

# Investigating Particularized Conversational Implicatures in a Sitcom Serials

Ida Zuraida Supri<sup>1</sup>, Ervina C M Simatupang<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract**— *Misunderstanding may happen when the utterance of one of the participants does not fulfill the cooperative principles of communication. This may result in unpleasant situation, such as feeling offended, bad impression or misjudge. The above misunderstanding can be avoided if the partner of speaking understands the message intended to convey despite the violating of cooperative principles. This research aims at identifying particularized conversational implicatures in the assertive illocutionary acts found in a sitcom serial. The results show particularized conversational implicature is found in three types of assertive illocutionary acts.*

**Keywords**— listening, competence, listening part, TOEIC, vocational school

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

The study of speaker meaning, contextual meaning, how more get communicated that is said and expression of relative distance is the definition of pragmatics (Yule:1996). In line with the above definition, Levinson (1983:6) states that pragmatics is the study of the relation between language and context that are fundamental to achieve language understanding. However, he limits that pragmatics is the study of deixes, implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and aspects of discourse structures.

Utterances are complete communication units which focus on series of incidents in a certain period of time that involve speaker and hearer in a context (Leech: 1983). In communication there should be aspects of utterance, namely the speaker, hearer, topic, setting, and situation scene. An utterance should be under a context; any background of knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer that contribute to the hearer's interpretation or understanding on what speaker mean by a given utterance. Context of utterance are classified into three; situational context; the physical presence that includes body language during the interaction, background knowledge context which includes cultural knowledge and interpersonal knowledge, and Co-textual context; the background knowledge shared by both speaker and hearer.

Speech acts are actions performed via utterances (Yule:1996;46). There are three types of utterances. The first is locutionary acts; a real meaning utterance. For example, in the utterance "I'm broke", the speaker just states his financial condition. The second is illocutionary acts, is an act of utterance to inform, to offer an explanation and other purposive communication. The utterance "I'm broke" means he seek for financial help. He expects that the hearer lends him some money. The third is perlocutionary acts is the result or the effect of the utterance. When a speaker utters "sit down", it is expected that the hearer will do as what he intended him to do: sit down.

---

<sup>1</sup> ida.zuraida@widyatama.ac.id  
English Department, Faculty of Languages, Universitas Widyatama, Indonesia  
ervina.simatupang@widyatama.ac.id  
English Department, Faculty of Languages, Universitas Widyatama, Indonesia

Types of illocutionary acts is the basic human linguistics communication (Searle:1976). It also a performing act in saying something (Leech 1983:199). This means that illocutionary acts functions not only uttering but there is also intended purpose of communication by the speaker.

Assertive illocutionary acts bonds to the true proposition expressed, such as stating, suggesting, complaining. (Leech:1983) categorized assertive illocutionary into stating, reporting, announcing, predicting, asserting and complaining. There are verbs generally used in illocutionary acts with the construction of S Verb (...) that X. Following are the examples: Jim believed that no one had arrived (stating). Bill assured Pat that he will telephone her (asserting). Jim reported that no one had arrived (reporting). The verbs are used in assertive illocutionary acts functions to express the true proposition.

There are two types of assertive illocutionary acts; the explicit or performative, like in this utterance: "I state that he did not do it", and implicit or non-performative, like, "He did not do it"

Implicature is whatever the speaker implied, suggested, meant, etc., is dissimilar from what is uttered. Conversational implicature is something which is implied in conversation, that is, something that is left implicit in actual language usage. Implicature is categorized into:

1. Conversational implicature derives from cooperative principles of conversation and a number of maxims expected to be followed by each participant in a speech event.
2. Generalized conversational implicatures, a conversational implicature which is inferable without a referent to a social context.
3. Scalar implicatures is when certain information is communicated by using a word which expressed one value from a scale of value.
4. Particularized conversational implicatures take place in a very specific context in which locally recognize inferences are assumed.
5. Properties of conversational implicatures
6. Conventional implicatures are associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used.

Particularized conversational implicatures takes place when the context is specific, understood the participants of communication. In the example:

Tim: "Can you help me with my final project?"

Chloe: "I have to hurry to the office."

To make Chloe's response relevant to Tim's question which is simply "I can" or "I cannot", Tim should have certain knowledge that allows him to draw conclusion that Chloe has to go to the office for something that she has to do.

## II. METHODS

This research implemented a naturalistic qualitative research method; that process of collecting is not orchestrated or impeded. Paton (2001) as cited in Golafshani (2003) states that qualitative research is a naturalistic approach that investigate about understanding phenomena in context-specific settings such as 'real world setting' where the researcher does not endeavor to manipulate the phenomenon of interest. Consuelo (1992:94) states that a descriptive analysis method is used to compare and elaborate data. Maxwell asserts that Descriptive inductive analytical approach the general patterns of data analysis were a simultaneous action during the data collection stage. Data obtained were analyzed, compared then, conclusions could be drawn.

### A. Research Questions

This research aims at seeking answers for the following questions:

1) *identifying types assertive of illocutionary acts found in the sitcom serial*

2) *analysing the particularized conversational implicature*

*B. Limitation of the Research*

This research focuses on one type of implicature, that is personalized conversational implicature in assertive illocutionary acts found in a sitcom serial, Glee Season I.

*C. Research Object and Source of Data*

1. The research object is personalized conversational implicature. This research intends to investigate the what type of assertive illocutionary acts that employs personalized conversational implicature.

2. The source of data used is a situational comedy Glee. The

*D. Research Objective*

1. *to identify types assertive of illocutionary acts found in the sitcom serial*

2. *to analyse the particularized conversational implicature*

*E. Data Collection*

A set of data collection is implemented:

1. Watching the sitcom serial to identify assertive illocutionary acts utterances that have particularized conversational implicature

2. Classifying data of personalized conversational implicature based on type of assertive illocutionary acts.

3. Analysing the data

4. Drawing conclusions.

**III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

*A. Particularized Conversational Implicatures in Stating Assertive Illocutionary Act*

Data 1

Will : “You’re doing great, Baby. Keep breathing”.

Kendra : “No, giving birth is not like how it is in the movies. It is bloody and bestial and you get dirt all over your cowboy boots”.

Will : “*Well, I’m just trying to be supportive*”.

There is a background context knowledge of the utterance for the participants of communication; a maternity training that is followed by Will and Terri. The implicature of utterance “*Well, I’m just trying to be supportive*”, is classified to particularized conversational implicature.

The data above “*Well, I’m just trying to be supportive*” shows that will is true of being supportive and that he implicitly stating it by saying “*Well, I’m just trying to be supportive*”. Performative verb is not used by Will. Therefore, it is categorized into implicit one.

Data 2

Emma : How, um... How long have been married?

Will : Mm, Five years last march.

Emma : Really?

Will : Yeah, but we’ve been together since high school. I mean she was my first girlfriend actually

Emma : Was is love at first sight?

Will : for me it was. I don’t know. She used to be filled with so much joy.

Emma : And now?

Will : *Oh, it's show time.*

The participants of communication share the background context knowledge of the utterance, which is Will's marriage life. This belongs to interpersonal knowledge. There is understanding between them of the local context of the utterance. So, the utterance *Oh it's show time*, is categorized into particularized conversational implicature.

The data above *Oh, it's show time* shows that what Will says is true that it is time for the show and that he implicitly stating it. Performative verb is not used by Will. Therefore, it is classified into the implicit one.

Data 3

Finn : Practicing. And no one was around. Look! Do you know how much interference I had to run with these guys to get you this try-out? If you do it your way, they're gonna kill you.

Kurt : *My body is like a rum chocolate souffle.* If I don't warm it up right, it doesn't rise. If I'm doing this. I'm doing it my way.

The implicature is type personalized implicature. Both participants understand the background context knowledge, which is interpersonal knowledge; Kurt and Finn shared the same understanding that doing warming up with song is the right way to do.

In data *My body is like a rum chocolate souffle*, Kurt is expressing his thought by stating it. It is obvious that he has to do the warming up before practicing. He does not use performative verbs in uttering it, yet he does it implicitly. It can be seen that there is an implicature in the context of the conversation.

B. *Particularized Conversational Implicatures in Asserting Assertive Illocutionary Act*

Data 4

Will : Think you can handle it, Rachel?

Rachel : *It's my go-to shower song. It's also my ring tone.*

There is background knowledge context between the speaker and hearer; about the ability of performing the song. Rachel convinces Will that she is certain she can sing the song well. Based on the context of conversation above, it can be concluded that the utterance *It's my go-to shower song* is a particular implicature.

The utterance of Rachel is an implicit assertive illocutionary act because Rachel asserts or convinces Will, his teacher that she masters the song. She can sing it her best. Performative verb is not employed in her utterance. There is an implicature of Rachel's saying *It's my go-to shower song*.

Data 5

Carl : Whoa, whoa! Schuster, you messing up with my woman? I thought we had a deal.

Will : I don't know what you're talking about.

Carl : yes, you do. Because Emma and I have a full disclosure policy, total honesty. It's something that allows us to have a little something I like to call intimacy. Something you clearly know nothing about.

Will : *Look, we were just rehearsing.*

In terms of context, both Carl and Will share background knowledge, that is interpersonal knowledge. They both believe that Will and Emma practice or rehearse together; they do not have a special relationship. To sum up, based on the context, it is categorized into particularized implicature.

The utterance *Look, we were just rehearsing*, is Will's expression of mind to Carl to inform something. He asserts and tries to convince Carl that he and Emma is rehearsing. His prejudice is not true. Will express his conviction implicitly because he does not employ performative verb.

C. *Particularized Conversational Implicatures in Reporting Assertive illocutionary Act*

Data 6

Puck : What's your problem?

Finn : Nothing. I just got a lot on my mind.

Puck : Seriously, Dude? What's going on? I'm your best friend. Talk.

Finn : It's personal

Puck : I knew it. You're in love with Kurt.

Finn : *Quinn's pregnant*. She's keeping the baby.

Finn and Kurt shared the same background context knowledge. They have interpersonal knowledge context that Quinn is pregnant. Therefore, the utterance is a particularized conversational implicature. Finn's utterance is an assertive illocutionary act. He intends to inform his partner of speaking. He lets Puck know that Quinn is pregnant.

Taking a look at the function of the utterance, this is categorized into reporting type. He is reporting that *Quinn's pregnant*. Because Finn does not use performative verb in his utterance, the type assertive illocutionary act is implicit.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

To summarize, in this sitcom serial employs the particularized conversational implicature in the three types of assertive illocutionary act is found, stating, asserting and reporting. the participants of conversation have understanding in the context in which the utterance related to.

#### V. REFERENCES

- [1] Austin, J.L. (1962). How to do Things with words. London: Oxford University Press.
- [2] Consuelo, Sevilla. (1992). Research Methods. Manila: Rex Book Store Publishing.
- [3] Cruse, D. A. (2000). Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics dan Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [4] Cutting, Joan. (2003). Pragmatics and Discourse. London: Routledge.
- [5] Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation." Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts 3. Eds. P. Cole and J. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.
- [6] Grice, H.P. (1991). Studies in the Way of Words. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.Griffiths, P. (2006). An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [7] Leech, Geoffrey. N. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. Longman
- [8] Levinson, C. Stephen. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Martinich, A.P. (2008). The Philosophy of Language. New York: Routledge.
- [10] Maxwell. J.A .1996. Applied Social Research Methods Series. Volume 41. Qualitative Research Desian: An Interactive Approage. Sage Publications Inc.
- [11] Osisanwo, W. (2003). Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics. Lagos: Femolous Fetop Publishers.Rivera-Fuentes,
- [12] Reboul, A. & Moeschler, J. (1998). Pragmatics of Speech. Paris: Armand Colin.
- [13] Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philos-ophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- [14] Searle, J. R. (1975). "Indirect Speech Acts." *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts 3*. Eds. P. Cole and J. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.
- [15] Searle, J. R. (1976). *Classification of Illocutionary Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16] Searle, J. R. (1985). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Stalnaker, R. (1972). "Pragmatics." In D. Davidson & G. Harman, eds; *Semantics of Natural Language*, 380-97. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- [18] Supri, Ida Zuraida. 2017. Unearthing students' Realization of Speech Acts in Asking for Information in Telephone Conversation. *English Review Journal*. Volume 5 No2.
- [19] Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Essex, England: Longman.
- [20] Van Dijk, T.A. (1981). *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. New York: Mouton Publisher
- [21] Yang, Xiaw. Utako Minai and Robert Fiorentino. 2018. Context Sensitivity and Individual Differences in the Derivation of Scalar Implicature. *Frontier in Psychology*. Volume 9 Article 1720.