CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to understand this study, it is concerning the definition of cooperative principle, flouting maxims, and Hymes's context of situation.

2.1 Cooperative Principle

Grice's "Logic and Conversation" (1989: 26) stated "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." By Grice's statement we may know as a speaker we should try to give the conversation meaningful. Then as a listener, we assume that our conversational partners are doing the same. In other word, the way in which people try to make conversations works is called a co-operative principle. By applying cooperative principle, the speaker allows the hearer to draw the assumptions about the speaker's intentions and the contextual meaning.

The cooperative principle, based on Grice in Cutting (2002: 34) divided into four types, which is called Grice's maxims. They are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance or maxim of relation, and maxim of manner.

1. Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality occurs when the speakers are expected to be sincere, to be saying something that they believe corresponds to reality.

They are assumed not to say anything that they believe to be false or anything for which you lack adequate evidence. Some speakers like to draw the hearer's attention to the fact that they are really saying what they believe to be true and that they lack adequate evidence. Simply the maxim of quality concern on:

- 1. Do not say what you believe to be false
- 2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

2. Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity occurs when the speakers should be as informative as is required, that they should give neither too little information nor too much. Some speakers like to point to the fact that they know how much information the hearer requires. Simply the maxim of quantity concern on:

- 1. Make your contribution as informative as is required.
- 2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

3. Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation occurs when the speakers are assumed to say something that is relevant to what has been said before. Simply the maxim of relevant concern on makes your contributions relevant.

4. Maxim of Manner

In the maxim of manner, we should clear in what we say and we should avoid obscurity and ambiguity. Moreover we should be brief and orderly in our contribution to the interaction. Simply the maxim of manner can be said to:

- 1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
- 2. Avoid ambiguity.
- 3. Be brief.
- 4. Be orderly.

a. Flouting Maxims

According to Paltridge (2006: 64) on some occasions speakers flout the cooperative principle and intend their hearer to understand this; that is they purposely do not observe the maxim and intend to the hearer to be aware of this. For example, an American student has asked a Chinese student direction to the station. As they are walking to the station, the following conversation occurs:

Chinese student : What do you do in America?

American student : I work in a bank.

Chinese student : It's a good job. Isn't it?

American student : Well, just so so.

Chinese student : Then how much your salary every month?

American student : Oh, no...

Chinese student : What's wrong?

American student : Why are you asking that?
Chinese student : Just asking, nothing else...
The station isn't far is it?

Here the question the Chinese student has asked does not observe the maxim of relation for an English conversation of this kind. He is not aware of this, although the American student clearly is. He then asks her if she is traveling alone and if she is married. The American student quickly hails the taxi and takes it to the station.

11

Next, according to Cutting (2002: 37) flouting maxims is when the speaker

seems not to use the maxim at the time they produce the utterance but the

speakers assumes that the hearer understands about the words and appreciates

the implicit meaning. Moreover According to Grice in Cutting (2002) there

are four kinds of the flouting maxims. They are:

1. Flouting Maxim of Quality

Flouts which exploit the maxim of quality occur when the speaker

says something which is blatantly untrue or for which he or she lacks adequate

evidence.

There are various ways to flout the maxim of quality. First, the speaker

may flouts the maxim by exaggerating as in the hyperbole." I could eat a horse or

Lynn: Yes I'm starving too"

Martin: Hurry up girl

Lyyn: Oh dear, stop eating rubbish. You won't eat any dinner.

In which" I'm starving" is a well established exaggerating expression. No

speaker would expect their hearer to say," What you could eat a whole horse?' or

I don't think you dying or hunger- you don't even look thin". Hearers would be

expected to know that the speaker simple meant that they were very hungry.

Hyperbole is often at the basis of humor.

Second, a speaker can flout the maxim of quality by using metaphor. As

in" My house is a refrigerator in January" or" Don't be such a wet blanker- We

just want to have fun.'

Here the hearer would understand that the house was very cold indeed and

the other person is trying to reduce other people's enjoyment. Metaphor is a figure

of speech which makes an implicit, implied, or hidden comparison between two things.

The last two main ways of flouting the maxim of quality are irony and banter. As Leech (1983:144) says:

"While irony is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness), the type of verbal behavior know as" banter" is an offensive way of being friendly (mock-impoliteness)"

Thus, in the case of irony, the speaker expresses a positive sentiment and implies a negative one. For example, if a student comes down to have breakfast one morning and says" if only you know much I love being woken up at 4 am by a fire alarm". She is being ironic and exaggerating her friends to know that she means the opposite. Moreover, an irony signifies an avoidance of friendship and show a lack of friendship or relationship.

Sarcasm is a form of irony that is not so friendly; in fact it is usually intended to hurt, as in "This is a lovely undercooked egg you've given me here, as usual. Yum! Or "Why don't you leave all your dirty clothes on the lounge floor, love, and then you only need wash them when someone breaks a leg trying to get to the sofa?"

Banter, on the contrary, expresses a negative sentiment and implies a positive one. It sounds like a mild aggression, as in, "You're nasty, mean and stingy. How can you only give me one kiss?" but it is intended to be an expression of friendship or intimacy. Banter can sometimes to be a tease and sometimes flirtatious comment. Moreover, banter signifies a bond and a friendship and show a strong friendship or relationship.

2. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

A flout of the maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker blatantly gives more or less information that the situation requires.

3. Flouting Maxim of Relation

If speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance the speakers did *not say*, and make connection between their utterance and the preceding one.

4. Flouting Maxim of Manner

The flouting of the maxim of manner is exploited by making obscurity expression, a response which is unclear; this maxim is prolixity, using too many words, therefore boring and difficult to read or listen to. So that the hearer cannot catch what the speaker means.

b. Context

When we study about pragmatics and discourse analysis is related to the context. This part is dealing with the meaning of words in context (the physical and social world) and assumption of knowledge that speaker and hearer share (Cutting, 2002:3). The contexts are:

a. Situational Context

Situational context is what speakers know about what they can see around them. According to Cutting (2002:4) situational context is the immediate physical co-presence, the situation where the interaction is taking place at the moment of speaking. It is about the gesture with their hands and face that the speaker and hearer share in a situational context.

14

That means to the words "it", "this", "that", etc are demonstrative

pronouns, used for pointing to something, an entity, that speaker and

hearer can see. For example:

Teacher: What is it?

Pupil: It is a bird.

The situational context is obviously is in the classroom, and

presumably the teacher and the pupil pointing to either the blackboard or

picture. The word "it" refers to the picture of a bird.

b. Background Knowledge Context

Background Knowledge context is what they know about each other

and the world.

1. Cultural Knowledge

Cultural Knowledge is that people carry with them in their minds

areas of life. Talk amusing shared knowledge of cultural context often

shows as assumption of shared attitude toward the cultural context. If

interlocutors establish that they are part of the same group, they can

assume mutual knowledge of everything normally known by group

member. (Sperber and Wilson 1995) in Cutting (2002:5). When the

speakers modify their expressions to reflect that of their interlocutors, they

can be seen as accommodating their attitudes in order to be accepted and

be seen as belonging to the same group.

2. Interpersonal Knowledge

Interpersonal Knowledge is that specific and possibly private knowledge about the history of the speakers themselves. It shared interpersonal knowledge is knowledge acquire through previous verbal interaction or verbal activities and experiences, and it includes privileged personal knowledge about the interlocutor. There was a US television advertisement that featured a telephone dialogue like this:

Her How are you

Him OK

Her Did you have friends in and get a video last night? Him Oh I had friends in, but we just watched a little TV

Her Ah right

Him That was great. How do you feel?

Her Ok

It is only when she says "OK" at the end that there is a flashback and we see that she won a gold medal in a Olympics events. At this point we understand that "Oh I had friends in, but we just watched a little TV" means "I had friends in to watch you playing on TV and I know you won." The interpersonal knowledge shared by a husband and wife is obviously enormous: this why it is reference to any part of it can be vague, implicit, and minimal (Cutting, 2002:6-7).

In this study, the researcher uses the concept of S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G from Hymes's theory of the context of situation. They are:

S (Setting or scene/ time and place of a speech act and in general, to the physical circumstances).

P (Participants). Speaker and audience.

E (Ends or purposes)

A (Act sequence including the message form, medium and content)

K (Manner or mood of communication; formal, informal, casual, relaxed, etc.)

I (Instrumentalities; verbal or non verbal channel)

N (Norms of interaction). Social rules governing the event and participant's actions and reactions.

G (Genre). The kind of speech act and event.

In this research, the researcher does not use all the concept of SPEAKING but the researcher only uses setting, participant, ends or purposes, act sequence, and manner or mood of communication. It is because five of them are enough to used by researcher to analyze the purpose of the main characters flouted the maxims of quantity and quality.