CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Giving information or messages to others through language is a form of communication. A speaker uses a language to exchange information with hearers such as ideas, feelings, and desires. Language has an important role in human life because they always use it in their activities. Therefore, language should be conveyed as clear as possible to make the information easy to understand by hearers. However, there are differences between what a speaker conveys and the literal meaning of the sentences. The speaker tends to express their intention using indirect sentences. For example, when a speaker says, "*There's one piece of pizza left*" (Birner, 2013, p. 1). The speaker's utterance does not only provide information that there is still a slice of pizza left, but also offering a slice of pizza to the hearer. The speaker implies his/her intention without outright asking the hearer. Therefore, the differences between the meaning of a sentence and the speaker's meaning can lead to confusion and misinterpretation. One of the factors that can cause misinterpretation is implied meaning.

Implied meaning is a way of conveying information implicitly or indirectly. It can be found in formal places such as in a courtroom. Courtroom is a formal meeting with the purpose to resolve a problem. To resolve a problem, it requires communication between the judge and the accused. Then, conversations between the judge and the accused sometimes contain implied intention in their utterances

1

to achieve certain goals. This phenomenon can be seen in the case Mr. Bronston as the accused of fiscal evasion:

> Judge   : *"Do you have any bank accounts in Swiss bank, Mr. Bronston?"*
> Bronston : *"No, sir."*
> Judge   : *"**Have you ever?**"*
> Bronston : *"The Company had an account there for about six months, in Zurich."*
>
> <div align="right">(Zufferey et al, 2019, p. 77)</div>

By looking at the context, the conversation above occurs between the judge and the accused (Mr. Bronston) in a court. Mr. Bronston is the accused of fiscal evasion. The judge asked him a direct question with a general meaning. The judge wants to confirm whether the accused had bank accounts in Swiss banks or not. The accused can understand the judge's intention. Then, he answered straightforwardly that he did not have any bank accounts in Swiss.

Furthermore, the second question *"Have you ever?"* had the same meaning as the previous one. However, the structure of the sentence was different. This question was categorized as an implied meaning. The judge and the accused required special context in order to understand the meaning of the utterance. In this utterance, the judge was trying to trick the accused into confessing his accusation. Indirectly, the accused answered that he had an account in Zurich through his company. This meant that the accused admitted that he had fiscal evasion in Swiss. In this case, the function of implied meaning was to tell the truth/confess the accusation.

Based on the explanation above, an understanding of implied meaning in the courtroom is needed in order to achieve the purpose of communication between the judge and the accused. Implied meaning in the courtroom can be found in a

show called "Caught in Providence". It is one of the most popular TV Shows in America that records people with the real cases and real process in the court. The judge in this TV show is named Judge Frank Caprio who serves traffic violations cases, parking tickets, and misdemeanor in municipal Court of Providence, Rhode Island, United States of America. This TV shows can be seen on YouTube and Facebook channel. The number of followers on the "Caught in Providence" Facebook page is about 16 million and 2,37 million subscribers on YouTube channel. The number of followers and subscribers of the videos indicates that many people watched and accessed the videos. Thus, the number of viewers also indicates that the implied meaning between the judge and the accused can be understood by people.

Then, "Caught in Providence" is chosen as the object of this research. This research aims to improve comprehension of the implied meaning of the accused and the judge in the trial process. Moreover, this research becomes the reason for expanding the knowledge about implied meaning in the courtroom. Thus, the aim of this research is to find out the types and the functions of the implicature in "Caught in Providence" TV Shows.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

1.2.1 Pragmatics

Implicature is a linguistic phenomenon which is described and investigated academically in Pragmatics. Pragmatics is the study that concerns how the use of "context in language" (Birner, 2013, pp. 2). The use of context in language means how the speaker arranges sentences. Then, the hearer interprets the meaning of

utterances based on the particular context. In order to know how context contributes to the utterance meaning, it requires the speaker's consideration to organize his/her intention. The speaker must have the consideration about the situation of conversation such as "who does the conversation, where is the conversation take place, and under what circumstance the conversation happens" (Yule, 1996, pp. 3). The following utterance, *"I'm cold."* (Birner, 2013, p. 24) was expressed in one utterance but it has more than one meaning. The meaning depends on the context and the way a hearer interprets the utterance. If the utterance above is uttered by a teacher in the classroom, the meaning might be:

a. Close the window.

b. Bring me a jacket.

c. Turn off the fan.

d. The heater is broken again.

f. I'm sick.

The utterance above was conveyed by a teacher to students in a room which has the air conditioner. The utterance "*I'm cold"* means as a hint to the students. It means that the teacher wants the students to turn off the air conditioner. In this case, the speaker realizes that the hearer is nearby from the air conditioner remote. The hearer can understand what the speaker wants because they have the same background knowledge about the situation of conversation. Therefore, when the speaker conveyed the utterance *"I'm cold"*, the hearer already knew the speaker's intention.

From the illustration above, it can be seen that Pragmatics has the function to describe the real meaning or real message in an utterance. Furthermore, Pragmatics concentrates on the implied meaning aspect which cannot separate from the presence of the context. The implied meanings in pragmatics are described and investigated utterances academically in implicature phenomenon.

1.2.2 Implicature

Implicature is a phenomenon of pragmatics which considers "the additional meaning" of an utterance (Yule, 1996, pp. 35). The additional meaning occurs because the utterance meaning is different to the sentence meaning. In other words, the information that is conveyed has a different meaning from what the speaker actually said. Horn & Ward (2006) argue that implicature is "a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said" (p. 3). It means that speakers express their intention indirectly stated in their utterance. The speaker tends to convey something implicitly or indirectly in their conversation.

There are two types of implicature proposed by Grice (1975). They are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. This research will only concentrate on the conversational implicature, which examines implied meaning in a conversation. The detailed descriptions of the types of implicature will be given in the following sections.

1.2.2.1 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is a type of implicature which helps the hearer to define the additional meaning not based on "the cooperative principle and the

conversational maxims" (Potts, 2005, pp. 9). The additional meaning in conventional implicature can get directly from the meaning of the words used in an utterance. They do not require specific context to interpret the meaning of the utterance. Moreover, conventional implicature has conventional meaning. Conventional implicature can be seen by paying attention to some particular words such as and, therefore, but, and many others. As illustrated in an utterance:

*"If I say (smugly), "**He is an Englishman, he is therefore brave**."*

(Grice, 1989, p. 25)

Based on the utterance above, it can be seen that utterance meaning is related to the meaning of the word used. The hearer must have access to the lexical meaning which is triggered by the word. The additional meaning in this utterance is found in the word 'therefore'. It indicates that the consequence of being brave is that he is an Englishman.

1.2.2.2 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is an additional meaning that exists in a conversation as a "result of interacting mutual knowledge" about what is being talked about (Grundy, 2000, pp. 80). Speakers and hearers have the same perception about the context of conversation. Therefore, the additional meaning can only be understood by people who belong in the conversation. Then, conversational implicature can occur because speakers and listeners follow or not the conversational principles and maxims. An example is given the following conversation:

A: "Can you tell me the time?"
*B: "**Well, the milkman has come**."*

6

Based the on example above, B's reply means that he/she does not know exactly what time it is. B's respond is categorized as a conversational implicature. In this case, the implicature is triggered by B's answer. The answer is irrelevant to A's question. However, in fact B tries to help A with giving information as much as he/she can. The speaker gives a hint to the hearer, even though he/she does not know the exact time at that moment. The hint is obtained because the speaker and hearer have the same knowledge about milkman. Therefore, they can conclude the time of the present moment in the conversation.

Furthermore, conversational implicature can be divided into two types. They are:

1.2.2.2.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized conversational implicature is a conversational implicature type which occurs without considering the "specific context" in which they occur (Yule, 1996, p. 40). It means that the implied meaning can be easily gotten without exploring the utterance context. The hearer can draw inferences about the implied meaning of the utterance based on "certain lexical items" in order to determine what the speaker intended to say (Zufferey et al, 2019, pp. 145). In the following example:

> John: "How did yesterday's guest lecture go?"
> Mary: "**Some of the faculty left before it ended**."

Mary's reply is categorized into generalized conversational implicature. The additional meaning of conversation above is triggered by the use of the word

7

'some'. The hearer can understand the additional meaning without requiring any particular context or special knowledge about the context. Furthermore, the word 'some' indicates a term for expressing quantity which is not the entire faculty left before the lecture ended.

1.2.2.2.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature, as opposed to generalized conversational implicature, occurs when the speaker fails to follow the conversational maxim. The speaker intentionally flouts the conversational maxims because there are certain things to achieve. Therefore, to understand the meaning of the speaker, the hearer must have special background knowledge about "particular context" of conversation (Thomas, 1995, pp. 58). In the following example:

> A: *"Am I in time for supper?"*
>
> B: *"**I've cleared the table**."*

<div align="right">(Curse, 2000, p. 349)</div>

By looking at the context of conversation, A is a husband who promises to his wife for supper together. However, A was late for home and missed supper. B's answer is irrelevant to A's question. B should answer simply 'no' instead of answer indirectly. B's answer indicates that A is late for supper. There are implied meanings behind B's utterance. In order to investigate B's intention, A must have mutual knowledge about a certain context in the conversation. In this case, B's answer did not only explain that A is late for supper. B's answer indirectly means that she is disappointed because A does not keep his word. Thus, the wife's

utterance can be understood within a specific context. Therefore, her response is indicated as particularized conversational implicature.

1.2.3 Context

Pragmatics is a study that cannot be separated from context. Context helps the hearer to determine "the meaning" in an utterance (Grundy, 2000, pp. 10). In a conversation, context refers to background details that the speaker and the hearer give about the situation and condition. Context is very close to the implicature. It can be helpful to the hearer in determining the implied meaning of the speaker's utterance. The following utterance, "*This tea is really cold*!" (Yule, 1996, p. 48) will have a different meaning in different contexts. If the speaker utters this utterance in the winter season, the speaker might want a cup of hot tea. As a result of that, the speaker can feel unhappy. Meanwhile if the speaker utters this utterance in summer or on a hot day, the speaker might feel hot and there is someone who gives her/him a cup of cold tea. Then, the speaker can feel happy because of that.

1.2.4 Language Functions in Courtrooms

The Court of law is a place where the interaction among judges, jurors, accused, prosecutors, lawyers, and witnesses. The interaction in the courtroom is organized as question and answer. Questions are usually asked by a judge, prosecutor, and lawyer. Meanwhile the person who answers the questions is usually witnesses and accused. The judge, the prosecutor and the lawyer tend to ask questions that have an implied meaning and vice versa. The accused and the witness are answered the judge's, prosecutor's and lawyer's questions in an implied way too.

According to Shuy (1993), there are seven language functions in courtrooms. The following functions of language used in court are:

1.2.4.1 Offering Bribe

Bribe is the act of "giving or offering money" to someone for doing something dishonest (Shuy, 1993, pp. 20). People bribe to achieve certain purposes instantly. Bribery can be done by people directly or indirectly. For example, in an utterance:

"I offer you $5,000."

(Shuy, 1993, p. 20)

The utterance above is an example of bribing directly. The hearer immediately understands that the utterance above is a bribe. Bribery can directly insult the receiver and the giver. In order to avoid insults, people tend to bribe indirectly. In the following utterance:

"I'd really like to help you with your problem"

(Shuy, 1993, p. 20)

The utterance above is not like a bribe. The speaker bribes indirectly to avoid insulting. If the hearer understands the context, the hearer can get the meaning about the utterance above.

1.2.4.2 Agreeing

Agreement is the act to accept a statement. This act aims to express an agreement on something. An agreement occurs when someone asks an opinion to the hearer. There are five responses to express an agreement such as "*Yes, indeed, Yes, Yep, Yeah,* and *Uh-huh*" (Shuy, 1993, p. 67). Furthermore, the accused often

uses the response of agreement in a courtroom. The accused unconsciously gives a brief answer to the judge's questions, however it can tell the truth. For example:

> *Agent   : "You see, these plans are very hard to get."*
> *Engineer :**"Uh-huh."***
> *Agent   : "Fd need to get them at night."*
> *Engineer : "Uh-huh."*
> *Agent   : "It's not done easily."*
> *Engineer : "Uh-huh."*
> *Agent   : "Understand?"*
> *Engineer : "Uh-huh."*

(Shuy, 1993, p. 8)

The conversation occurs between an agent disguised as the representative of an American company and an industrial engineer from Japan. Japanese industrial engineers buy the product's internal secrets from an American company illegally. From the conversation above, the engineer is answered all the agent's questions with the response 'uh-huh. The answer 'uh-huh' can be categorized as an agreement. It depends on how the hearer interprets the meaning based on the context of the conversation.

1.2.4.3 Threatening

Threat is the act of scaring or intimidating someone by "enforce someone to do something unpleasant" (Shuy, 1993, pp. 97). Threats can be spoken directly or indirectly. For example:

"I'm gonna kill you if you don't do this."

(Shuy, 1993, p. 110)

The hearer clearly understands that the utterance above is a form of direct threatening. The threat frightens the hearer. Meanwhile, the utterance such as, "*Someday you're going to find yourself in the hospital*" (Shuy, 1993, p. 110) is a

form of indirect threat to the hearer. Furthermore, in order to know whether the utterance is a threat or not, the hearer must understand the context in which the utterance is conveyed.

1.2.4.4 Admitting

Admission is recognized as the act to tell the truth. Admission is a difficult thing to say honestly by people. As an illustration, a student is late to class. Then, the teacher asks the student why she/he is late. The student replies:

"My alarm clock didn't go off"

(Shuy, 1993, p. 118)

In this case, the student gives the reason for why she/he is late. Actually, the teacher wants to hear the student's admission that she/he is wrong for coming late.

1.2.4.5 Telling the Truth / Confessing

Telling the truth or confessing aims to make the accused tell or admit that he/she has done something wrong. In order to find the truth, the attorney asks the witness to give evidence in court. The attorney gives some tricky questions to the witness in order to determine whether he/she is telling the truth or not. In this case, the attorney or the judge uses a consistency method to find the truth of the accused's utterances. The consistency method is used by the judge or the attorney to ask the "same things with different times and different ways of delivery" (Shuy, 1993, pp. 137). If it is known that what the witness or the accused said is not true, he/she will be charged with perjury or lie while testifying.

1.2.4.6 Promising

Promise is a condition where the speaker says something for the "hearer's benefit" (Shuy, 1993, pp. 97). Promise is not only words but also an act to do something. For example, when the speaker said, "*I promise to give you $50.*" (Shuy, 1993, p. 197). The utterance includes a promise. The promise will come true if the speaker also does something.

1.2.4.7 Denying

Denial is the act of refusing or rejecting to admit a fact. Denial aims to defend oneself from charges in a court. The accused does denial to avoid punishment for his/her actions. For example:

Judge   **:** *"I see the cops say you were pickled last night and were driving an old jalopy down the middle of the road. True?"*

Accused **:** **"Your Honour, if I might be permitted to address this allegation, I should like to report that I was neither inebriated nor indeed was I under the influence of an alcoholic beverage of any kind."**

(Holmes, 2013, p. 250)

The conversation above occurs between the judge and the accused. The accused denies the accusation given by the cop. The accused tries to deny that he was not drunk.

1.3 Review of Previous Studies

In relation to this research, there are four previous studies related to the topic. The first research is a journal article written by Marat Sardimgaliev (2019) entitled *Implicature in Judical Opinions*. This journal article discussed about the implicature in judicial opinions. It is kind of legal discourse. Moreover, this journal article discussed about the extent people should be skeptical about implicature in judicial opinions of legal discourse. The data were analyzed based on the theory of

implicature proposed by Grice (1989). The result of this research showed that the evidence-based approach makes skeptical views doubtful. Moreover, pursuing communication cooperation in judical opinions was suggested in this research.

In this research, the researcher used valid data. Reliable examples of implicatures in judicial opinion were taken. In addition, the weaknesses of his research were mentioned. Then, suggestions were given for the next research. Unfortunately, a limited sample was provided. This research was limited to the U.S. Supreme Court. Moreover, the research did not describe in detail about the skeptical belief that implicature rarely occur in legal discourse.

The second research is a journal article conducted by Ahmed Sahib Mubarak and Hawraa Jabber Rahi (2021) entitled *Pragmatic Tactics in Traffic Trials*. This research identified the pragmatic tactics utilized in the context of traffic trials. Twenty traffic trials from the court as seen in "Caught in Providence" TV show were taken as the data. According to the findings of this research, there were six pragmatic tactics in the traffic trials such as felicitousness, effectiveness, maximum efficiency, appropriateness, avoidance of impositions, and maximal options for deniability.

In this research, the researchers made clear explanations for the results of their analysis in this paper. They also used some theories in doing the analysis, such as the theory of context and politeness theory. However, those theories were not clearly explained in the paper. As a result, it was difficult to get the point while reading it. Furthermore, the researchers did not mention the characteristics of

choosing the data for the research. Then, they did not give any suggestions for further research.

The third research is a journal article entitled *Politeness Strategies in the Criminal Trial* by Norizah Ardi, Amirah Ahmad, Mazlina Mohamad Mangsor, and Mazlifah Mansoor (2021). Based on an excerpt from the summary of a chosen case, this study examined politeness tactics used during cross-examination in court proceedings. This research used theory proposed by Brown and Levinson about politeness (1978, 1987) and theory about illocutionary functions proposed by Leech (1983) to identify the language usage during the cross-examination. This study used qualitative content analysis. It is based on the context of the trial presented. The result of this study showed the importance of politeness strategies in ensuring the fairness of judicial decisions. Therefore, there are two types of illocutionary in this research. They are competitive and conflictive.

Nevertheless, the data used in this journal article were taken from trial transcripts from selected case summaries. In doing research on politeness strategies, it would be better if the data were taken from the authentic resources. The data did not represent the population of the source. The categories of choosing the source of the data in the paper were not explained. In addition, the research conveyed the implied and inferred meaning of the utterance. Meanwhile, theories of implicatures in analyzing the implied meaning of the utterances were not found.

The fourth research is a journal article by Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen (2008) entitled *On the availability of 'literal' meaning: Evidence from courtroom interaction.* The purpose of this research was to identify distinctions between literal

and context-induced meaning in cross-examination of witnesses in a court. The researcher took the data from transcripts of criminal trials. According to the findings of this research, semantic transfers of the meaning of specific constituents of a given utterance necessarily happen without the awareness of language users, even those who are linguistically untrained.

In this research, a clear explanation was given. However, the use of 'I' as the pronouns was employed. Grice theory and context theory were mentioned in the paper, but the researcher did not explain these theories. In addition, the data of the research was biased because the researcher compared how the literal meaning was used by ordinary language users to those who are linguistically trained.

Moreover, more information in writing this study after reading four previous studies were gotten. Most of the previous studies did not pay attention to the types of conversational implicature. The language functions in courtrooms were being forgotten. Thus, the writer is interested in analyzing the use of implicature in courtroom as seen in Caught in Providence TV Show. The language functions and the types of conversational implicature in the utterances are the focus of this study. There are some researches with the same data. Nevertheless, the topic and theories used are different. This study contributes to the understanding of the use of implicature in American courtroom.

1.4 Research Questions

This research is designed to find out the use of implicature in Caught in Providence TV Shows. The research focuses on the following questions:

1. What are the types of conversational implicature used at American court of law seen in "Caught in Providence" TV Show?

2. What are the functions of conversational implicature used at American court of law seen in "Caught in Providence" TV Show?

1.5 Objective of the Study

Related to the research questions above, the aims of this research are:

1. To determine the types of conversational implicature used at American court of law as seen in "Caught in Providence" TV Show.

2. To identify the functions of conversational implicature used at American court of law as seen in "Caught in Providence" TV Show.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This research focuses on investigating the types and functions of implicature at American court of law as seen in "Caught in Providence" TV Shows. Furthermore, the basic of analysis is the implicature theory proposed by Grice (1975) to determine implicature types. Then, to classify and explain the functions of implicature, language functions in courtroom theory by Shuy (1993) will be used. The research is limited to the utterances contain the implicature in the courtroom. The data of this research obtain from corpus of CA transcription in Caught in Providence TV Shows. The data will be taken 20 videos randomly in individual case. Furthermore, this research limits the use of implicatures, the types of the conversational implicature, and the functions of language used in the courtroom.