

THE FUNCTIONS OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN TV SHOW “F.R.I.E.N.D.S”: PRAGMATICS APPROACH

Vivian Cristina¹

Universitas Putera Batam (UPB), Batam, Indonesia
pb171210021@upbatam.ac.id¹

Afriana²

Universitas Putera Batam (UPB), Batam, Indonesia
afriana@puterabatam.ac.id²

Abstract

According to Grice (1975), conversational implicature is speaker's intention which not expressed explicitly. Conversational implicature can be found easily in every aspect of life that involves communication, especially conversation. Each of the conversational implicatures that found in the conversation may has different functions. The aim of this research is to analyze the function of the conversational implicature found in a famous American TV show, named F.R.I.E.N.D.S. The researcher used the conversational implicature theory by Grice (1975) to identify the utterance and the speech acts theory by Searle (1976) to categorize the function. Searle (1976) classified speech acts into five. These acts include representatives/ assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. The design of this research is qualitative research. The researcher used the interview method by Sudaryanto (2015) to collect data, the pragmatic identity method by Sudaryanto (2015) to analyze the data, and used the informal presentation method by Sudaryanto (2015) to present the research result. In order to analyze the data, researcher collected ten data that contain conversational implicature, and two of the data categorized as representatives/ assertives, three data categorized as directives, two data categorized as commissives, two data categorized as expressive, and the remaining data categorized as declarations. The result concludes that out of the ten analyzed data, directive was the most used speech acts in the TV show.

Keywords: conversational implicature, Grice, pragmatic, speech acts

1. INTRODUCTION

Communication is a fundamental aspect of our life as a human being. According to Davis & Newstrom (1981), Communication is the process of passing and understanding information from one person to another. It allows us to express our feelings, ideas, intention, knowledge, etc. There are many ways we can use to interact/ communicate with one another. One of them is through language. Sound, form, and meaning are the three basic components of language. In the process of

exchanging the information, the information may not be delivered successfully. It can be caused by many reasons. One of the reasons is the hearer failed to recognize the meaning behind the speaker's utterance.

When the speaker fails to deliver or express feelings, ideas, intention, and knowledge, and the hearer fails to recognize the meaning behind the speaker's utterance, the speaker and hearer will end up in a misunderstanding and confusing situation. To avoid this situation, a

philosopher came up with a set of principles, called the cooperative principle. According to Grice (1975), the contribution is required in the process of exchanging information in order to achieve effective communication. In the cooperative principle, there are four sub-principles. The cooperative principle is including maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. But the utterance doesn't always have its literal meaning. According to Grice (1975), some maxims are broken on purpose in order to create conversational implicature. Conversational implicature is speaker's intention which not expressed explicitly (Grice, 1975). The speaker's intention can be identified by the hearer based on the necessity or requirement to have knowledge of the context. Some utterances can be identified by the hearer without having to read the situation at that moment. On the other hand, in some circumstances, the hearer has to have at least the basic knowledge of the situation at that moment to able to understand the speaker's meaning. In the process of delivering or expressing feelings, ideas, intention, and knowledge, utterances can have different functions. These functions will be determined by using a theory by Searle (1976). The conversational implicature found will later be classified into five kinds of acts to determine the functions of the implicature. These acts include representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations (Searle, 1976).

We can find conversational implicature easily and there are a lot of previous researchers that analyzed this topic. One previous research that found by the researcher that analyzed speech act and conversational implicature is by Asror (2019) from IKIP PGRI

Bojonegoro. The title of the journal is "Analysis of Speech Acts and Implicature in The Political Advertising of Candidates Legislative Members Bojonegoro District 2019". The researcher aiming for finding the form and purpose of using the conversational implicature in advertisements that used to promote several legislative candidates in Bojonegoro 2019. The researcher used the listening and note technique to obtain the data and the triangulation theory to analyzed the data. After the data were analyzed, the researcher found four kinds of speech acts. Which are representative, directive, expressive, and commissure. And all those utterances are used by the candidates to expressing hope, making proposals, giving advice, inviting to do something, showing feelings, and promising in order to able to win the voters' hearts.

Conversational implicature can be found easily in every aspect of life that involves communication, especially conversation. We can find conversation easily on TV shows. The researcher decides to analyze an American TV sitcom, F.R.I.E.N.D.S. We can find this phenomenon in the episode "The One Where Monica Gets a Roommate", season one (03:24). Rachel rushed into a coffee shop in a wet wedding dress and looking for Monica. It's been forever since the last time they met each other. Monica surprised she met Rachel in the coffee shop that she, her brother, and their best friends always go to. Rachel explained that she went to Monica's apartment to meet her but she wasn't there. The maintenance guy told her that Monica is at the coffee shop so she rushed over. Monica then introduces Rachel to her friends and brother. Monica's brother, Ross once had a crush on Rachel. He's in shock that Rachel suddenly appears when his marriage

with his ex-wife crumbles. Ross greeted Rachel when Ross's umbrella suddenly opened in front of Rachel and they both backed down awkwardly. To break the awkward silence, Monica said, "So, you want to tell us now or are we waiting for four wet bridesmaids?"

Monica didn't really mean to ask if they are waiting for four wet bridesmaids. Everybody there knew that something went wrong at the wedding because Rachel came in with her wedding dress still on her and it was wet because whatever the reason is. Monica is indirectly requesting an immediate explanation of what had happened to Rachel. According to Searle (1976), an utterance is directives when there is an attempt by the speaker to get the hearer to do something. So, the utterance is a conversational implicature because the intention is not explicitly said and the function is to request which include into the directives.

There are some previous studies that developed ideas in this research. Surayani (2016) in her research related with request strategies based on gender perspective is one of implementation using pragmatic approach. Afriana (2018) also wrote about the attitude of the language towards the politeness of the language of the students of Putera Batam University. Ameliza (2020) find one of pragmatic approach in order to find types and reasons of code switching on whatsapp Putera Batam University student. All of the researches above give much inspiration developing this ideas but the data source and analysis of this article has the gap. This research focused on the analysis of maxim by using Grice theory. Each of data explores clearly by using F.R.I.E.N.D short show to clarify conversational implicature toward the character or speaker on those TV show.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatic is a subfield of the scientific study of language that studies meaning that linked to the context. There are many experts that defining pragmatics. According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics is the study of language usage. In addition to that, Birner (2012) stated that pragmatics is defined as contextual language study. In other words, Pragmatics is a linguistics branch that studies language usage in social contexts and how meanings can be produced and understood through language.

2.2. Cooperative principle

According to Grice (1975), the contribution is required in the process of exchanging information in order to achieve effective communication. Grice (1975) created this guideline, that he called cooperative principle. Grice (1975) believes the speaker-hearer must contribute to the engaged conversation to achieve effective communication. In the cooperative principle, there are four sub-principles. The cooperative principle is including maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner.

Every maxim has the same purpose but different things to govern. According to Grice (1975), when one tries to give as much information as one possibly can and is needed without overdoing it, this phenomenon is called maxim of quantity. Unlike maxim of quantity, maxim of quality is more focus on telling no false information without supported by firm evidence and only tries to be truthful (Grice, 1975). Like the name, maxim of relation focus on telling only things that pertain to the discussion and tries to be as relevant as possible in the discussion (Grice, 1975). And the last, Grice (1975) stated that maxim of manner is where the ones try

to avoid ambiguity or obscurity by being as clear, brief, and orderly in what the one says as one possibly can. These maxims may affect each other especially the maxim of manner.

2.3. Conversational implicature

In a conversation, a sentence may or may not have more than one meaning. To be able to identify the meaning of the sentences, one has to know the knowledge of the utterance circumstances (context). According to Grice (1975), a maxim may intentionally be flouted by the speaker with the intention to create conversational implicature. Paltridge (2006) adds, conversational implicature refers to inference made by the hearer towards what has been said by the speaker regarding the speaker's intention.

2.4. Speech acts

In the process of delivering or expressing feelings, ideas, intention, and knowledge, utterances can have different functions. These functions can include informing, requesting, promising, apologizing, christening, etc. According to Austin and Searle in Paltridge (2006), speech acts is performing acts through language/ words. Searle (1976) classified speech acts into five. These acts include representatives/ assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

Searle (1976) believes that the purpose of representatives/ assertives is to commit the speaker to what one believes is the truth. Those included in the representative/ assertives class are judged by the dimension of assessment (i.e. true and false) expressed by the speaker. In the different class, an utterance is directives when there is an attempt by the speaker to get the hearer to do something (Searle, 1976). Searle (1976) also mentioned some common

verbs that are included in this class which are ask, order, command, request, etc. The purpose of the third class, commissives is to commit speaker to some future actions (Searle, 1976). According to Searle (1976), the point of expressives is to express psychological state. Common verbs that included in this class are thank, congratulate, apologize, condole, deplore, and welcome. And the last class, declarations. the point of this class is the successful performance of an act or in other words to change the state of affairs. It portrayed in one of the examples given by Searle (1976), which is "if I successfully perform the act of appointing you chairman, then you are chairman".

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Research design

Sugiyono (2012) defines the types of research into two; they are quantitative research and qualitative research. Quantitative research based on the quantity measurement or amount. In the other hand, the type of this research is qualitative research because the conversations observed are in the form of words and are not focus on numbers. With this method, the researcher can only observe and take notes of the events in order to analyze the object. Here, the researcher acts as the tool by having knowledge of the data (object and theory), process analysis, and data collection.

3.2. Object of the research

In this research, the object of the research is conversational implicature and speech acts. In order to support the analysis process, the researcher used some theories by experts. The objects of the research were used to find the data of the research in the data source. The data source is an American TV sitcom called "F.R.I.E.N.D.S.". The TV show

has 10 seasons in total. The data were ten utterances found in the first season of the TV show that contain conversational implicature.

3.3. Method of collecting data

According to Sudaryanto (2015) there are two ways to collect data, which are *metode simak* (observation method) and *metode cakap* (interview method). In this research, the researcher used the observation method as qualitative research indicates, as this research observes conversations contain conversational implicature in a TV show called "F.R.I.E.N.D.S.". The researcher also used *teknik catat* (note-taking technique) by Sudaryanto (2015) as the researcher take notes of the conversational implicatures found in the TV show.

3.4. Method of data analysis

The data were first collected by using the observation method and will be analyzed by using the pragmatic identity method. According to Sudaryanto (2015), the pragmatic identity method is used to identify a response or reaction that occurred after a certain utterance was said by the speaker. In the pragmatic identity method, the researcher used the pragmatic competence in-dividing technique to analyze the data.

3.5. Method of Presenting Research

Result

According to Sudaryanto (2015) there are two methods of presenting the data, which are Informal and formal presentation method. The informal presentation method is a presentation of data analysis used words, phrases and sentences. On the other hand, the formal presentation method is a presentation of data analysis that used symbols, numbers, and table. In presenting the research result, the researcher only uses the informal presentation method. The researcher uses words, phrases, and

sentences to explain, classify and present the analysis result.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the first season of "F.R.I.E.N.D.S.", the researcher found ten utterances that are conversational implicature. Which are:

Data 1

S1:E3 18:42 – 18:50 "The One with the Thumb"

Phoebe was having something in her mind and can't focus. She had been holding the Pop-Tart for quite some time. Ross just finished his Pop-Tart and notice Phoebe's gesture. So, he asked politely.

Ross : Hey, Pheebs. *You gonna have the rest of that Pop-Tart?*

In the utterance above, Ross indeed asking to make sure if Phoebe will finish her Pop-Tart. But he intends to ask Phoebe if he can have her Pop-Tart because Phoebe didn't seem like she will eat her Pop-Tart. But he said it politely. Ross flouted maxim of quantity because he didn't give enough information about his intention. Which is make it an intention that didn't say explicitly or conversational implicature. Because the function of this conversational implicature is to request, then it is categorized as directives. As Ross requested to have Phoebe's Pop-Tart politely.

Data 2

S1:E4 03:10 – 03:22 "The One with George Stephanopoulos"

Joey and Chandler have an extra hockey ticket and asked Ross to join them. But It reminds Ross of something important in his life. Something happened on October twentieth that Ross can't forget. Something important but bitter. He groaned. Out of confusion, Joey asked about what happened on October twentieth. Before

Ross can even answer, Chandler made a sarcastic guess.

Chandler : *Eleven days before Halloween, all the good costumes are gone?*

In the utterance above, Chandler doesn't know what Ross talking about. So, he sarcastically brings up a topic about Halloween costumes. He knows that there is no relevance between what have been talking about and Halloween. But he brought that topic up anyway. Here, He violated the maxim of relevance. He intends to let Ross know that he and Joey don't know what he is talking about and asking for an explanation. Because the function of the utterance is to request an explanation, it is categorized as directives.

Data 3

S1:E6 08:09 – 08:50 “The One with the Butt”

Rachel was doing something rare. She cleaned the whole apartment and asking for praises from her friends. Her roommate, Monica was the one who always does the cleaning. Monica is known as the clean freak in the friend group and she noticed that Rachel moved the green ottoman. She sarcastically confronted Rachel about it. Rachel said she thought it looked better besides the coffee table and could be used as an extra seat.

Monica : Yeah, it's-it's interesting. *But you know what? Just for fun. Let's see what it looked like in the old spot. Just to compare. Let's see... Ha. Well, it looks good there too. Let's just leave it there for a while.*

Monica expressed her discomfort with Rachel moving her furniture around. She said it that way just so Rachel wouldn't get offended. Because Rachel has been trying hard to clean their apartment but she also doesn't like unorganized things. Rachel

is still new to the friend group, so she doesn't know that while everyone else in the room knows. Monica flouted the maxim of quality. When she said "just for fun", she didn't mean it. She intended from the start to move the green ottoman back to its place. This whole situation portrays Monica's discomfort/complaint which refers to expressing the psychological state, Expressives.

Data 4

S1:E8 00:00 – 00:50 “The One Where Nana Dies Twice”

Chandler's coworker, Shelly walked in on Chandler eating cup noodles at the pantry. Shelly asked Chandler if he's seeing anybody. She wanted to set Chandler on a date with a guy that she believes is funny and cute. Chandler is speechless. He makes sure that the date Shelly wanted to set him up with is a guy.

Shelly : Oh, God. I just...I thought... you're not, so. Good, Shelly. Okay.

I'm just gonna go flush myself down the toilet now.

Okay. Bye-bye.

Shelly assumed that Chandler is gay. Which she later realizes that he is not. She is embarrassed and sorry for assuming that way which makes her said: "I'm just gonna go flush myself down the toilet now". She violated the maxim of quality. Of course, she doesn't really mean that. She isn't going to flush herself down to the toilet, she just shows that she is sorry but too shy to say that. This kind of utterance is categorized as expressive. The utterance shows that she is embarrassed and sorry.

Data 5

S1:E9 02:48 – 03:00 “The One Where Underdog Gets Away”

Joey walked into the coffee shop he always meets with his best friends

with makeup on. They greeted each other as Joey walked in. His friends are shocked. Because they never saw him wear makeup.

Chandler : *And this from the cry-for-help department, are you wearing make-up?*

We all know that there is no department called the cry-for-help department. So, Chandler violated the maxim of quality just to give a boost to his next utterance, which is "are you wearing make-up?" Chandler can see clearly that Joey is wearing makeup, he asked the question not to make sure but to emphasize to Joey that he looks terrible. Here, he criticizes which means he believes his beliefs to be true and he indicates/ points out the fault. This utterance is included in to the representatives/ assertives class.

Data 6

S1:E9 04:29 – 04:40 “The One Where Underdog Gets Away”

The friend group was talking about the thanksgiving plan they're going to have when Ross got to go to his ex-wife, Carol's apartment. Phoebe suggested that they should invite Carol to their thanksgiving. Out of annoyance, Ross answered her question sarcastically.

Ross : *Ooh, Ooh because she's my ex-wife and will probably want to bring her ooh, ooh lesbian life partner.*

Ross said the utterance in a way to emphasize the certainty. Because everyone in the friend group knows that Ross struggling with his relationship with his ex-wife, her girlfriend, and his unborn baby. He said it sarcastically that he wants them to be at their friend group's thanksgiving when he actually doesn't. We can see that he violated the maxim of quality by lying. The utterance is a refusal saying that he will not invite his ex-wife and her girlfriend

to thanksgiving. This included in commissives because the purpose of commissives is to commit the speaker to some future actions. (Searle, 1976)

Data 7

S1:E10 07:21 – 07:40 “The One with the Monkey”

Joey was late to meet up with his friends at Monica and Rachel's apartment. He just finished his part-time as a Santa Claus's worker elf. He walked into the apartment in his elf costume with his elf shoes jingling. Everyone chuckled. Chandler can't hold himself to not make fun of Joey.

Chandler : *Too many jokes. Must mock Joey.*

The utterance above is violating the maxim of quantity. Chandler doesn't give enough information and let alone without the basic knowledge about the context/ situation, we will not able to understand what has been said by Chandler at that moment. But what really happen is Chandler thinks Joey is very funny with his costumes on and he really want to make fun of him. The utterance shows Chandler criticize Joey's look which makes it categorized as representatives.

Data 8

S1:E11 13:29 – 14:25 “The One with Mrs. Bing”

Joey forced Ross to confess that he kissed their best friend's mom. Not knowing what to expect, Ross confessed and Chandler flipped out. Ross tried to explain the situation and accidentally drag Joey into the fight. The anger escalated as he knows that Joey knows but didn't tell him even though they spent the entire day together. As Ross and Joey kept trying to explain themselves, Chandler expressed his disappointment to his best friends and walked out of his apartment.

Chandler : *Let me slam the door!*
slam the door behind him

Chandler violating the maxim of relevance. In the middle of the chaos, he says "let me slam the door". He doesn't mean to ask permission to allow himself to slam the door but it's a way to tell Ross and Joey that he is furious and they should not hold him back. The function of this utterance is to command his two friends to not hold him back, which makes it included in directives class.

Data 9

S1:E15 03:00 – 03:45 “The One with the Stoned Guy”

Chandler just quit his job and was looking for a new job. Phoebe's massage client, Steve was opening up a restaurant and he's looking for a head chef. Phoebe wants to know what Chandler thinks about the job opportunity. Monica would love to know about the details of the job vacancy because Monica is a chef all along and Chandler is not. But Phoebe insisted to offer Chandler the job because he needs it.

Chandler : Yeah, *I just don't have a lot of cheffing experience. Unless it's an all-toast restaurant.*

Monica asked Phoebe about the details of the job. Phoebe and Monica got all excited. But Phoebe didn't understand what Chandler said, so she asked for Chandler's opinion once again. Chandler then refused her by saying that he doesn't really see himself in a big white hat.

Phoebe was being nice to offer a job to Chandler. But it was not Chandler's specialty or job of choice. Chandler's utterance violates the maxim of quantity and maxim of manner. Chandler didn't give enough information that causes the emergence of ambiguity. Phoebe still expecting an answer from Chandler after hearing the utterance by Chandler. Chandler could have answer directly but he chose not

to. The conversational implicature acts as a refusal. He refuses the offer that gave to him by Phoebe. Therefore, this utterance included in commissives class.

Data 10

S1:E5 15:39 – 16:10 “The One with the East German Laundry Detergent”

Chandler always hates the moment when he has to break up with someone. He hates the awkwardness. Phoebe offered that she will break up with her boyfriend at the same time to make Chandler feels easier. They called to meet their partner at the coffee shop. When Chandler's girlfriend walked in, he got nervous. He was struggling. But Phoebe's break-up process is done within a second before his eyes. He was trying to encourage himself with a couple of espressos and planned to finish it quickly.

Chandler : Janice. Hi, Janice.
Okay, here we go.
I don't think we should go out anymore.

Chandler violated the maxim of quality as he doesn't mean what he said. He doesn't really mean that they cannot hang out anymore. What he means is he wants to break up with her girlfriend at that time, Janice. Along with the utterance said by Chandler, there is a change in the state of affairs. They started the conversation as boyfriend and girlfriend, and end up being exes. This utterance is included in the declarations.

5. CONCLUSION

The researcher collected ten data that contain conversational implicature. After the data was collected, the data were analyzed and categorized based on their function. The categorization using speech acts theory by Searle (1976). According Searle (1976) there are five kinds of speech acts, which are

representatives/ assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

Out of ten data, there are two data categorized as representatives/assertives. There are three data categorized as directives. There are two data categorized as commissives. There are two data categorized as expressives. And there is only one data categorized as declarations. Directives is the kind of speech acts that emerge the most.

REFERENCES

- Afriana, Mandala, Robby Satria. (2018). Kesantunan Berbahasa Pada Pembelajaran Mahasiswa Universitas Putera Batam. *Jurnal Basis*, [S.L.], V. 5, N. 2, P. 43-52, Nov. 2018. Issn 2527-8835. Available At: <http://Ejournal.Upbatam.Ac.Id/Index.Php/Basis/Article/View/777>
- Ameliza, Thessa Cynthi, Ambalegin, Ambalegin. (2020). Code Switching Analysis In English Literature Whatsapp Group. *Jurnal BASIS*, [S.L.], V. 7, N. 1, P. 141-150, Apr. 2020. Issn 2527-8835. Available At: <Http://Ejournal.Upbatam.Ac.Id/Index.Php/Basis/Article/View/1837> Date Accessed: 20 Apr. 2021. Doi: <Https://Doi.Org/10.33884/Basisup.b.V7i1.1837>.
- Asror, A. G. (2019). *Analysis of speech acts and implicature in the political advertising of candidates legislative members Bojonegoro district 2019*. 347–351.
- Birner, B. J. (2012). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons.
- Davis, K., & Newstrom, J. W. (1981). *Human Behavior at Work: Organizational Behavior*. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Studies in Syntax and Semantic III: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Continuum.
- Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166848>.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Darma University Press.
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suryani, Melly Siska. (2016) Strategi Permintaan Dalam Bahasa Minangkabau: Tinjauan Dari Perspektif Jender. *Jurnal Basis*, [S.L.], V. 3, N. 1, P. 64-75, Apr. 2016. Issn 2527-8835. Available At: <http://ejournal.upbatam.ac.id/index.php/basis/article/view/493>

