series

TV series is a group of episodes of a television program broadcasts in regular intervals with a long break between each group, usually with one year between the beginning of each. (www.yourdictionary.com)

The Vampire Diaries is an American supernatural drama television series developed by Kevin Williamson and Julie Plec, based on the popular book series of the same name written by L. J. Smith. (<u>www.wikipedia.com</u>) Here in analyzing this study, the writer chooses the second season of The Vampire Diaries which has twenty two episodes.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a field of linguistics studying communication. According to Fromkin (2003:207) pragmatics is concerned with the interpretation of linguistic meaning in context. In other words, pragmatics is a theory of language use considered the speaker and hearer, the context, the purposes, and the meanings in communication when the sentences or utterances are produced.

Furthermore, Yule (1996:3) stated that pragmatics is the study of meanings communicated by speaker or writer and interpreted by listener or reader. He also explained that pragmatics is the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the user of those forms. Therefore by studying pragmatics we can figure out people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes, and kinds of actions they are performing in communication through the context.

Context is important to determine or to interpret the meaning of an utterance. By understanding the context, we can avoid wrong interpretation about the meaning of an utterance. According to Cook (1898:10) context is knowledge of the world outsides language which people used to interpret. It

can be said that context is the related factors that contributes to build the understanding about the intended meaning the speaker wants to convey.

Context is classified into situational context and linguistic context. According to Halliday (1989:46) situational context used to explain why certain things have been said or written in particular occasion, and what else might have been said or written. Therefore situational context consist in a bare set of features to answer the question about what, who, when, where, why and how the utterance produced.

On the other hand, linguistic context consist in a physical set of features such as referring pronoun in the text. Linguistic context also called as co-text. It is the context inside the text. For example "*a cat catches a bird and eats it*". The linguistic context of that sentence is that the pronoun *it* refers to the bird.

Different from semantics which has the same learning about meaning, pragmatics has the wider concern in studying about the meaning. In pragmatics, the meanings of an utterance depend on certain situational context. Thus different situational context of an utterance can created different meaning. On the other hand, the meanings of semantics do not require the situational context of an utterance to be interpreted. It usually called as literal meaning.

Leech (1983:6) gives the distinction between the meaning of pragmatics and semantics. He stated that the meaning in pragmatics is defined relative to a speaker or user of the language, whereas the meaning in semantics is defined purely as a property of expressions in a given language, in abstraction from particular situations, speakers, or hearers. Thus the study of pragmatics is important because we can find the meaning in a higher level which cannot be found in semantics through understanding the context.

Pragmatics has some branches. According to Yule, pragmatics includes deixis, reference and inference, presupposition and entailment, cooperative and implicature, speech acts, politeness, conversation and preference structure, discourse and culture. In this paper, the writer discussed one branch of pragmatics which studied about the implied meaning that is implicature. For deeper explanation, the writer explains the definition of implicature in the following point.

2.1.2 Implicature

Implicature is one branch of pragmatics. As stated above that the meaning of an utterance cannot be understood appropriately only by using the theory of semantics, because an utterance may contain literal meaning and implied meaning. Therefore we need to study about implicature.

The term implicature was first introduced by Grice which used to make the distinctions between "what is said" by the speaker of a verbal utterance and "what is implied". Grice in Davis (2007:5) stated that implicature is the act of meaning or implying something by saying something else. It is indicated that an utterance may have a hidden meanings or additional meanings despites of its verbal or lexical words. Basically, Grice distinguished two different types of implicature, they are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Potts (2004:26) defines the distinction between conventional and conversational implicature. He explains that conversational implicature exists in the case of the maxims and the cooperative principle, whereas conventional implicature are properties of the grammar.

Conventional implicature is an implicature that have conventional meaning of the word used. For example *"I choose the pink hat, but my mother chooses blue"*. The word "but" on that utterance has conventional meaning which indicated the contrast. Therefore, the implied meaning of that utterance is that between what the speaker chooses and her mother is contrast.

On the other hand, conversational implicature is an implicature contained in conversation as the result of flouting Gricean maxims. For example:

Amie	: what time is it?
Ben	: well, the milkman is coming

Ben's answer is seemed not relevant with what Amie's question. He flouts the maxim of relation. But after understanding the context, and having the knowledge about the milkman, it means that the time is the same when the milkman coming, that is eight a.m. Therefore, the implied meaning of that utterance is that it is eight a.m. The deeper explanation about the distinction between conventional and conversational implicature will be explained in the following points.

2.1.3 Conventional Implicature.

Conventional implicature is a kind of implicature that have conventional meaning of the word used. According to Davis (2007:133) "convention" means an arbitrary social custom or practice. Therefore, the words that have conventional meaning are the words that agreed by the user of language to have an arbitrary meanings. For example the word "*and*" in the following utterance:

"Yesterday Marry was happy and ready to work"

(Yule, 1996:46)

The implied meaning of this utterance comes from the specific word "and". The word "and" is agreed conventionally by the user of English language to has the meaning of "addition" or "plus". Thus, the implied meaning of that utterance is that Marry was happy yesterday plus she is ready to work.

Conventional implicature also regarded as a property of grammar. In this case, conventional implicature is treated as regular logical entailments. According to Yule (1996:25) entailment is something that logically follows from what is asserted in the utterance. For example *"He is Englishman, he is, therefore, brave"*. This utterance implied the meaning that the case of his being brave is a consequence of (follows from) his being Englishman (Brown & Yule, 1983:31).

Different from conversational implicature, conventional implicature do not have to occur in a conversation. They are independent from the principle of cooperative conversation, and also independent from contexts for their interpretation. In conversational implicature, the interpretation of its implied meaning is purely come from the properties of grammar and some specific words which have conventional meaning.

Bach (1999:333) gives some specific words which contributed as being part of conventional implicature. Some of them are the word *but, yet, even, still, manage, fail* and *too.* For example "Sasha managed to start the car". The word "managed" in that utterance has conventional meaning that it is required some effort to start the car. Therefore, It is implied the meaning that Sasha made some effort to start the car.

Another example is the word "too" in the utterance "Maher Zain was in Moscow last spring too". The word "too" in that utterance has conventional meaning that some other given person was in Moscow last spring. So that, it is implied the meaning that there is another person besides Maher Zain was in Moscow last spring.

2.1.4 Conversational Implicature

Conversational imlpicature is a kind of implicature that occur in conversation. This kind of implicature is regarded as one of the most important ideas in pragmatics (Levinson, 1983:97). It is because this implicature is one of linguistic phenomena that found and applied frequently in conversation.

According to Brown & Yule (1983:33), conversational implicature must be treated as inherently intermediate since they derive from a supposition that the speaker has the intention of conveying meaning and of obeying the cooperative principle. It means that conversational implicature is an implicature which appears as the result of disobeying or flouting the cooperative principle. And in interpreting the implied meaning, the listener should suppose that the speaker is still tried to be cooperative.

The cooperative principle was purposed by Grice which aimed to create successful communication between speaker and listener and to avoid misunderstanding between them. Grice based his cooperative principle on four sub principles or maxims. These are the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner and maxim of relation.

The maxim of quantity asks people to make their contribution as informative as is required for the particular purpose and not making it more informative than is required. The maxim of quality asks people to say only what they belief to be true and what they have evidence for. The maxim of relation asks people to make their contribution relevant to the interaction. And the maxim of manner asks people to be clear in what they say, avoid ambiguity, be brief and orderly in their contribution in interaction. In other words, this principle and maxims ask the speaker to give a required contribution when the communication occurs. It should be clear, true, brief, relevant, and informative as is required.

Furthermore, Grice pointed out that people may not follow the maxims. So when the speaker fails to obey the maxims, it possibly means that there is something special behind that. This case of breaking the maxims does

not mean that the speaker does not aware to fulfill the maxims, but there is a hiding meaning behind it. Thus it does not always mean that the person who does not obey the maxims are not cooperative in conversation, but they are still in action to adhere the maxims in a deeper way.

Conversational implicature is divided into two kinds: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. The brief explanation about two kinds of conversational implicature and its differences is explained in the following points.

2.1.5 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized conversational implicature is a kind of conversational implicature when there is no special knowledge required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. According to Levinson (1983:126) generalized conversational implicature occurs without reference to any particular features of the context. As the same with Levinson, Yule (1996:41) states that when no special knowledge in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called generalized conversational implicature. Therefore the interpretation of the implied meaning in generalized conversational implicature can be easily seen without concerning the local or special knowledge in the context. For example:

Woman: Do you invite Bella and Andre tonight?Man: I invited Bella tonight

In that conversation, the man may appear to flout the maxim of quantity because he gives less information to the woman. And in order to make the conversation cooperative, she must assume that what is not mentioned was not invited. Therefore, although the man does not explain about it, generally it can be understood that he only invites Bella to the party, while Andre is not invited.

Generalized conversational implicature can also be identified with indefinite articles "a" or "an", (Yule, 1996:41). For example "I entered a house and a dog come running towards me". In this utterance the speaker applies generalized conversational implicature. Generally, without special knowledge in the context, it can be understood that the house and the god are not belong to the speaker. If the speaker wants to inform that the house and the god belong to his or her, he or she may said "my house" and "my dog".

2.1.6 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is a kind of conversational implicature that depends on special or local knowledge in very specific context in conversation. And because they are the most common, particularized conversational implicatures are typically just called implicature (Griffiths, 2006:134). According to Levinson (1983:126), particularized conversational implicature is a type of conversational implicature which do require such specific context.

As the same with Levinson, Paltridge (2006:71) stated that particularized conversational implicature are derived from a particular context, rather than from the use of the words alone. Therefore, if the speaker flouts these maxims intentionally, the listener must observe the cooperative principle on a deeper level through analyzing the specific context. For example:

Man	: do you like ice cream?
Woman	: is the pope catholic?

Yule (1996:43)

In the conversation above, the woman may appear to flout the maxim of relevance. She is indicated to give the information which seems does not relevant with the man's question. But in order to make the conversation cooperative, he must assume that the woman is still cooperates in their conversation.

Based on local knowledge, we all know that a pope is always catholic. Then if we turn it to the answer of the woman, the answer is obviously yes. It is indicated that the woman is implied the meaning that exactly, she likes ice cream. Here, the woman actually answers the man's question but not in direct way. In this case, the woman has applied particularized conversational implicature.

Another example of particularized conversational implicature can be seen when someone says to her friend *"I like when you sing out of key all the times"*, but in the real situation she does not like to hear it. Here, the speaker flouts the maxim of quality, because she said something which she beliefs to be false. But it does not mean that she intended to lie, she asks the hearer to understand what a hiding meaning actually she wanted to convey. Actually she means the opposite of what she said, that she does not like when the hearer sings out of key all the times.

2.1.7 Speech Acts

Speech acts is an action performed through producing an utterance. According to Austin (1962:12), when we are saying something we are also doing something. Therefore when we are producing an utterance, in the same time we are also performing an action. For example when we say "*I will be there at seven*", we are not only speaking, but we also seem to perform the action of promising.

Austin (1962:108) classifies three distinct levels of action beyond the act of utterance itself. They are locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act. Yule (1996:48) gives an explanation about these three related acts.

First, **Locutionary act** is the production of a meaningful linguistic expression. In other word, locutionary act is performing act of saying something. Therefore when we are doing an action of saying something, we are arriving at the stage of locutionary act. Second, **Illocutionary act** is the action of performing an utterance with some kind of function in mind. In the stage, we have an intention inside of saying something. For example when we are uttering:

"It's hot in here, close the door please".

In saying the utterance above, we are not only saying it unintentionally. But it has a function of ordering someone to close the door. Third, **Perlocutionary act** is the effects on the audience through uttering of a linguistic expression. It means that perlocutionary act is the effect of utterance toward the other person. For example after we saying "*it's hot here, please close the door*", then there is someone closes the door. Here, he or she gets an effect from our utterance.

In conducting this study, the writer analyzes the functions of each implicature by using Searle's theory of five general speech act classification: they are representative or assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

1) Representative or Assertive

Representative or assertive is speech act that have function of committing a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition and thus carry a truth-value. Leech (1983:105) explains that assertive commit speaker to tell the truth of the expressed proposition. Such as asserting, claiming, criticizing, concluding, informing, reporting and stating.

In performing this type of speech acts, the speaker represents the world as he or she believes. For example when someone said to his friend "*George has a new sport car*", that statement is included in the function of representative that is about informing.

2) Directive

Directive is a speech act that cause the hearer to take a particular action, or when the speaker expects the listener to do something as a response. According to Mey (2001:120), directive embodies an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to do something, to direct him or her towards some goals. Such as ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, and recommending.

In using directive, the speaker intends to elicit some future courses of action on the part of the addressee, thus making the world match words via the addressee. For example when someone said "*Could you please close the door?*". This utterance above is included in the function of directive which is about requesting. The speaker does not really question if the listener can close the door or not, he/she expects the response of the listener to do something that is to close the door.

3) Commissive

Commissive is speech act that commits a speaker to some future course of actions. Yule (1996:54) defines that commissive is a kind of speech act that the speaker uses to commit themselves to some future actions. The actions that included into commissive are promising, offering, refusing, and vowing. For example when someone said "*I will be at home at nine*" This utterance is included in the function of commissive that is about promising. Here the speaker does not only say or inform that he will be at home at nine, but he also doing an action of promising.

4) Expressive

Expressive is a speech act that expresses the speaker's attitudes and emotions toward the proposition. Yule (1996:53) states that expressive is to express the psychological states like pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, sadness, joyfulness, thankful, greeting, apologizing and praise. For example when someone said "*what a wonderful world*" This utterance is included in the function of expressive that is about praising. Here the speaker does not only state that the world she was seeing is wonderful, but she also doing another action of praising.

5) Declarative

Speech acts can change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration. Declarative is a kind of speech acts that affects immediate changes in some current state of affairs. Yule (1996:53) states that declarative are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterance.

In performing the types of declarative the speaker brings about changes in the world, they affect a correspondent between propositional context and the world. Such as (officially) opening a bridge, declaring war, excommunicating, firing form employment, and nominating a candidate. For example when a teacher said to her students *"the class is dismiss"* this utterance is included in declarative because by saying that utterance, the speaker changes the situation by dismissing the class.

2.1.8 The Vampire Diaries Season 2

The Vampire Diaries is an American supernatural drama television series developed by Kevin Williamson and Julie Plec, based on the popular book series of the same name written by L. J. Smith. The series premiered on the CW on September 10, 2009, and concluded on March 10, 2017. This drama series is set in the fictional town in Virginia. It follows the life of Elena Gilbert, a teenage girl who has just lost both parents in a car accident. Then she falls in love with a 162 years old vampire named Stefan Salvator. Their relationship becomes increasingly complicated as Stefan's mysterious older brother Damon Salvator returns, with a plan to bring back their past love Katherine Pierce, a vampire who looks exactly like Elena.

The Vampire Diaries produced 171 episodes over eight seasons. Each season have twenty two episodes except the third season with twenty three episodes. The first season of The Vampire Diaries was released on September 10, 2009. And this second season was aired on September 10, 2011 until May 2013 with twenty two episodes with different title. They are The Return, Brave New World, Bad Moon Rising, Memory Lame, Kill or Be Killed, Plan B, Masquerade, Rose, Katerina, The Sacrifice, By the Light of the Moon, The Descent, Daddy Issues, Crying Wolf, The Dinner Party, The House Guest, Know Thy Enemy, The Last Dance, Klaus, The Last Day, The Sun Also Rises, and As I Lay Dying.

The show of The Vampire Diaries has received have attracted the largest audience for The CW of any series premier since the network began in 2006. The first season average 3.60 million viewers. It also has received numerous award nominations such as winning four People's Choice Awards and many Teen Choice Awards.

2.2 PREVIOUS STUDIES

The writer uses two previous studies related with the study about particularized conversational implicature to develop her thesis. First is the study which was conducted by Kristiani and Emalia Iragiliati from State University of Malang. In conducting the study, the writers used descriptive qualitative method which aimed to discuss particularized conversational implicature, by analyzing the maxim that mostly flouted found in *The Duchess* movie. They limited the analysis by focusing on the two main characters. The writers then analyzed the function of uttering the particularized conversational implicature in the case of politeness.

As the result, the writers found that there were 27 utterances of particularized conversational implicature uttered by the two main characters in *The Duchess* movie. The mostly flouted maxim is the maxim of relation. The result also showed that the function of applying the particularized conversational implicature used by the two main characters in *The Duchess* movie is to reduce the threat which could possibly damage the speaker and hearer's face.

The difference between this study and the writer study is on the combining theory they related. On their study, they combine particularized conversational implicature with the theory of politeness based on Brown and Levinson about politeness strategy. While the writer combines the particularized conversational implicature with their function based on Searle's speech act classification.

Second is the study which was conducted by Anisa Inayati et al. from State University of Padjajaran Bandung in 2014. In this study, the writers analyzed the conversational maxims which are flouted in particularized conversational implicature appears in drama serial *Gilmore Girls*. In conducting this study, the writers used descriptive qualitative method, based on the theory developed by Grice and Yule about particularized conversational implicature.

The objectives of the study are to find the types of maxims which are flouted in *Gilmore Girls* drama serial, and the types of sub-cooperative principle in each maxim which is flouted in *Gilmore Girls* drama serial. The result showed that particularized conversational implicature flouts two kinds of maxims that are maxim of relation and manner. And most of the speakers' utterances contain irrelevant utterance, obscurity of expression, ambiguity, and unnecessarily prolixity which is a phenomenon of flouting maxim as cooperative principle.

The difference between this study and the writer's study is that they focus on flouting conversational maxim as the result of particularized conversational implicature, while the writer combines particularized conversational implicature with the function of each implicature based on Searle's theory of speech act classification.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Research Design

The writer applied descriptive qualitative research in this study. According to Woods (2006:2) qualitative method focuses on natural setting, has interest in meaning, perspectives and understanding, and gives great consideration on the process. Thus by using the approach of descriptive qualitative, the writer analyzed the data of particularized conversational implicature utterances which were produced by the characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2 based on the theory from Grice and Searle to answer the research problems. The results were showed by giving the description about the utterances, the implied meanings, and the functions of particularized conversational implicature.

The writer used two theories in this study. The first theory is the theory proposed by Grice to identify the utterances of particularized conversational implicature. In analyzing the implied meaning of each particularized conversational implicature utterance, the writer looked at the background knowledge of the specific context within the conversation. The second theory is the theory of speech acts classification proposed by Searle to identify the function of each particularized conversational implicature utterance.

3.2 Data and Data Sources

The data sources of this study were the drama TV series of The Vampire Diaries season 2 and its English transcript. This TV series contained 22 episodes with the duration about 40 minutes for each episode. The data of this study were the utterances of particularized conversational implicature produced by the characters in the dialogue conversation of The Vampire Diaries season 2.

The data were limited only on the utterances of particularized conversational implicature which contained specific context to calculate the implied meanings. The writer chooses the drama TV series of The Vampire Diaries season 2 as the source of the data because it contained everyday languages and most of the characters frequently applied implicature in their conversation.

3.3 Research Instrument

In descriptive qualitative research, the main instrument of the study is the researcher herself. According to Bogdan and Bilken (1982:76), the researcher him/herself is the key instrument of qualitative research. So, the exact instrument of this study to acquire and analyze the data is the writer herself supported by some notes and personal computer. As a tool to analyze the data, the writer did the whole steps in conducting the study such as watching the video, taking some notes, selecting the utterances, and then analyzing the data herself.

3.4 Techniques of Data Collection

The writer collected the data by using these following steps:

- The writer downloaded the video of The Vampire Diaries season 2 from https://pahe.in and paid attention to the conversation in the video.
- The writer downloaded the English subtitle or transcript of The Vampire Diaries season 2 from <u>www.subscene.com</u>

- 3. The writer applied the subtitle on the video and read it directly while watching the video in order to make sure that the subtitle was matched with the video.
- 4. After making sure that the subtitle and the video was matched, the writer gave marks to the utterances of particularized conversational implicature in dialogue transcript of The Vampire Diaries season 2.

3.5 Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, the writer used two theories. First, the writer used Grice's theory to find the utterance of particularized conversational implicature. Second, the writer used Searle's theory of Speech Acts Classification to identify the functions of each implicature.

After the data were collected, the writer analyzed the data by the following steps:

1. Identification

The writer identified the utterances of PCI based on flouting maxims. They were flouting quality maxim, quantity maxim, manner maxim, and relation maxim. While the writer classified the functions of the PCI utterances based on Searle's theory of speech acts classification. They were the function of representative, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative.

2. Explaining Identified Data

The writer explained the implied meaning of each particularized conversational implicature based on flouting the maxims and by looking at the specific context when the utterances produced. And in explaining the function of each implicature, the writer used five functions of speech act classification: representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

3. Drawing Conclusion

Finally, the writer drew conclusion based on the results of analysis.



CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The main purpose of this chapter is to answer the statement of problems which were presented in chapter 1. This chapter presents two sections: research findings and research discussions. In finding section, the writer presents detail information about the data of Particularized Conversational Implicature (PCI) utterances produced by the characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2, the implied meanings, and the functions of each utterance. While in discussions section, the writer gives the general explanation about the findings.

4.1. Research Findings

To answer the research questions, the writer attempts to present the results by showing the utterances of particularized conversational implicature based on flouting the maxims, the implied meanings of each utterance based on the context, and the functions of each utterance based on Searle's theory of speech act classification.

There are 14 utterances of particularized conversational implicature produced by the characters in the dialogue conversation in The Vampire Diaries season 2. Those utterances come from flouting two conversational maxims: (7) flouting relation maxim, (6) flouting manner maxim and (1) flouting relation and manner maxim. While from those 14 utterances of PCI, there are (10) utterances included into representative function, (1) utterance included into directive function, (1) utterance included into commissive function, and (2) utterances included into expressive function, and no utterance included into declarative function.

Datum 1

Context : Stefan and Katherine were met at Tyler's house, where many people surrounded after Tyler's father got murdered. Katherine threatened Bonnie and Stefan asked her to leave Bonnie.

Stefan : Leave her alone.
Katherine : Ok.
Stefan : What are you doing here?
Katherine : After the way you treated me last night, I thought that public place would be less violent.

The conversation above showed that Katherine did not obey the conversational maxim. Katherine flouted the maxim of manner by giving brief less response towards Stefan's question. Stefan was asking her about what was she doing on Tyler's house, but she answered Stefan's question by saying that she thought a public place would be less violent after the way he treated her last night. By flouting the maxim of manner, Katherine did not actually intend to break the conversation, but she expected Stefan to recognize her implied meaning.

In particularized conversational implicature, the specific context was needed to interpret someone's implied meaning. The last night before they met on Tyler's house, Katherine wanted to meet Stefan on his house but they finally fight each other. And they would not fight while they were in a public place, such as in Tyler's house. Therefore Katherine's utterance implied the meaning that she wanted to meet Stefan without any fighting like what they did last night.

Katherine's utterance was included into representative function. Katherine did not only doing an action of saying the utterance, at the same time she also performing an action of informing. She wanted to inform Stefan that what was she doing on Tyler's house is that she wanted to meet him without fighting each other.

Datum 2

Context : Elena and Bonnie were meeting Carter at the carnival.

Carter	: Wow.	What are you	doing,	beautiful?
--------	--------	--------------	--------	------------

Bonnie : Um, what do you know about karaoke's speaker?

Carter : Why don't you show me the problem?

- Elena : Yeah, Bonnie. Show him the problem.
- Bonnie : Ok. Come on.

The above conversation showed that Bonnie did not follow the conversational maxim. Bonnie was flouted the maxim of relation by blatantly giving the response which not relevant to Carter's question. Carter asked them about what they were doing in the carnival but Bonnie gave a response by questioning about karaoke's speaker. By flouting the maxim of relation, Bonnie was not really intended to break the conversation, but she actually wanted Carter to be aware about her point.

The specific context required to interpret Bonnie's implied meaning. When they were walking in the carnival, Bonnie and Elena saw many couples having fun. Bonnie who was still single seemed envy to them, and after met Carter, Bonnie who was a black girl got interested with that black boy. In this case we have to draw assumed knowledge that Bonnie was not really questioning about karaoke's speaker, but she has special meaning behind it that she may tried to ask him out with her. Therefore Bonnie's utterance implied the meaning that she asked Carter to go with her in karaoke booth. If the specific context was needed to calculate the implied meaning, it means that Bonnie applied particularized conversational implicature.

Bonnie's utterance was included into directive function. Bonnie did not only doing an action of uttering something, at the same time she was also performing an action of asking. She was not really questioned Carter about the karaoke's speaker, but she committed Carter to do something. She asked Carter to go out with her in the karaoke.

Datum 3

Context : Caroline met her mom, Liz who was preparing the stuffs in front of their home.

Caroline : Are you off today?

Liz : The Historical Society Volunteer Picnic is today.

The conversation above showed that Caroline's mother did not observe the conversational maxim. She flouted the maxim of relation by blatantly giving irrelevant information towards Caroline's question. The simply relevant answers she may use are "yes" or "no", but she gave irrelevant answer by saying "The Historical Society Volunteer Picnic is *today*". By flouting the maxim of relation, Liz did not actually meant to break the conversation, but she expected Caroline to be aware about her additional implied meaning.

Liz was a sheriff, and The Historical Society Volunteer Picnic was not a part of her works. When she told that The Historical Society Volunteer Picnic is today, she was wearing casual clothes and prepared some stuff. In this case we have to draw assumed knowledge that Liz will join the picnic and she will not going to work at the sheriff office. Therefore Liz's utterance implied the meaning that yes, she did not going to work today because she was joining The Historical Society Volunteer picnic. And when the specific context was required to interpret the additional conveyed meaning, it is classified as particularized conversational implicature.

Liz's utterance was included into representative function of informing. In the conversation above Liz did not only doing an action of uttering, but she was also performing an action of informing something. She wanted to inform that she did not going to work or she was off today.

Datum 4

Context : Damon and Jeremy were talking about a legend book that explained about the use of moonstone.

Damon: Who has the stone now?Jeremy: Tyler.Damon: Can you get it?Jeremy: Yeah.Damon: See, now your life has purpose.

Jeremy : So you do believe it?

Damon : Same book says a werewolf bite kills a vampire. Ignoring it would make me an even bigger idiot.

In the conversation above, it was showed that Damon did not follow the conversational maxim. Damon was indicated to flout the maxim of manner by giving brief less answer towards Jeremy's question. Jeremy questioned him about his belief to the legend of the moonstone, but Damon responded by giving unnecessary prolixity answer to Jeremy. By flouting the maxim of manner, Damon did not tried to break the conversation, but he expected his implied meaning to be recognized by Jeremy.

In that conversation, we have to draw on some assumed knowledge that Damon did not ignore the legend. In other words, it is indicted that he believed about it. Therefore Damon's utterance implied the meaning that yes, he belief the legend book that told about the moonstone. And when some inferences are acquired to work out the conveyed meaning of the conversation it should be particularized conversational implicature.

Damon's utterance was included into representative function of stating. He did not only doing an action of saying an utterance, at the same time he also performing an action of stating something. He stated that he believed the legend book.

Datum 5

Context : In the yard of Tyler's house, a man asked Mason to move his Van.

Man: Hey, can you move your Van?Mason: Blocked in.

The conversation above showed that Mason's response did not appear on the surface to adhere the conversational maxim. He gave obscurity information to the man by just saying *"Blocked in"*. Thus it is indicated that Mason's response flouted the maxim of manner. By flouting the maxim of manner, mason did not really intend to break the conversation, but he wanted the man to recognize his implied meaning.

Before understanding the implied meaning of Mason's utterance, we must have the knowledge about the Van. The Van is a brand of Mason's car. Thus the man asked him to move his car. When the conversation occurred, Mason's car was trapped and stuck by another car in front of it, and it caused him lacked to move the car. Therefore Mason's utterance implied the meaning that he cannot move his car because it was trapped in the yard by another car. And while the local knowledge was needed to calculate the implied meaning of the conversation, it should be particularized conversational implicature.

Mason's utterance included into representative function of informing. He did not only saying the utterance of *"blocked in"*, at the same time he was also performing an action of informing something. In the conversation above, he wanted to inform that he cannot move his car because it was stuck by another the car.

Datum 6

- Context : Stefan refused Jeremy to look for Elena with him. Jeremy said that Stefan cannot do that only by himself. Then Damon appeared to go with him.
- Stefan : You two go back to your house just in case. I'm gonna call you the minute I find her.
- Jeremy : But you can't do this alone.
- Damon : He's not.
- Stefan : You're coming with me?
- Damon : It's Elena.

The conversation above showed that Damon did not observe the conversational maxim. Damon flouted the maxim of manner and relation by giving irrelevant and obscurity information towards Stefan's question. The simply relevant and clear answer he may use are by saying *"yes"* or *"no"* towards Stefan's question, but he said *"It's Elena"*. By flouting the maxim of relation, Damon did not intend to break the conversation, but he wanted Stefan to be aware of Damon's conveyed meaning.

In order to make Damon's utterance relevant, we must understanding the specific context of the conversation. Elena was kidnapped by other danger vampire and Stefan intended to look for and save her. Damon was loved Elena, furthermore she was Stefan's girlfriend and he would not let Stefan to look for Elena by himself. Therefore Damon's utterance implied the meaning that yes, he was coming with Stefan because he also wanted to save Elena. In this case Damon's utterance was classified into particularized conversational impicature because it required specific context to calculate his implied meaning.

Damon's utterance was included into representative function of stating. He did not only doing an action of saying an utterance, at the same time he was also performing an action of stating something. In above conversation, he wanted to state that he would go with Stefan to look for and save Elena.

Datum 7

- Context : Elena was kidnapped by Rose. Elena was curious about the motif of kidnapping herself. And she asked rose to telling her the truth.
- Elena : you got me ok? It's not like I can go anywhere. The least you can do is telling me what you want with me.
 Rose : I personally want nothing. I'm just a delivery service.
 Elena : Delivery to who? Elijah?
 Rose : Two points to the eavesdropper.

In the conversation above, it showed that Rose's utterance did not appear to adhere the conversational maxim. She was flouted the maxim of manner by giving obscurity or unclear information to Elena. She did not clear to give the information it was true or not that Elena would be delivered to Elijah, instead she said *"Two points to the eavesdropper"*. By flouting the maxim of manner, Rose did not really meant to break the conversation. She wanted Elena to be more aware about her point. The word "*eavesdropper*" was actually referred to Elena because she was tried to listen her conversation about Elijah with her brother. In this case we have to draw the assumed knowledge that Rose's utterance implied that Elena was correct about her guessing. Therefore Rose's utterance implied the meaning that yes, Elena was right and she will be delivered to Elijah. While the specific knowledge was needed to acquire the conveyed meaning, Rose's utterance was classified into particularized conversational implicature.

Rose's utterance was included into representative function of informing. She did not only doing the action about saying something, but she was doing an action of informing something. In above conversation, Rose was intended to inform Elena that her guessing was correct.

Datum 8

- Context : Stefan told Damon that he has started to drink the blood every day in order to strengthen his body.
- Stefan : I've been drinking a little every day, slowly increasing my intake, and building up my strength.
- Damon : Does Elena know you're drinking blood?
- Stefan : I've been drinking hers.

The conversation above showed that Stefan did not follow the conversational maxim. Stefan was indicated to flout the maxim of relation by blatantly giving the information that was not relevant to Damon's question. Damon questioned him does Elena know or not, instead Stefan answered that he has been drinking hers. By flouting the maxim of relation, Stefan did not really wanted to break the conversation. He wanted Damon to calculate his implied meaning.

In order to make Stefan's utterance relevant, we have to draw some assumed knowledge. Stefan said that he has been drinking hers, and it referred to Elena's blood. This utterance created an assumption that Elena has knew that Stefan started to drink the blood again because he has been drinking her blood. Therefore, Stefan's utterance implied the meaning that yes, Elena knew Stefan started to drink the blood. And when some inferences are acquired to work out the conveyed meaning of the conversation it should be particularized conversational implicature.

Stefan's utterance was included into representative function of informing. Stefan did not only do an action of saying something, but he was also performing the action of informing something. He wanted to inform Damon that Elena has already knew that he started to drink the blood.

Datum 9

Context : Caroline was tried to remind Tyler that there was almost a full moon.

Tyler : Are you two still on the outs?
Caroline : Looks like it. You realize there's almost a full moon?
Tyler : Vampires don't have enough problems. You want to take on mine?
Caroline : Have you even thought about it?
Tyler : The whole...Wolf thing?
Caroline : Do you know what you're going to do?

Tyler : I'll be fine.

In above conversation, it showed that Tyler did not fulfill the conversational maxim. Tyler flouted the maxim of relation by blatantly giving information that was not relevant to the Caroline's question. Caroline reminded Tyler about the full moon, but Tyler gave a response by saying *"Vampires don't have enough problems"*. By flouting the maxim of relation, Tyler hoped Caroline to be aware about his implied meaning.

In order to interpret Tyler's implied meaning, we must concern to the specific context of the conversation. Tyler is a newbie werewolf, and when the full moon was coming he would got a great painful while transforming into a giant wolf. In this case we have to draw assumed knowledge that by saying that utterance, Tyler cannot answer Caroline's question. Therefore he implied the meaning that he did not want to discuss about the full moon.

Tyler's utterance was included into expressive function of dislike. He did not only doing the action of saying the utterance, at the same time he was also performing an action of expressing his attitude of dislike. He expressed his dislike attitude toward Caroline because did not like to discuss about the full moon.

Datum 10

Context : Damon was taking Elena to her house and they were talking about Elijah.

Elena : She was just scared. She didn't mean to run.

- Damon : Yes, she did. She's been running for 500 years.
- Elena : I can't believe Elijah's alive. Why do you think he killed those 2 vampires and just let us go?
- Damon : If I had a dollar for every time some evil vampire surprised me.

The conversation above showed that Damon did not observe the conversational maxim. He flouted the maxim of relation by blatantly giving irrelevant answer towards Elena's question. Elena asked Damon's opinion about Elijah, why he killed two vampires and let them alive, but Damon answered *"If I had a dollar for every time some evil vampire surprised me"*. By saying irrelevant utterance, Damon expected Elena to be aware of his point.

The specific context was needed to calculate Damon's intended meaning. Before Damon took Elena to go home, they were surprised by other vampires who wanted to kidnap Elena. They got more surprised when Elijah came to them and killed the two vampires but he let Elena and Damon alive. In this case we have to draw an assumed knowledge that Damon did not liked to be surprised by some bad vampires. Therefore Damon's utterance implied the meaning that he has no idea about the reason why Elijah let them alive and he did not like to be surprised by other bad vampires.

Damon's utterance was included into expressive function of dislike. He did not only doing an action of saying something, at the same time he was also performing the action of expressing his dislike feelings. He wanted to show that he did not like to be disturbed by other cruel vampires.

Datum 11

Context : Jenna was introducing her friend to Damon.

Jenna : So my friend wants to meet you. Damon Salvatore, this is...Damon : I know you... the news lady.Andie : Yeah, Andie star. Nice to meet you! Can I buy you a drink, Damon?

Damon : My glass is all full, Andie.

In the conversation above, it was showed that Damon's utterance was not appeared to adhere the conversational maxim. He flouted the maxim of relation by blatantly giving the response that not relevant with Andie's question. Andie offered to buy him a drink, but he said that his glass is full. By flouting the maxim of relation, Damon did not really want to break the conversation, but he expected Andie to recognize about his implied meaning.

In order to make Damon's utterance relevant in the conversation, we have to draw on some assumed knowledge that Damon in that situation tried to convey something. Damon said that his glass was all full. It is indicated that he did not need any more drink. Thus Damon's point is not about telling Andie that his glass was full, but he implied the meaning that he refused Andie's offering to buy him a drink. And while it was needed some assumed knowledge in the specific context to calculate the conveyed meaning, it was included into particularized conversational implicature.

Damon's utterance was included into the function of commissive of refusing. In that conversation, Damon did not intend to inform that his glass was full, but he was actually performing the action of refusing something. He refused Andie's offering to buy him a drink.

Datum 12

Context : Lexi visited Stefan's room, and she saw many dead girls with their blood everywhere.

Lexi : Oh my God! You are a ripper. Stefan : A what?

Lexi : There are good parts of being a vampire and there are bad parts. You are the second.

In the conversation above, it showed that Lexi did not observe the conversational maxim. She flouted the maxim of manner by giving brief less information toward Stefan's question. Stefan asked her to repeat what Lexi has called him because he did not hear it clear, but Lexi answered by giving unnecessary prolixity utterance. By flouting the maxim of manner, Lexi did not really wanted to break the maxim. She wanted Stefan to be aware about her point.

In order to calculate Lexi's implied meaning, we should have assumed knowledge that Stefan was a vampire. Therefore Lexi's utterance implied the meaning that Stefan was a bad vampire. Some assumed knowledge in the specific context was required to work out Lexi's conveyed meaning, and it is classified into particularized conversational implicature.

Lexi's utterance was included into representative function of stating. In above conversation, Lexi did not only doing an action of saying something, but she was also performing the action of stating. Lexi stated that Stefan is a bad vampire.

Datum 13

Context : Katherine was curious where Damon will go. He looked panic.

Katherine : Where are you going?

Damon : Luka Martin's dead. His father's going after Elena. Katherine : I'm coming with you.

The conversation above showed that Damon did not follow the conversational maxim. He flouted the maxim of relation by blatantly giving an information which not relevant to Katherine's question. Katherine asked him where will he go, but Damon answered "*Luka Martin's dead. His father's going after Elena*". By flouting the maxim of relation Damon did not actually intend to break the conversation, but he expected Katherine to recognize her additional conveyed meaning.

In order to make Damon's utterance relevant, we must understanding the specific context. Damon said that Luka Martin was dead and his father's going after Elena. It meant that Elena was in danger and Damon wanted to save her. Therefore Damon's utterance implied the meaning that he will going to Elena's place. And while the specific context was needed to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, Damon's utterance was included into particularized conversational implicature.

Damon's utterance was included into the function of representative of informing. In that conversation Damon did not only doing an action of saying something but he was also performing the action of informing. He informed that he would go to Elena's place.

Datum 14

Context : Alaric was telling Jenna and Stefan the secret that there were vampires in the town, and he was obsessed with them.

Jenna : Are you joking?

Alaric : Not at all. How about you, Stefan? Are you a fan of vampires?

Stefan : In literature. Bram Stoker. It's dense, but I appreciate it.

The conversation above showed that Stefan's utterance was not appeared to adhere the conversational maxim. He flouted the maxim of manner by giving obscurity in answering Alaric's question. The simply clear answer Stefan may use are "yes" or "no", but he gave unclear answer by saying "*In literature. Bram Stoker. It's dense, but I appreciate it*". By flouting the maxim of manner, Stefan expected Alaric to be aware about his additional conveyed meaning. In order to determine Stefan's conveyed meaning, we have to know the specific knowledge about Bram Stoker. Bram Stoker is Ireland writer who has wrote a book about Dracula, and Stefan said that he appreciate it. Therefore it implied the meaning that Stefan was interested about the vampires. And while the specific context needed in calculating the conveyed meaning, it should be particularized conversational implicature.

Stefan's utterance was included into representative function. He did not only do an action of saying something, at the same time he was also performing the action of stating. Stefan stated that he was interested about the vampires.

4.2. Research Discussions

After presenting and analyzing the data in the previous findings, in this section the writer explains the discussion which aimed to provide rich description of the research problems. From above analysis, there were found 14 utterances of particularized conversational implicature produced by some characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2. Those utterances appeared as the results of flouting two conversational maxims of manner and relation. And there were no utterances found as the result of flouting quantity and quality maxim.

Among those maxims, most utterances of particularized conversational implicature were come from flouting the relation maxim. There seven utterances of particularized conversational implicature came from flouting relation maxim. The characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2 were often flouted relation maxim. They often gave irrelevant information or response from the previous topic.

Besides flouting the maxim of relation, the characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2 were often flouted the maxim of manner. There were found six particularized conversational implicature utterances as the results of flouting the maxim of manner. The characters often used obscurity, unclear and brief less responses towards another characters. The last data of PCI utterance appeared as the result of flouting the maxim of relation and manner. The character used irrelevant and obscurity utterance to response other character. But by flouting the maxim of relation and manner, the characters did not really want to beak the conversation, but they actually tried to be cooperative in their conversation. They wanted the listener to be aware of their implied meanings.

In analyzing the data, context was very important thing to interpret the implied meaning of each particularized conversational implicature utterance. Without understanding the context surrounded the utterance the writer will be difficult to interpret the implied meaning. It included the topic of the conversation, the character's relation to other characters, where, when, and why the utterances were produced. Besides context, some local and specific knowledge are also important to help the writer in calculating the additional conveyed meanings.

After interpreting the implied meaning, the writer also classified the functions of particularized conversational implicature utterances produced by the characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2. There were found ten utterances of particularized conversational implicature included into representative function, two utterances included into expressive function, one utterance included into directive function, and one utterance included into commissive function. And no utterance included into declarative function. Among those functions, representative function was mostly intended by the characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2. They often used it in order to give information and state something to other character.



CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

The data in this study are the utterances of particularized conversational implicature (PCI) used by the characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2. The data source of this study is drama TV series of The Vampire Diaries season 2 with twenty two episodes. From those twenty two episodes, the data of PCI utterances are found in the first, second, fifth, sixth, eighth, tenth, eleventh, thirteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and nineteenth episodes.

This study aimed to identify the utterances, the implied meanings, and the functions of particularized conversational implicature. Based on the findings and discussions, the writer concludes that there are 14 utterances of PCI used by the characters in The Vampire Diaries season 2. Seven utterances of PCI produced as the results of flouting the maxim of relation, six utterances appeared as the result of flouting the maxim, and one utterance produced as the result of flouting the maxim of relation and manner.

In analyzing the implied meanings of each PCI utterance, the writer concerned the context surrounded the conversation. Besides understanding the specific context of each utterance the writer also concerned of the local and special knowledge in the conversation in order to interpret the implied meanings. The writer uses the theory of Searle's speech acts classification to identify the function of PCI utterances. They are representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative function. And from five functions of speech act classification, there are four function found in Victorious season 4. There were ten utterances included into representative function, two utterances included into directive function, one utterance included into expressive function, one utterance included into expressive function, one utterance included into declarative function. By applying PCI utterances the characters use it in order to inform, to express, to ask and to refuse something from other characters.

5.2 Suggestion

The writer suggests the next researchers who want to conduct a study of particularized conversational implicature to apply this theory with other interesting theory. The next researchers can relate the theory of PCI into other linguistic phenomena such as metaphor, sarcasm or verbal irony. The writer also suggests the next researchers to apply the theory of PCI in other different object with more short duration such us a movie. The last, the writer hopes that this study will gives benefits to the readers in adding their knowledge about particularized conversational implicature.

REFERENCES

- Ariel, M. 2008. *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, J. 1975. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bach, Kent. 1999. *The Myth of Conventional Implicature*. Linguistics and Philosophy.
- Bogdan, R. C. & Bilken, S. K. 1982. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. 1989. Discourse. New York: Oxford University.
- Davis, W. A. 2007. Implicature: *Intention, Convention, and Principle in the Failure of Gricean Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fromkin, Victoria., et al. 2003. An Introduction to Language (7th Edition). New York: Heinle.
- Grice, P. 1989. Studies in The Way of Words. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Griffiths, Patrick. 2006. An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1989. Language, Context, and Text: Aspect in Language in A Social Semiotic Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Inayati, A., et al. 2014. *Flouting Maxims in Particularized Conversational Implicature*. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 6 (3), 2289-2737.
- Kristiani & Eragiliati, E. Main Characters' Particularized Conversational Implicature in The Duchess Movie. State University of Malang.

Leech, G. 1983. Principles of Pragmatics. New York: Longman Inc.

Levinson, S. C. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mey, J. L. 2001. Pragmatics: An Introduction. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Potts, C. 2004. *The Logic of Conventional Implicature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Paltridge, B. 2006. Discourse Analysis: An Introduction. MPG Book Ltd, Great Britain.
- Tomas, J. 2013. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Routlege.
- Woods, P. 1999. Successful Writing for Qualitative Research. New York: Routledge.
- Yule, G. 1996. Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Vampire_Diaries

https://pahe.in/the-vampire-diaries-season-2

https://subscene.com/subtitles/the-vampire-diaries-second-

season/english/1279745

http://userwww.sfsu.edu/kbach/Myth.htm#_edn1

http://www.yourdictionary.com/tv-series