# CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter the writer explains some theories which are related to this study about pragmatics, context, and focuses on cooperative principles theory and violating maxims.

### 2.1.1 Pragmatics

A successful communication is not only knowing the meaning of words in an utterance, but also knowing what speakers mean by their utterances. The study of what speaker mean is called pragmatics (Yule, 2010:127). Forrester (1996:54) states that pragmatics is an approach to the meaning. The speakers can talk about people's intended meaning, share their assumption, expectation, purposes or goals, and the kinds of actions (for example, request) when they try to communicate (Yule, 1996:4). In this case, by studying pragmatics, the hearer can understand what the speaker meant to make a good communication.

There are four areas that pragmatics concerned. The first, pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. The second area, pragmatics is the study of how gets communicated more than is said. The third, pragmatics is the study of expression of relative distance, and the fourth rule, pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning (Yule, 1996:3). In other word, pragmatics dealing with two things, language and its

context. It interprets what the speaker mean in context and how context influences

what is said. For example, in sentence It's very hot here comes to be interpreted as

Turn on the fan or open the window. Thus, this study is to help people to understand

what the speaker mean.

2.1.2 Context

Pragmatics deals with the meaning of words in context and assumptions of

knowledge that speaker and hearer share (Cutting, 2002:3). There are two kinds of

context. Those are linguistic context, situational context. Yule (2006:114) states that

linguistics context also known as *co-text*. Co-text has a strong effect on what we think

the word probably means. Such as the word fine, as a homonym, it is a single form

with more than one meaning. If the word *fine* is used with word *paying*, absolutely

we are easy deciding which type of *fine* is a punishment which involve money to

redeem. However, if someone says that she looks fine today, we will know from

linguistic context which explain about feeling.

Situational context happened when speakers know about what they can see

around them. Cutting (2000:4) defines that the situational context is the immediate

physical co-presence, the situational where the interaction is taking place at the

moment of speaking. In this case, demonstrative pronouns like "that", "it", or "this",

etc are used for pointing to something or an entity that the speaker and hearer can see.

For example: (this time from the house)

Mother: what is that?

Son

: that is a bird.

The situational context is in the house and presumably the mother and her son

pointing to either the animal or picture. The word "that" refers to the picture of a bird.

2.1.3 Cooperative Principles

An underlying assumption in most conversational exchanges seems

participants are cooperating with each other. Grice in Paltridge (2007:61) argues that

to a person ca interpret what someone else says, some kinds of cooperative principles

must be assumed to be in operation. The cooperative principles are stated by Grice in

the following terms: Make your conversational contribution such as is required

which it occurs, by the accepted purpose of the talk exchange in which you are

engaged (Yule, 1996:37). Cooperative principles are set of rules to describe how

speaker and hearer cooperate in their conversation. The function of cooperative

principles is to make the speaker and the hearer understand each other.

Speaker and hearer must obey cooperative principles in their communication

which is expected to make successful conversation. Grice based his cooperative

principles on four principles or maxims. These are maxims of quality, quantity,

relation, and manner (Grice, 2006:68):

1. Maxim of Quantity

This maxim indicates that speakers should give information to what the

needed of the hearer. They should give neither too little information nor too much.

Speakers must be to the point in what the hearer needs. If the speakers give too much

information, the hearer will be bored or disturbed. Speakers who give too little

information make hearers not being able to identify what they are talking about

because they are not clear enough. Specifically this maxim states: 1. Make your

contribution as informative as is required. 2. Do not make your contribution more

informative than is required.

For example:

Amira

: What are you looking for?

Nada

: I am looking for my mobile phone.

The example is happened when Nada is busy with her bag and Amira sees her.

It shows that Nada answers Amira's question by giving information as needed by

Amira. Nada's answer is not too much and also not too little. Her remark is precise to

quantity maxim.

2. Maxim of Quality

In this maxim, the conversation is expected to be seriously and speak the truth

or fact, the speakers say something that they believe matches to reality. They will not

say anything that they guess to be false or anything which they lack evidence.

Specifically this maxim states: 1. Do not say what you believe to be false. 2. Do not

say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

For example:

Anna : Is Surabaya in central Java?

Nino : No. but Surabaya is in east Java.

Here Anna gives the wrong statement to the Nino but, Nino gives the right

statement because in the fact that Surabaya is in east Java. So, Nino in this dialogue

obeys the maxim of quality.

3. Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation means the utterances must be relevance with topic to what

the speaker and hearer discussed. Speakers are assumed to be saying something that

is relevant to what has been said before (Cutting, 2002:35). Specifically this maxim

states: 1. Be relevant

For example:

Joe : Brian, I saw you in royal Plaza last night. What did you buy?

Brian: I bought clothe and shoes.

From the conversation, Brian's answer is relevance with Joe's question. Joe

sees Brian in royal Plaza and he wants to know what Brian buy and Brian gives the

answer which stays on the topic.

4. Maxim of Manner

This maxim indicates that people's utterances should be perspicuous. Be

perspicuous means the contribution should be easy to understand in conversation

exchange. The speakers must give clear contribution to the hearers. People are not

unambiguity in their conversation. They should not give excessively information.

And people should avoid excessively information. Specifically this maxim states: 1.

Avoid obscurity of expression. 2. Avoid ambiguity. 3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary

prolixity). 4. Be orderly.

For example:

*Al* : Where did you put my bag?

*El* : I put your bag on the table in your room.

From the dialogue, it can be known that El gives clear explanation to Al by saying the position where El put Al's Bag.

By applying cooperative principles, speaker and hearer should fulfill of maxims which proposed by Grice to make the conversation understood each other. But in reality, people usually break the rules in their conversation. They are called violate the maxims. The detail of violating maxims explanation will be discussed in the next subtitle.

# 2.1.4 Violating Maxims

In surrounding us, we will find many people do not fulfill or obey the maxims in their conversation. Sometimes, there are possibilities that they mislead the other person (Paltridge, 2007:65). It is called as violating maxims. Cutting (2002:40) says that speaker violates a maxim when he knows that the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the meaning of the words. Grice (1975) also takes place violating the maxims happened when speaker intentionally refrain to apply certain maxims in their conversation to achieve some other purposes (Sadehvandi, and

Khosravizadeh 2011: vol.26 page 122). The examples of violating the maxims are follows:

### 1. Violating the maxim of quantity

Violating maxim of quantity occurred when what the speaker want to say is not appropriate with the hearer's expect. It can be too short or much information. The speaker does not give enough information because he/she does not want the hearer know the full condition.

# **Example:**

(the setting: A (a guest) wants to be nicer and friendlier, he smiles to B (a receptionist) and says hello politely. A dog comes and stads beside him. Then A asks B)

A: does your dog bite?

B:No

A: (bends down to stroke it and gets bitten) Ow! You said your dog does not bite!

*B* : that is not my dog. (cutting, 2002:40)

B actually knows that A is talking about the dog which is beside B and B's dog at home, yet B intentionally does not give A enough information, for reasons best known to A herself.

#### 2. Violating the maxim of quality

Violating maxim of quality happened when people is not sincere. They do not give true information or denying the truth information.

# **Example:**

Mother: Did you study all day long?

Son who has been playing all day long: yes, I've been studying till know!

(IPEDR, 2011: volume 26 page 122)

The conversation above, the boy is not truthful and violates and violates the maxim of quality. He lies to avoid unpleasant consequences such as punishment or to be forced to study for the rest of the day.

# 3. Violating the maxim of relation

The violation of the Relation Maxim means that the utterance of the speaker is irrelevant to the context for some reasons. The conversation is not relevant to what has been said before.

# **Example:**

Tom: Tom is such a noisy man, isn't he?

Dick: I saw a fantastic movie yesterday.

(Zhou, 2009: volume 2 page 45)

This is a dialogue between two roomates; Dick's answer violates the maxim of relation. What can we know from Dick's answer? He did not want to talk about Tom's Topic.

### 4. Violating the maxim of manner

In this case, violating the maxim of the manner means the information is not clear. It is occurred when speakers give ambiguous language means there are some

interpretations of what the speaker said, the speaker exaggerates thing, and the speakers use slang in front of people who do not understand it.

## **Example:**

Sarah: did you enjoy the party last night?

Anna: there was plenty of oriental food on the table, lots of flowers all over the place, people hanging around chatting with each other.

(IPEDR, 2011: vol.26 page 123)

Sara asked a very simple question, however what she receives from Anna is a protracted description of what was going on in the party. Two interpretations can be made from Anna's description: 1. Anna had such a good time in the party that she is obviously too excited and has no idea where to begin. 2. Anna has such a terrible time and she does not know how to complain about it.

#### 2.1.5 Christoffersen's Classification

In reality, when people deliver a message, they often break Grice's cooperative principles. Sometimes, they lie when they communicate (Tupan and Natalia, 2008: volume 10 page 64). However, people tend to tell lie for some reasons. According to Christoffersen (2005), people believe that a lie is the natural tool to survive and to avoid them from anything that may put them in an inappropriate condition (Tupan and Natalia, 2008: volume 10 page 64). In this case, the condition has violated the maxims which people disobey Grice's maxims by not telling the truth condition. They have their own reasons why they not tell the truth condition.

Christoffersen (2005) (as cited in Tupan and Natalia, 2008: vol.10 P.64) says that in reality, people tend to tell lies for different reasons. The following reasons with the examples are:

### 1. Hiding the truth

This reason happened when a speaker have a privation. He/she covers information from someone and not allow someone to know it.

Example: (John covers his real age to his sister's friend whom he met at the party by telling her that they have the same age)

A: I am twenty years old, and how old are you?

B: exactly the same.

# 2. Saving face

It indicates that when people do something embarrassing in public, and they distract attention or say something to minimize the seriousness of what they did (Meyerhoff, 2006:84).

Example: (Ann covers herself for being shoplifter in front of people)

A: What is in your bag? I think our bracelet is in it

B: I – I do not know what you are talking about. I do not have any bracelet.

### 3. Feeling jealous about something

This reason happened where a speaker unhappy or angry because something that possible will be taken by other person.

Example: (Cindy lies to Jance that she doesn't know Jim, the new student.

Cindy actually likes him)

A: I know you talked to Jim, this morning. He is awesome. What do you think about him?

B: I don't know what you are talking about.

# 4. Satisfying the hearer

When speaker do manipulation to make the hearer feel pleased.

Example: (A conversation between a mother and her son)

A: Mom, how was I born?

B: Uhm... because God loves you so He sends you to me as a gift

# 5. Cheering the hearer

Cheering the hearer happened when a speaker describe something that encourages a hearer to make a hearer feel happier.

Example: (a wife asks her husband whether she looks OK with the purple blouse or not. Her husband who hates purple, cheers his wife by giving an answer that is expected by his wife)

A: Honey, does this color nice?

B: of course sweetheart, you look gorgeous.

# 6. Avoiding to hurt the hearer

It occurred when speaker give contribution to prevent something that make hearer hurt.

Example: (a mother of three years old boy wants to protect his son by telling that this father has gone overseas rather than saying that he died)

A: Mummy, where is Daddy?

B : Daddy has gone overseas because he wants to buy some toys for you.

### 7. Building one's belief

This reason meaning when a speaker increases something to make the hearer more believe.

Example: (Joan asks her boyfriend whether he still remembers his ex girlfriend or not. Her boyfriend lies to her and makes her believe 100%)

A: I wonder if you are still in love with your ex.

B: Of course not darling, you know you are the one in my heart. (fact: he is still in love with his ex)

A: But how come you still keep her photo in your wallet?

B: that is not her, she is my cousin who looks like her. (fact: that's his ex's photo).

### 8. Convincing the hearer

This reason is to make a hearer believe that something is true.

Example: (a part time clerk asks his friend to take his shift, but his friend refuses by creating a good reason)

A: can you take my shift tonight?

B: I wish I could, but I have to take my daughter to the dentist.

#### 2.2 Related Studies

In this section, the writer provides some researches that have been done before. The research dealing with violating the maxim. One of the researches dealing violating the maxim is written by Muzaim (2015). In his study, he talked about violating maxim in *vampire suck* movie. He focused on Becca's utterances as the main character which violates the maxims. Muzaim founds four types of violation of

maxims that uttered Becca and six types of reasons to violate the maxims. The types which found by Muzaim are hiding the truth, saving face, avoiding hurt the hearer, convincing the hearer, cheering the hearer, and satisfying the hearer.

The next research is written by Nisya (2008). In her study, she talked about cooperative principles in debate. The study showed that three of four maxims were violated in the three examined talk shows. There were maxims of quantity, relevance, and manner. Here the speakers deliver their opinions to defend their argument to win and the speaker was more liable to respond vaguely and verbosely to the question raised. So that's way the violation of maxims of quality was not found.

Moreover other researcher is written by Raharja (2015), he talk about cooperative principle violation in stand up comedy. He focused on the utterances of Dodit Mulyanto in stand up comedy Indonesia season 4. Raharja found all of the types of violating maxims in his data. The dominant of the violation in his data is maxim of relation.

Those previous researcher above have differences and similarities with this research. The similarity is in the theory. The differences are the data object. The previews researches object are humor movie, debate, and stand up comedy whereas the writer's object is a movie which combines the elements of family, romance, music, and comedy.