CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

4.1 Conclusion

This research is about the use of implicature at American court of law as seen in Caught in Providence TV shows. This research aims to determine the types and to identify the functions of Implicature in Caught in Providence TV shows. The result of the research shows that there are two types of implicature used in the conversations that occur in 20 cases in the Caught in Providence TV show as proposed by Grice in 1975. They are Generalized conversational implicature and Particularized conversational implicature. Furthermore, there are 47 utterances contains implicature found in the Caught in Providence TV shows. The most dominant implicature used in the courtroom is generalized conversational implicature. It appears 30 times (64%). Then, particularized conversational implicature appears 17 times (36%). It can be seen that participants in the Caught in Providence TV shows tends use generalized conversational implicature in their conversation. Generalized conversational implicature often used because participants in this show have different background knowledge. Therefore, implied meaning can be easily understood by the hearer without requiring specific context.

Moreover, the speakers produced six functions of implicature in the courtroom based on theory by Shuy (1993). They are denying, telling the truth/confessing, agreeing, admitting, threatening, and promising. Denying is the most function of implicature that can be found in this research. It appears eight times (17%) in both of types conversational implicature. It can be seen that

participants in courtroom especially the accused tends use denying. The reason is because the accused try reject the accusations indirectly. Therefore, denying is used reject a claim or accusation indirectly which can trigger unnecessary conflict in the trial process. In other word, it indicates that the speaker conveys defence or information indirectly to avoid direct confrontation when there is a possibility of refusal in the trial process. The second most functions in this research are telling the truth/confessing and admitting, both of them appear in the generalized conversational type seven times (15%). Following that, agreeing occurs five times (11%) in the generalized conversational type. Then, threatening occurs three times (6%) in the generalized conversational type. Furthermore, the functions telling the truth/confessing and admitting functions in the particularized conversational implicature type appear with the same number. They appear four times (8,5%). The last is promising function in the particularized conversational implicature type that appear only once (2%).

4.2 Limitation

The limitation of this research is using American court as the object of the research. Conversation in the courtroom tends to use implied meanings for certain purposes. As the result, the participants in the courtroom must have background knowledge regarding the context and situation of the conversation. In this research, the explanation about the context is only explained in general. Therefore, the theory of context can be explained more specifically using related theory. Moreover, the data in this research used the same data as Ardina Wardani's research but with a

different research topic. Therefore, this research only enriches the implicature of the same data as Wardani's research data.

4.3 Suggestion

This research is expected to enrich knowledge about the concept of conversational implicature that occurs in the trial process. Then, the researcher expects that further researchers can apply the conversational implicature theory to different objects. The researcher also expects the next researchers to be able to research implicatures by applying different theories such as the theory of relevance. Moreover, the researcher also expects to apply theory about context more specifically.