

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves as the introduction to this study. The chapter consists of research background that also contains previous studies which become references in working on this research, statement of problem, research purpose, research significance, and the definition of key terms.

1.1 Research Background

Communication involves the exchange of information from one speaker to the listener, either directly or indirectly. The goal of communication is to achieve mutual understanding between the two parties involved (Lagu, 2016). According to Walgito, it is called a process of communication when speakers exchanging the same meaning (Tutiasri, 2016). The study which discussed about meaning in the branch of linguistic studies is known as pragmatics.

According to Levinson, pragmatics is the study of relation between language and context that obeys the structure of a language or grammaticalized. Also, the concern of pragmatics is language meaning conveyed in the context of where it is being stated (Vikry, 2017). Pragmatics and context are closely related, as the meaning of language is often dependent on the context in which it is used.

Context helps speakers to understand the intended meaning of words and actions in a particular situation. Context is the concept framework which refers to anything that is used as a reference in communication as well as understanding the meaning of the speech (Saifudin, 2018). Without context, it will be difficult to

understand a statement uttered by someone due to some people like to imply their meaning. Bach and Harnish stated that an implied meaning which occurs in utterance is called implicature (Ariani 2016:2 as cited in Sari et al., 2021).

Implicature is something that is implied in a communication, it is a process of interpreting a meaning according to the situation and the context used (Mey, 1993:99 as cited in Yulianti & Utomo, 2020). Implicature can be explained as hidden desires, intentions, and expressions (Brown and Yale, 1996:31 as cited in Izah, 2019). The type of implicature which only known by particular people who understand the context of the utterance is called conversational implicature (Yuniarti, 2014).

A conversational implicature refers to something that is implied but not explicitly stated during a conversation. In other words, implicature explains how it is possible to convey more meaning than what is directly expressed in the language used (Igwedibia, 2017). There are two categories of conversational implicature: particularized implicature and generalized implicature. If no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional meaning, that is when generalized conversational implicature occurs (Yule, 1996 as cited in Martini, 2018). Particularized implicature is constrained by the context in which it is used. It involves drawing inferences that are necessary to understand how an utterance is relevant in a particular context (Anggrarini, 2017).

Grice proposed a conversational rule in 1975 which is now known as maxims (Fadillah & Imperiani, 2020). According to Grice (1975) when having a conversation, there are some unwritten rules humans tend to follow. For example, it is expected for

people to tell the truth when they speak (the maxim of quality) and to give all the relevant information that is needed, but not too much (the maxim of quantity). Speakers are advised to stay on topic (the maxim of relevance) and to speak clearly and succinctly, without using confusing or vague language (the maxim of manner). So, if a speaker follows all these maxims, both speaker and hearer will be more likely to have a successful and productive conversation (Fadillah & Imperiani, 2020). However, on some occasions speakers fail to observe the maxims and it is called as non-observance maxims. Those non-observance maxims are: flouting a maxim, violating a maxim, and opting out a maxim (Vikry, 2017). Grice (1989) stated that some people may fail to observe the maxims, various ways to disobey the maxims are as follows: (1) quietly violate the maxims, by making the utterance liable to mislead. (2) opt out the maxims, by not giving enough information that is needed, and (3) flout the maxims, by providing irrelevant information or speak in a way that is intentionally vague or confusing (Herawati, 2013).

The phenomenon of communicating with implicature could be seen in the selected animated cartoon Family Guy, specifically Family Guy season 4 which contains of 31 episodes. This specific season was chosen because this season considered to have the longest episode, not only that, the show also has been nominated for both Emmy and Annie Awards, and it won three Outstanding Comedy Series awards since 1961. Back in 2013, TV Guide ranked it as the ninth Greatest all-time TV Cartoon (Debbas & Haider, 2020). This object was chosen because Family Guy's main concept of humor is by using conversational implicature. The characters

in the sitcom frequently mention current issues that happen in society, yet the jokes still remain funny while also giving information about the current issues. The implicature happened in the sitcom successfully create a different kind of joy especially if the context is understood. Most of the jokes become funnier because it was delivered implicitly.

Some previous research was used in this study to show the gap between this present study and the previous ones. A study conducted by Syalshabila (2022) examined the violations of maxims found in a debate video in 2020. There were two questions conducted for this research, about the types of violated maxims and how the violated maxims were created. These two research questions are related to the topic of this research about the non-observance maxims because violating a maxim is one of the kinds of non-observance maxims. In some cases, speakers purposely make their utterance uneasy to understand, the utterance may create misleading information for the interlocutors (Grice, 1975). Speakers are expected to violate a conversational rule when they know that the listeners will not discover the truth and will only recognize the expressed meaning of what is being said (Amianna and Putrani, 2017 as cited in Mangilaya II, 2020).

Other study is by E.P (2021) which analyzes the four-flouting maxim in a movie. There were two questions conducted for this research, about what are the flouted maxims and what are the strategies used to flout the maxims by the main characters in the movie. Flouting maxim is part of the non-observance maxim, and the strategies used in flouting a maxim are considered important because it is

important to know the context of how the utterance is being flouted. Flouting a maxim happens when the speaker expects the hearer to understand the implied meaning of an utterance. In flouting, speakers do not provide the correct information as required by maxims, but the hearer can still understand the meaning due to the implicature (Noertjahjo et al., 2017a).

Then, research by Khusnudzona (2022) which analyzes the violation of maxims in a talk show. There were two questions conducted for this research, about what are the types of violated maxims and what are the functions of violated maxims. Speakers must have a reason why they do not obey the maxims, that is why the function is important. In this research the conversation happens in a talk show, violated maxim happen might be because whether the guest or the host do not provide a clear information. Instead, they purposely make the utterance unclear and expect the hearer to only understand the surface meaning. Violating maxims can cause misleading information for the hearer (Noertjahjo et al., 2017a). This also happens when the topic is considered too sensitive to be talked about, so the speaker violates the maxims to prevent conflicts and other not-expected problems.

Another study by Ester Hanna BR. Sembiring (2017) which study about the flouting maxim in a movie script. The object of the study chosen by the researcher was a script from a movie which contained fictional characters. The fictional characters included animal characters which behave and talk like humans. There were two main questions in this research. They were the types of flouting maxim and the function of flouting the maxims. The result found that flouting the maxim of quantity

was frequently found. The characters flouted the maxim of quantity due to providing more explanation. While flouting the maxim of quality became the least found data since the characters mostly tell the truth.

This research expanded on what previous studies on conversational implicature had studied. Rather than just examining the violation or flouting of maxims, the study looked at the different types of implicature, including generalized and particularized implicature, and the three non-observance maxims: flouting, violating, and opting out. The researcher also emphasized the importance of considering the context of the conversation when trying to identify the implicature being used. This research provided a more comprehensive understanding of conversational implicature by taking into account the different types, the non-observance maxims, and the context of the conversation. The object used in this study deviated slightly from the previous conversational implicature studies. The object used was a sitcom in which characters were fictional, and not all characters are depicted as human. There was one of the main characters which depicted as a dog which behaves and talks like a human. So the utterance uttered in the data were not only utterance from humans, but also a dog fictional character.

1.2 Research Questions

The researcher has formulated the following research questions to discover more about the Conversational Implicature and non-observance maxims, as follows:

- 1) What types of conversational implicature found in the sitcom Family Guy season

2) What kinds of non-observance maxims found in the sitcom Family Guy season 4?

1.3 Research Objectives

After seeing the problem statement, the researcher decided that the objectives of this study are as follows:

- 1) To identify the types of conversational implicature found in the sitcom Family Guy season 4.
- 2) To reveal the kinds of non-observance maxims found in the sitcom Family Guy season 4.

1.4 Research significance

This research can be useful for those who want to study the use of language and how meaning is being delivered. This research can also be used to enrich the knowledge of pragmatics, specifically on conversational implicature. This research is expected to become an empirical source for those who are interested in studying pragmatic specifically in conversational implicature.

a) English Literature Students

This research can be used by English literature students as a reference in understanding pragmatics especially in understanding the theory of conversational implicature and how it leads to disobeying the rules of communication which also known as maxims by Herbert Paul Grice (1975). This research can be useful for them which may inspire them in analyzing phenomenon using the same theory but with different point of view.

b) Future Researcher

For future researchers, this research can be used as an example on how to analyze a phenomenon using the theory of conversational implicature and the rules of maxims by Herbert Paul Grice. Future researchers are also expected to be capable in finding the gaps in this research so then they could do better in the upcoming study.

1.5 Definition of key terms

To formulate and explain the terms of the title to avoid ambiguity in this research. The definition is as below:

1. *Implicature* is explained as hidden desires, intentions, and expressions. Implicature happens when what is meant is different from what being stated.
2. *Conversational Implicature* is one of Pragmatics studies which analyze the implicit meaning of an utterance.
3. *Generalized Implicature* is a kind of implicature that does not require special context to understand the meaning.
4. *Particularized Implicature* is a kind of implicature that requires special context to understand the meaning.
5. *Non-observance maxims* happen when an utterance does not obey the rules of maxims.