





### 2.1.3 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is not only can be extracted by particular context, but also by calculating the maxim of conversation. According to Paltridge (2006:70), conversational Implicature refers to the inference a hearer makes about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from their use of the literal meaning of what the speaker said, the conversational principle and its maxims.

Grice (1975:50) states that to working out a conversational implicature, the hearer will rely on the following data: (1) The conventional meaning of the words used, together with the identity of a reference that may be involved. (2) The cooperative principle and its maxims. (3) The context, linguistic or otherwise, of the utterance. (4) Other items of background knowledge. (5) The fact (or supposed fact) that all relevant items falling under the previous headings are available to both participants and both participants know or assume this to be the case.

Grice introduces a distinction between two types of conversational implicature, those are Generalized Implicature and Particularized Implicatures. Levinson (1983:126) defines Generalized conversational implicatures occur without reference to any particular features of the context. In other words, special background knowledge or inferences are not required in calculating the additional conveyed meaning. Whereas, Lakoff (1993:107) defines particularized implicature is implicature that needs context or cultural understanding must be assumed.

























instance, people who have known each other will show the higher solidarity to each other. On the contrary, people who are in distant relationship will have a low solidarity with each other.

### **2.1.10 Irony**

The irony utterance usually used by people to utter the utterance that has the opposite meaning to what the speaker said. There are several definitions about irony. According to Simpson (2011:34), Irony has a frequent and common definition: saying what is contrary to what is meant. Whereas, Abrams (1981: 89) states that irony is a statement in which the implicit meaning intended by the speaker differs from that which he ostensibly asserts.

In connection to the definition of irony this can be divided into 3 categories, these are: (1) Verbal irony, the most common type of irony that people usually get in touch with and can be explained like difference between the intended and expressed meaning. (2) Situational irony, the incongruity between what is expected and what actually occurs in the situation. For recognizing the situational irony requires a part of the particular situation, because it cannot be simply recognized just by understanding the words, but also gestures and tone of voice. (3) Dramatic irony, a type of situational irony that occurs in drama. The ironic element is produced by a narrative when the audience knows more about present or future circumstances than the character of the story. The incongruity happens between what the character does or in





1. Research by Miftahul Huda (2013) entitled “Conversational implicature found in dialogue of Euro Trip Movie”.

The main objective of this study is to discover how utterance can go beyond its literal meaning by the disobeying or flouting of some principles by the speaker in dialogue. That study focuses on analyzing the dialogue using the theory of implicature and cooperative principles proposed by Grice and the theory of speech act proposed by Searle. This study concludes that the speaker and the listener often flout conversational maxim mostly occurs in informal communication.

The differences between Huda’s research and the writer’s research are located in the objectives and the utterance that is being observed. Huda’s objectives are identified the conversational implicature and determine the types and functions of conversational implicature. Whereas, the writer’s study is not to determine the types of conversational implicature but identify the way to express conversational implicature which to determine the utterance using polite or impolite ways. The second difference is located in the utterance that being observed. Huda’s analyze in all utterance which flout the maxim, while the writer’s analyze only on verbal irony utterance.

2. Research by Larasati Dwiki Naskiki (2015) entitled “Verbal Irony and Flouting Maxims in Bad Teacher Movie”.

This study discusses flouting maxims through verbal irony occur in Bad Teacher Movie. The problem of this study is what kinds of flouting



4. Article by Marta Dynel (2103) entitled “*Irony from a neo-Gricean perspective: On untruthfulness and evaluative implicature*”.

This article discusses about irony from a new perspective like a renewal of thought which called neo-Gricean perspective. The aims are to shed new light on the workings of irony, drawing on the research from the field of pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and the philosophy of language. To meet this objective, he presents article takes as its departure point the Gricean philosophy, which is endorsed as a tenable basis for a new approach to irony.

The differences of Dynel’s research and the writer’s is located on the aims of research which larger than the writer. Dynel uses the aims which more complex than she who uses the simply aims. However, there is a similarity of research which located on the workings of irony to produce implicature.