CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, the writer describes the discussion about the supporting theories and previous study to show the differences and similarities between this research and another research. It involves about Pragmatics, Context of Situation, Cooperative Principle, Violating Maxims, and Previous Study.

2.1.1 Pragmatics

Studying about language would be closely with two branches of language science, semantics and pragmatics. Both of that sciences concern at language but in different side. Semantics refers to the construction of meaning language, while pragmatics refers to meaning construction in specific interactional context. Kreidler (2002: 18) said that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that is concerned with meaning and people's ability to use language meaningfully. Pragmatics is the study of the language study of the usage of the language that is associated with the context of use. The meaning of that language can be understood when it is known the context. Pragmatic constraints are the rules regarding language usage of forms and meanings associated with the intent of the speaker, the context, and circumstances. According to Leech (1981:1), pragmatics is is the study of linguistics communication according to the principle of conversation. One principle is the sense of an expression violates the principle speaker. For some people learning about pragmatics is more challenging than

others science of linguistic. It is because in pragmatics we studies not only about languages but also learns about the external meaning of the sentence or utterance.

Grundy (2000: 3) said that pragmatics is about explaining how produce and understand the language which is used in communication everyday but apparently rather peculiar uses of language. Then, Yule (1996: 3) also states that pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning, the study of contextual meaning, the study of how more gets communicated than is said, and the study of the expression of relative distance (closeness in physical, social, or conceptual).

Yule describes pragmatics as a branch of linguistics that studies about the meaning desired by the speakers. That explanation leads to a pragmatic aspect of meaning, namely the intent to be delivered through the speakers of the existence of a context. This means pragmatics trying to describe a speech delivered by speakers. This means pragmatics trying to describe a speech delivered by the speaker by knowing the meaning of it. Based on the explanation above it can be concluded that the pragmatics is the study of language in its use and meaning generated by the sentence that can be known by looking at the existing context. Then we can know the meaning desired by the speaker to pay attention to the context of the enclosing the conversation.

2.1.2 Context

A context is part of a description or sentence that can support or add clarity to the meaning of a situation that has to do with the event. According to

Cutting (2002:3) in "pragmatics and Discourse", there are three sorts of context,

they are:

1. Situational Context

Situational context describes all of the events that happens when the

conversation is happening. Example:

Roland: what's on your mind about Rio Harianto?

Albert: hmm... Rio is an Indonesian Formula One driver for Manor.

He is Indonesia's first F1 driver in history. It's amazing.

From the conversation above, there are two boys named Roland and

Albert, they come to the circuit for watching The Australian Grand Prix. In the

conversation above they have watched that Rio was the second driver to be

eliminated from qualifying for the 2016 Bahrain Grand Prix, ahead of Felipe

Nasr.

2. Background knowledge context

Background knowledge context is when both of speaker and hearer

know what they are talking about, such as talking about the surrounding

environment or culture. There are two types of background knowledge

context, they are: cultural context and interpersonal context.

a. Cultural context

Cultural context is the knowledge or information about the life held

between the speaker and the listener are same. For example:

Helena: Are you forget about the incident last Friday night?

Fitria : I may not forget the terrible events. it is an event that does

not make sense but really happened.

From the examples above show that Helena and Fitria talking about

the events they experienced when they walk together. Helena asks the events

of last Friday night when they met with a strange figure like a ghost.

b. Interpersonal context

Interpersonal context is the knowledge about a person's personality

between the speaker and the listener are same. For example:

Helena: Simon is a diligent student in our class.

Fitria: yes, but he's arrogant and condescending to others. many

people who do not like to hang out with him.

From he examples above show that Helena and Fitria talking about

Simon. He was a classmate of Helena and Fitria. So they know how the nature

of Anton.

3. Co-textual context

Co-textual context is when the speaker and hearer understand each

other about what or who are they talking about. Example:

Andra : I went with Rian and Riska

Lia : Uhuh?

Andra : Rian's classmate, And Riska's family. There were six of us

to go Batu Night Spectacular

Lia : Uhm.

In the case above, pronoun 'us' refers to Rian's classmate and Riska's

family, the speaker assumes that the hearer know everyone mentioned in the

conversation, including 'us'.

2.1.3 Cooperative Principle

In carrying out its activity everyday human beings will always meet and interact with others. In interacting with others, humans use language as a medium of communication. In reasonable communication, each of the parties involved, between the speaker and the listener will always try to deliver the speech with effective and efficient. Paltridge (2008: 61) wrote the Grice (1975) argues that in order for a person to interpret what someone else says, some kind of cooperative principle must be assumed to be in operation. The cooperative principle is a principle of conversation that was proposed by Grice, stating that participants expect that each will make a "conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange".

In order for speech may be accepted by the opponent, spoken speech, speakers generally consider carefully various factors involved or may be involved in a process of communication. Grice argued that reasonable discourse can occur if between speakers and petutur dutifully on the principle of cooperation communication. Grice in his theory (2006:68) divides cooperative principle maxim on four sub-principle:

1. Maxim of Quality

The Maxim of Quality requires information provided in conversations to be genuine and justified. Maxim of quality is where one tries to be truthful, and does not give information that is false or that is not supported by evidence. The

maxim of quality principles, do not say what you believe to be false and do not

say that for which you lack adequate evidence. For example:

A: How many maxims of cooperation according to Grice?

B: According to Grice books that I read, there are four maxims in

the principles of cooperation.

A: what are they?

B: Maksim quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and

the maxim of the way (execution).

In the example above, (B) contributed the correct information, that

according to Grice books he read four maxims, that maxim of quantity, maxim

of quality, maxim of relevance, and the maxim of the way (execution).

2. Maxim of Quantity

The Maxim of Quantity relates to the amount of information provided in

conversations where one tries to be as informative as one possibly can, and gives

as much information as is needed, and no more. The maxim of quantity

principles, make your contribution as informative as required and do not make

your contribution more informative than is required. For example:

Teacher: "What is the capital city of Bali?"

Andy: "Surabaya, Sir"

Teacher: "Wrong. The capital city of Bali is Denpasar."

The maxim of quality also says that the speaker should not say something

that lacks adequate evidence or the speaker is not sure about something. The

speaker must give true information not false.

In conversational exchanges, it is assumed that people do not lie and give

factual information, and then we are able to detect falsehood.

3. Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation is where one tries to be relevant, and says things that are pertinent to the discussion. Coulthard (1985: 31) have described sub maxim of relation "Be relevant". Grice proposes this maxim as an explanation for a certain kind of regularity in conversational behavior with respect to the relevance of information provided at each turn of a conversation. Relevance is speakers' contributions should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange. The principle of maxim of relation is make your contributions relevant (Stephen C. Levinson, 1983:102). For example:

A: There is s<mark>om</mark>ebody at the door

B: I'm in the bath. (Joan Cutting, 2002:36)

When A tells B that there is someone who comes in the door of their home and expect B to open the door to the guest, then B says that she was in the shower at the time. Answer B implies that he expects A to understand where B is at that moment, so that B could not open the door and see who comes at the time. Thus, it can be said that the relationship between the participants said does not always lie in the conversation, but it can also be located on what is implied in the speech.

4. Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner is when one tries to be as clear and as orderly as one can in what one says. Brown (1983:32) said that maxim of manner must be perspicuous. Coulthard (1985:31) have described sub maxim of manner: Avoid

obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief and be orderly. When engaged

in conversation, the maxim of manner requires you to be perspicuous. The

principles of maxim of manner:

➤ Avoid obscurity of expression

Avoid ambiguity. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

➤ Be orderly. (Stephen C. Levinson, 1983: 102)

For example:

Helena: Where are you going?

Fitria: I'm going to buy some food because I was hungry

In example Fitria explores her purpose to go, there is no ambiguity

or obscurity in her utterance, she also answers in a brief utterance.

2.1.4 Violating Maxim

According to Grice, there are five major ways of failing to observe a

maxim: Flouting, Violating, Infringing, Opting out and Suspending.

Violation is defined as the unostentatious or 'quiet' non-observance

of a maxim. A Speaker who violates a maxim 'will be liable to mislead'

(Grice 1975: 49). Violating a maxim is quite the opposite of flouting a

maxim. Violating a maxim rather prevents or at least discourages the Hearer

from seeking for implicatures and rather encourages their taking utterances at

face value. Examples:

Dady: Do you love me?

Helen: Yes

(supposing you don't really: quietly violates maxim of quality: hence, a lie)

Violation is defined as the unostentatious or 'quiet' non-observance of a maxim. A Speaker who violates a maxim 'will be liable to mislead' (Grice 1975: 49). Violating a maxim in order to exploit it: Unlike someone who is simply violating a maxim, someone who is violating a maxim expects the listener to notice.

1. Violating the first Maxim of Quality (avoid falsehoods)

Violation maxim of quality occurs:

- if the speaker is not telling the truth and giving false information
- if the speaker does irony or makes ironic and sarcastic statement
- if the speaker disavows something
- if the speaker changes information

There is example for this violation:

A: does your cat scratch?

B:No

A: (bends down to stroke it and gets scratch) Ow! You said your

cat does not scratch!

B: that is not my cat.

In a speech at the top, can be described like this, when A visit to the home of B, there is no neighbor cat B that often are in A terrace House. A asked if the usual clawing cat B, and B does not answer. A do not know if the cat is in front of him it's not cat b. then when A try messing with the cat, it turns out that the cat is scratching, then he shouted that the word B doesn't like her cat scratched, but it turns out the cat scratches him. B said that cat scratches him replied that it was not his cat. Here the participants awarded feature either A and B do not provide as much information as is needed by both sides, so it happened a misunderstanding.

2. Violating the second Maxim of Quantity

Violating maxim of quantity occurred:

- when what the speaker want to say is not suitable with the hearer's expect
- if the speaker in uninformative
- if the speaker talks too short
- if the speaker talks too much
- if the speaker repeats certain words

For example:

A: Are you going to work tomorrow?

B: I am on jury duty, but I'll have to go to the doctor in the evening. I have asked the manager for permission.

In this example, B's reply violates maxim of quantity because B does not give information as required by A, yes or no. Instead, B gives more information which is not required or expected at all.

3. Violating the third Maxim of Relevance

Violation maxim of relevant occurs:

- if the speaker does not contribute that are relevant to the issue of the talks.
- If the speaker changes conversation topic abruptly
- If the speaker avoids talking about something
- If the speaker hides something or hides a fact

For example:

A: how the value of your examination yesterday?

B: I was invited by the party tomorrow night. Would you come with me

In the example B's answer is not relevant to A's question. B says something else which is not about A's problem at all.

4. Violating the last Maxim of Manner

Violation maxim of manner occurs:

- if the speaker does not speak directly.
- If the speaker uses ambiguous language
- If the speaker's voice is not loud enought

For example:

- A: Why was he arrested?
- B: He stole the money from the bank.

In the example B's statement is ambiguous. It can be interpreted that B didn't steal the money which is stored in he bank. He had gone the bank first and he stole the money in another place. Another interpretation is that he stole the money stored in the bank. He got the money by robbing the bank.

2.1.5 Christoffersen's Classification

In a conversation, a speaker giving the required information to a hearer. They can understand each other's utterances if they are said to have fulfilled the Cooperative principles. However, people sometimes cannot fulfill those maxims and they seem to disobey them.

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 will be used in the analysis to interpret the data. They are:

i. Hide the truth

This reason happened when the speaker doesn't want the hearer knowing the something real. Example: (Johnny hides the truth when the scientists asked whereabouts the voice-changing travel because johnny has to eat)

Scientist: Has anyone seen the voice-changing travel lozenges? Johnny: Um... No. No.

ii. Saving face

This reason happened when people do something embarrassing in public. 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.

iii. Feel jealous about something

Example: (Lia lies to Anggi that she doesn't know Toni, the new student.

Lia 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.

iv. Satisfying the hearer

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

v. Cheer the hearer

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.

vi. Avoiding to hurt the hearer

Example: (a mother of three years old boy wants to protect his son by telling that his 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

vii. Building one's belief

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

viii. Convincing the hearer

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

There are literally works that conduct almost the same topic that will be researched by the writer. The first is a graduating paper from Stain Salatiga written by Septi Dwi Andini, 2012. The title is "The Cooperative Principle Analysis of Palestine Protest Poster". This study is made to analyze the conversational implicature used in Palestina Protest poster. The first question of this research is how many types of conversational maxims used in Palestine protest posters. From the protest posters which collected by researcher there are 4 types of conversational maxims that found, they are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner and maxim of relation. However the maxim of quality is the more dominant than the other maxims. The protesters tend to use maxim of quality on their protest poster because they tried to speak the truth based on the fact.

The second question of this research is about the social context behind each utterance in Palestine protest poster. To analyze Palestine protest poster the researcher needs to know the history of the conflict between Palestine and Israel, and the social and political condition in Palestine. Every poster have their own history, by learning the social and political behind every poster, it will make us

understanding the poster easier. This is very important to give evidences to the reader to make strong the arguments of the poster. The researcher quoted some statements from some experts or some evidences from some articles, video and books is needed.

The differences between the researcher research paper and the others research above are the researchers thesis is focused on violating of conversational maxims analysis, while the research paper from Septi Dwi Andini is focused on conversational implicature meaning or the implicit meaning, even though she also analyzed conversational maxims in her research paper. The objects of the research are also different, Septi Dwi Andini was researched protest poster while another one was movie.

The second is the thesis of Yudith Tyas Prameswari "JOHNY ENGLISH'S CHARACTERIZATION THROUGH THE WAY HE USES COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN JOHNY ENGLISH REBORN MOVIE". This research aims to find Johnny English's characterization as the main character in Johnny English Reborn movie through the way Johnny English uses the maxims of the cooperative principle by Grice in his conversation. The data of this research is all of Johnny English utterances in the movie. Since, almost every utterances of Johnny English can be analyzed by using cooperative principle. The way Johnny English uses the cooperative principle leading to his characterization is explained. This research uses qualitative method. The data is analyzed by understanding the meaning of the utterance, considering the context when the conversation happens, finding the way

Johnny English uses the maxims of the cooperative principle, and concluding Johnny English's characterization. There are two conclusions of the research.

First, Johnny English uses the cooperative principle by observing and failing the maxim. He observes the maxim by following the requirement of the maxim and fails the maxims by flouting, violating, opting out, facing clash, and infringing the maxim. Second, from each characterization found in the analysis, there are nine bad characterizations and six good characterizations of Johnny English are found. It is also known that Johnny English is a person who can possess some opposite characterizations at once.