#### **CHAPTER II**

#### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher presents the discussion about the supporting theories and previous study. It involves about Pragmatics, Context of Situation, Cooperative Principle, Flouting Maxims, Hedging Maxims and its Previous Study.

## 2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing. This includes social, situational, and textual context. It also includes background knowledge context (Paltridge, 2006: 53). Pragmatics is especially interested in the relationship between language and context. It concludes the study of how interpretation of language depends on knowledge of the world, how speaker use and understand utterances, and how the structure of sentences is influenced by relationships between speakers and hearers (Richards et al 1992 in Paltridge).

Pragmatics studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually a conversation. It distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intent or the sentence meaning, and the other the communicative intent or speaker meaning (Leech, 1983; Sperber and Wilson, 1986). The

ability to comprehend and produce a communicative act is referred to as pragmatic competence (Kasper, 1997) which often includes one's knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge such as politeness, and the linguistic knowledge explicit and implicit.

In addition, pragmatics was defined by Morris in Schiffrin as a branch of semiotics, the study of sign. Morris viewed semiosis (the process in which something functions as a sign) as having four parts. A sign vehicle is that which acts as sign; a designatum is that to which the sign refers; an interpretant is the effect in virtue of which the sign vehicle is a sign; an interpreter is the organism upon whom the sign has an effect. In addition, Levinson (1983) states that pragmatic theory concerns with the inference of presuppositions, implicature, and participant's knowledge of the world and general principle of language usage.

Based on the given definitions above, we may conclude that there are three important components in pragmatics, namely: how the interpretation and use of language depends on the shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer; how speakers use and understand; and how the structure of the sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

# 2.2 Context of Situation

Discourse analysis is describing text and context all together in the process of communication. Moreover, (Cook, 1989:10) says that context is the

unity of discourse with considering the word at large, and it is the influenced by the situation when we receive the message, cultural and social relationship within the participant, what we know and assume the sender knows.

According to Paltridge (2006 : 53) The context of situation of what someone says is, therefore crucial to understanding and interpreting the meaning of what is being said. An understanding of how language functions in context is central to an understanding of the relationship between what is said and what is understood in spoken and written discourse.

In addition, context is provided by a drawing that is intended to constrain subjects' response to open-ended, descriptive/explanatory questions. It emerges that quite different nation of context are examined by clinical linguistics studies (Cumming, 2005:255). It means that context is on the particular occasion, contexts and that speakers are related each other. Moreover, in speech, meaning of the word is not made by language alone. The meaning of the sentence is right when we know the speaker is and who hearer is, that is why we should know the context.

# 2.3 Cooperative Principle

The success of a conversation depends upon the various speakers' approach to the interaction. The way in which people try to make conversations work is called cooperative principle. Grice in Grundy (2000:73) argues that "speaker intend to be cooperative is for speaker to give as much as information as is expected". He also formalized his observation that, when we

talk we try to be cooperative by elevating this notion into what called" The Cooperative Principle". The Cooperative Principle is enunciated as the following way: make your conversational contribution such as is required, as the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Finegan, 2004:300).

Concerning with his Cooperative Principle, Grice divides Cooperative Principle into four basic conversational maxims: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner (Grundy, 2000:74):

## a. Maxims of Quantity

<u>Maxim of quantity</u> and its <u>implicature</u> occur when the speaker or the writer conveys messages that are not as informative as they are required or the information is too much and unnecessary. We should make our contribution as much as required.

Example:

A: What time is it?

B: It's two past four

## b. Maxims of Quality

<u>Maxim of quality</u> and its <u>implicature</u> occur when your contribution one that is untrue or lack adequate evidence. People should says what they believe to be true and what they have evidence for.

Example:

A: What is the Capital City of Indonesia?

B: the capital city of Indonesia is Jakarta

#### c. Maxims of Relevance

<u>Maxim of relevance</u> and its <u>implicature</u> arise when the speaker deviates from the particular topic being asked and discussed. In this maxim we should make our contribution relevant to the interaction. Therefore, each participant's contribution should be relevant to the subject of conversation (Grundy, 2000:74).

## Example:

A: How about your camping yesterday Sana?

B: it's great Firli.

## d. Maxims of Manner

<u>Maxims of manner</u> and its <u>implicature</u> occur when the utterances are not brief, ambiguous, and obscure. It has to be clear. Therefore, each participant's contribution should be reasonably direct, that is, it should not be vague, ambiguous or excessive wordy.

## Example:

A: What did you think of that drama?

B: I am really like of the action of each player. They can play their role as good as possible.

## 2.4 Flouting Maxims

According to Grundy (2000: 78), flouting maxim is a particularly silent way of getting an addressee to draw inference and hence recover an implicature. Moreover, Cutting (2002: 37) states that when the speaker

seems not to hold on the maxims but expect the hearers to get the meaning

implied, it is called flouting the maxims. On some occasion speakers flout

the cooperative principle and intend their hearer to understand this; that is,

they purposely do not observe the maxim, and intend their hearer to be

aware of this.

The flouting of each maxim is determined on the basis of the

following criteria:

1. A speaker flouts the maxim of quantity when his contribution is not

informative as is requires for the current purpose of the exchange and

more informative than is required.

Example:

A: what day is it today?

B: it is Sunday, actually on march, 16 2015

In this example, A asks about what day today is but B answers

more than what A want to know. We cn see that B flouts the maxim of

quantity because B overtly gives more information rather than gives as

much as A want.

2. A speaker flouts the maxim of quality when his contribution is not true

and he says something for which lacks adequate evidence. It can be

hyperbole (overstatement), metaphor, irony, banter, litotes

(understatement), and sarcasm.

Example:

A: what is the capital city of Indonesia?

13

B: I believe it is Bogor, or maybe Jakarta. Indonesia was wide territory.

3. A speaker flouts the maxim of relation if his contribution is not relevant.

Example:

Mom: have you done your homework dear?

Son: my bycycle is broken mom.

4. A speaker flouts the maxim of manner if contribution is not perspicuous it may be obscure, ambiguous and disorderly.

Usually, flouting maxims can be found on Tautology, Metaphor, Overstatement, understatement, Rhetorical question and Irony (Grundy, 2000:76-77). The detailed description is as follows:

## 2.4.1 Tautology

Tautology is the saying of the same thing more than once in different ways without making one's meaning clearer or more forceful (Hornby, 1995:1224).

For example:

"Man is a man"

The word man repeated twice, the speaker can not give more explanation about man. He assumes that the hearer understood what man is.

## 2.4.2 Metaphor

According to Hornby (1995:654) Metaphor is an expression which means or describes one thing or idea using words usually used of something else with very

similar qualities or using words to mean something

different from their ordinary meaning.

For example:

"You have a stone heart"

2.4.3 Overstatement

It is the opposite of understatement. It is called as

hyperbole. When we speak using overstatement, we

exagerate our statement.

For example:

"You are like the sun shine shining my life"

This statement is a kind of hyperbole. It is

impossible for someone will be like the sun shine in real

life.

Understatement 2.4.4

understatement is stating the information in an

uninformative manner. In American heritage dictionary,

litotes is a figure of speech which consist of an

understatement where the utterance is expressed by

negating the utterance or use the opposite meaning

(Hornby, 1974:940).

For example:

Dewa: "what a beautiful house"

Dewi: "it's just an old huse".

15

#### 2.4.5 Rhetorical Question

Rhetorical question is used when someone expresses a question to impress some people without expecting any answer. It is usually used to give a stress for an important thing.

For example:

"how many times do I have to tell you to eat?"

# 2.4.6 Irony

Irony is the expression of one's meaning by saying the direct opposite of what one is thinking but using tone of voice to indicate one's real meaning (Hornby, 1995:632).

For example:

"How beautiful you are Jane" (in real condition, it is the opposite because actually Jane never takes a bath and very lazy to beautifying herself.

## 2.5 Hedging Maxims

According to Grundy (2000:79-80), hedging maxim is avoiding to make bold statement. Hedging maxim means that the speaker breaks the maxims when the information is not totally accurate but seems informative, well founded and relevant. According to Yule (2006:130), hedges is akind of expression that show speaker to use a maxim to be cooperative participant in communication.

Hedges help speakers and writers communicate more precisely the degree of accuracy and truth in assessments. Interestingly, from pragmatics aspects, hedges indicate how Grice's maxims are observed. In this case, hedges are markers tied to the expectation of the maxims of quantity, quality, manner, and relevance.

For example:

## 1. Maxim of quantity

"All I know, smoking is harmful to your health."

This sentence can be observed that the information conveyed by the speaker is limited by adding "all I know". By those words, the speaker not only wants to make an assertion but also observe the maxim of quantity.

## 2. Maxim of quality

"They told me that they are married."

If the speaker says "they are married" and he does not know for sure whether they are married, he may violate the maxim of quality because he say something that he does not know if it is true or false. Yet, by adding, "they told me that", the speaker wants to confirm that he is observing the conversational maxim of quality in conversation.

#### 3. Maxim of manner

"I am not sure if all of these are clear to you, but this is what I know."

This example shows that hedges are good indications the speakers are not only conscious of the maxim of manner, but they are also try to observe them.

### 4. Maxim of relevance

"Where is your mother, by the way?"

In this utterance, "by the way" shows that what the speaker said is not as relevant at the stage at which it occurs in the conversation as he is entitled to expect.

# 2.6 Previous Study

Before the researcher continues this study, she has collected some data and much information which related to the discussion. There were some analyses discussing about flouting and hedging maxims previously. First, Hanifa (2001) investigates flouting of the felicity conditions of conversational maxims in Oliver Goldsmith's *She Stoops the Conquer*. She finds that the flouting of the felicity conditions covers the flouting of the preparatory rule, the sincerity rule and the essential rule on the act of stating or giving information, the act of requesting or ordering, questioning, advising and promising. She also finds that the flouting of two rules of conversations has function to (1) develop ridiculous plot, (2) provide the readers of drama with the amusing situation, (3) keep the readers to read it, and (4) criticize the existing habit.

Second, Priambodo (2002) investigates violation and flouting of Grice's maxims in the Date of Salesman. He finds that there are 19 violations of maxims, which comprises of 2 violations of the maxim quantity, 4 violations of the maxim quality, 8 violations of the maxim relevance and 5 violations of the maxim of manner. In addition, there are 21 instances in which characters flout the maxims, which comprises of 6 flouting of the maxim of quantity, 4 flouting of the maxim quality, 6 flouting of the maxim of relevance and 5 flouting of the maxim of manner.

The last, Rahma (2005) investigates flouting and hedging maxims found on pojok column in Kompas newspaper. She finds that the maxims are flouted when they are overtly broken by speakers in the utterances on pojok column in kompas newspaper such as producing the utterances in the form of rhetorical strategies, namely; tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rhetorical question and irony. In addition, the maxims are hedged when the utterances that producedate not totally accurate, invalid whether the information is right or wrong thus there is no responsibility for the truth of the utterances.

Related to this study, the researcher concludes that this research has similar discussion, this thesis and previous discuss about the flouting and hedging maxims. But, although each of the studies above identifies instances of flouting and hedging maxims, this research quietly different from previous researchers. Hanifa (2001), for example, investigates flouting of felicity conditions of conversational maxims in Oliver Goldsmith's "She Stoops the

Conquer". She only focuses on using Searle's theory in speech acts perspective and she does not extend her analysis to identify flouting and hedging maxims. Priambodo (2002), on the other hand, his focus is on violation and flouting maxim in "The Date of Salesman" drama. The last researcher, Rahma (2005) focuses to investigates flouting and hedging maxims in a "Kompas" newspaper. The researcher would like to find how the flouting and hedging maxims are used on "Jhonny English Reborn" movie which is used Grice's maxims theory. The purpose of this study is to give additional contribution to the field of the study especially in Discourse Analysis. Hopefully, this study will lead the next study.