CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents a brief overview on the theory of cooperative principle by H.P Grice, followed by its maxim and the explanation of implicature, context, flouting maxims and also characterization. In addition, the researcher presents some previous studies of this field.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The theory which is used in this research comes from H.P Grice (1989). Grice's theory is an attempt at explaining how a hearer gets from what is said to what is meant, from the level of expressed meaning to the level of implied meaning (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 56).

The theory is included of the discourse analysis and pragmatics field. In discourse analysis, Paltridge (2006) says that it focuses on knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for successful communication. It can be said that discourse analysis concerns in analysing all about language which is spoken or written. There are sub subjects include in discourse analysis field according to Paltridge (2006) in his book *Discourse Analysis* namely; Discourse and society, Discourse and Pragmatics, Discourse and Genre, Discourse and Conversation, and Discourse and Grammar. While, pragmatics according to Paltridge (2006) is the study about meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing. Another definition of pragmatics comes from Yule's (1996) points of view. According to Yule (1996), firstly, pragmatics is the study of utterances as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a hearer. Secondly, pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. It requires a consideration of how a speaker organizes what he or she wants to say. Thirdly, pragmatics is the study of how the hearer gets the implicit meaning of the speaker's utterances. The last, pragmatics is the study of the relationship between linguistics forms and the users of those forms. From all the definition above, discourse and pragmatics are combined to see the relationship between language and context.

Furthermore, according to Yule (1996) in his book *Pragmatics*, it covers several scopes; they are deixis, cooperative principles, implicature, presupposition and speech acts. From the areas of pragmatics field, the co-operative principle becomes a main theory of this research.

2.1.1 The Co-operative Principle by Grice (1989)

H.P. Grice invents a theory of conversation like Thomas (1995) says that it "attempts explaining how a hearer gets from what is said to what is meant" (p. 56). In the way we are doing conversation, some principles should apply to make a good contribution of conversation as Grice's (1989) states "make our conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which is occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the exchange in which we are engaged" (p. 26). He suggests that all participants should give a contribution to each other in conversation by providing required information, speak the truth, be relevant and be clear. This principle will engage between speaker and hearer to co-operate each other. The principle is called as a maxim which is defined as a short, pithy statement expressing a general truth or rule of conduct (Oxford dictionary). In a simple word, a maxim means a saying.

2.1.2 The Kind of Gricean Maxims

In conversation, Grice (1989) presents four conversational maxims as the rules to express the cooperation during the conversation. They are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner. By these rules, the speaker should apply it in order to give a good feedback in conversation.

2.1.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of Quantity is a rule to give right information. It demands the speaker should give information not to be more or not to be lack. This rule asks the speaker to be informative to the listener. In order to give information, Cutting (2002) states that the speaker knows how much information the hearer requires or can be bothered with. In the other words, giving more information will make the hearer gets bored because of this, or giving too little information will risk the hearer because the hearer does not get explicit information. According to Grice (1989), this maxim provides to:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the certain purpose of the exchange).

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

(p. 26).

To make a clear explanation about maxim of quantity, Grice (1989)

also gives a brief analogue of this category as:

If you are assisting me to mend a car, I expect your contribution to be neither more or less than is required. If for example, at a particular stage I need four screws, I expect you to hand me four, rather than two or six (p. 28).

2.1.2.2 Maxim of Quality

Maxim of Quality is a rule to ask people should to speak the truth as they know. It demands the speaker to give information as the fact happen. Cutting (2002) notes that this rules "expects the speakers to be sincere as they believe corresponds to reality" (p. 35). According to Grice (1989) this maxim provides two specific maxims:

- 1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
- 2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence (p. 27).

In the analogue from Grice (1989) explains more clearly about

maxim of quality that:

I expect your contributions to be genuine and not spurious. If I need a sugar as an ingredient in the cake you are assisting me to make, I do not expect you to hand me salt; if I need a spoon, I do not expect a trick spoon made of rubber (p. 28).

2.1.2.3 Maxim of Relation

This maxim should make the contribution relevant as Grice (1989) states "be relevant" (p. 28). According to Cutting (2002), "some speakers like to indicate how their comment has relevance to the conversation" (p.

35). In following analogue of Grice (1989), he also states that:

I expect a partner's contribution to be appropriate to the immediate needs at each stage of the transaction. If I am mixing ingredients for a cake, I do not expect to be handed a good book, or even an oven cloth (though this might be an appropriate contribution at a later stage (p. 28).

2.1.2.4 Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner takes a rule in the way people should say clearly during conversation. According to Grice (1989), he provides the characteristics of using maxim of manner.

- 1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
- 2. Avoid ambiguity.
- 3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
- 4. Be orderly (p. 27).

Being clearly and orderly are the key to observe this maxim. Like Grice (1989) analogue in his paper "I expect a partner to make it clear what contribution he is making and to execute his performance with reasonable dispatch" (p. 28).

From all above, through those maxims, people should be cooperative in communicating by obeying all maxims. The following example shows a person who observes all the maxims that Grice noted:

(1) Husband: Where are the car keys?

Wife : They're on the table in the hall. (cited in Thomas, 1995,p. 63)

The wife has answered clearly as she obeyed of the maxim of Manner, said truthfully as she obeyed a maxim of quality, has given just the right information as she obeyed the maxim of quantity and has directly given the goal answer as she obeyed a maxim of relation.

2.1.3 The Theory of Implicature

In communication form, implicature means the way of speaker states indirectly and sometimes the meaning is to hint their listener to aware of something. This way is different from the literal meaning as they are saying. Grice states implicature as 'To imply is to hint, suggest or convey some meaning indirectly by means of language' (cited in Thomas, 1995, p.58). In addition, he makes clear explanation that an implicature is generated intentionally by the speaker and may (or may not) be understood by the hearer (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 58). It seems like by using implicature, the speaker tries to show their intention to the hearer. In order the hearer gets it or not, it depends on the hearer's interpretation for understanding the meaning. Grice (1975) proposes two kinds of implicatures. Those are conventional and conversational implicatures (cited in Thomas, 1995, p.57). Conventional implicature would be found in general sentence which is includes English conjunction such as Levinson (1983) mentions four list: but, even, therefore and yet (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 57). Below is the example of conventional implicature:

(2) She was cursed with a stammer, unmarried but far from stupid.

Notice that although it is not actually asserted that unmarried people (or, perhaps, people who stammer) are stupid, the word but definitely implies that this is the case. The word but carries the implicature that what follows will run counter to expectations (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 57).

The other one is conversational implicature as the focus of this research also. The implicature could be found in the conversation. The dialogue below is taken from Cruse (2004):

(3) A: Am I in time for supper?

B: I've cleared the table (p. 349).

Here it is obviously B's intention to convey the proposition that A is too late for supper, but this has to be worked out by the hearer.

To distinguish the differences between conventional implicature and conversational implicature that there is a dependence context in conversational implicature, while in conventional implicature, it is formed by the particular linguistics form.

2.1.4 Context

Context is the central understanding in interpreting the meaning. According to Cutting (2002), he divides it into three kinds aspect of context. They are situational context, background knowledge context and co-textual context.

Cutting (2002) explains the term situational context as "what speakers know about what they can see around them" (p. 3). In the way of conversation, the speaker and hearer engage themselves to use the things around them to support their speaking. Like Cutting (2002) says that it is an immediate physical co-presence, the situation where the interaction is taking place at the moment of speaking.

Background knowledge context is people say what they know about each other and the world. It includes cultural knowledge and interpersonal knowledge. Paltride (2006) explains that cultural knowledge tends to say "what they know about the world, what they know about various areas of life, what they know about each other and what they know about the norms and expectation of particular discourse community in which the communication is taking place" (p. 54). Interpersonal knowledge engages between speaker and hearer has relationship before. As Cutting (2002) sates "share interpersonal language is knowledge acquired through previous verbal interaction or joint activities and experiences, and it includes privilege personal knowledge about their interlocutor (p. 6)". So that they can share everything that both people know without feeling disturbing because they ever have a communication before.

The last is co-textual which engages in what they know about what they have been saying. Cutting (2002) says that the co-textual deals with the contextual context, the context of the text itself. This aspect includes grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. The grammatical cohesion expands to endoporic reference, substitution and ellipsis while the lexical cohesion deals with repetition, synonyms, superordinates and general words.

2.1.5 Flouting Co-operative Principle

In cooperative principle by Grice, maxim should be applied in the way of conversation. A set of maxims that could be not observed by speaker because of certain purpose is called as flouting maxim. Cook (1989) says there is a condition when speakers could not observe the maxims:

There are times, however, when being truthful, brief and relevant might have different meanings, indeed different context and situation may have different understanding of what 'be truthful, relevant and brief' means. There are further, occasions where we cannot be brief and true at the same time. This leads us to the 'flouting' of the co-operative principle and its maxims (cited in Paltridge, 2000, p. 64).

When people apply it perfectly in conversation, it means they are observing maxims. If they do not apply it, it means they are failing the maxim. As Grice pointed out, there are five ways of failing to observe maxim, namely; flouting, violating, infringing, opting out and suspending (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 64). All these kinds are the kinds of not observing the maxim as should be. So, the function is still not obeying cooperative principle.

Flouting is the type of failing maxim in order the speaker wishes the hearer to get a certain meaning as Thomas (1995) said "the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning" (p. 65). The second type is violating maxim. This maxim is different from flouting. If flouting asks the hearer looks for the other meaning, this failing maxim discourages the hearer for seeking for implicature. Grice draws 'violating maxim as the unostentatious non observance of a maxim. Grice (1989, p. 30) states directly "a speaker who violates a maxim will be liable to mislead". The third type is infringing of maxim. Grice said infringing is failing the maxim because of imperfect linguistics performance such a young child or a foreign learner or in the way the speaker's nervousness, drunkenness, excitement. Opting out maxim is the way the speaker fail maxim to indicate unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim require. It is the kind of legal or ethical reason (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 74). The last is suspending of maxim. The speaker might use this failing maxim in under certain circumstance as part of certain events there is no expectation on the part of any participants that one or several maxims should be observed (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 74).

As the research focuses on flouting conversational maxim, the following will emphasize its discussion more on flouting in each maxim.

2.1.5.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Grice has said that flouting comes if 'the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning' (cited in Thomas, 1995, p.65). Maxim of quantity demands the speaker to give right information. Flouting maxim of quantity occurs when speaker disobey this rules. Cutting (2002) explained the flouting maxim of quantity seems to give little information and too information. Here is the example taken from Cutting (2002):

(4) A: Well, how do I look?B: Your shoes are nice (p. 37).

From this conversation, we know that B flouts the maxim of quantity. In this case A expects B to give a comment for his whole appearance but B gives lack information by saying a part of his appearance "Your shoes are nice". By only saying A's shoes looking, B knows that A will understand that his performance is good enough. Even though B does not give whole information as A expects, A gets the meaning of B saying.

2.1.5.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality is known as a maxim which demands us to give information based on the fact. Flouting maxim of quality comes when the speaker say unreal information or they are lack adequate evidence. Here is the example taken from Thomas (1995):

(5) A: Is he nice?

B: She seems to like him (p. 66).

This conversation shows that B flouts the maxim of quantity because B is not sure whether he is nice or not. Normally, speakers may flout the maxim of quality in several ways as cutting (2002) describes below:

1. Hyperbole

The speaker may flout the maxim by using hyperbole words such "I could eat horse" (p. 37). When the speaker used this sentence, it does not really mean eating a real horse. The hearer will understand that the speaker's saying means speaker is hungry now.

2. Metaphor

Using metaphor to flout maxim often occurs in our daily conversation. The sentence "I'm going to wash my hand" (p. 37), we agree to understand this sentence with 'I'm going to urinate'.

3. Irony and Banter

Leech (1983, p. 144) noted that while irony is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock politeness), the type of verbal behaviour known as "banter" is an offensive way of being friendly (mock impoliteness). (cited in Cutting, 2002, p. 38)

4. Sarcasm

It is a kind of offensive like irony but the result is hurting people. This kind of flouting maxim can be seen in the way people saying and be

based from the context again like 'This is lovely undercooked egg you've given me here, as usual. Yum!' (cited in Cutting, 2002, p. 38).

2.1.5.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

A person who flouts maxim of relation means his/her saying is irrelevant with the topic. Cutting (2002) stated that flouting maxim of relation seems to expect the hearer know the real utterance which did not say. Below is the example of flouting maxim relation.

(6) A: So, what do you think of Mark?

B: His flatmate's a wonderful cook (As cited in Cutting, 2002, p. 39).

B does not say that B was not very impressed with Mark, but by not mentioning him in the reply and apparently saying something irrelevant, B implies it.

2.1.5.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

. Cutting (2002) said that flouting of manner appears when the speaker to be obscure. To flout the maxim of manner, people like to give ambiguity information. It will make the listener gets unclear information from the speaker. When it is conducted by a certain purpose, the listener can get what the speaker means. Here is the example:

(7) Interviewer : Did the United States Government play any part in Duvalier's departure? Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?

Official : I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 71).

Actually the official can say "Yes", but her actual response is extremely long-winded and convoluted. So, the official chooses to flout the maxim of manner.

2.1.6 Characterization

Characterization is given by author to draw a personality of characters in a story. This element includes in literary works. There are two ways to characterize the characters. Minderop (2005) says that they are direct characterization method or telling and indirect characterization method or showing.

Direct characterization means telling a watcher about the personality character by the author directly. Pickering and Hoeper (1981, p. 27) states briefly about direct method:

One method is telling, which relies on exposition and direct commentary by the author. In telling - a method preferred and practiced by many older fiction writers – the guiding hand of the authors is very much evidence. We learn and look only at what the author calls to our attention. (cited in Minderop, 2005, p. 8)

According to Minderop (2005), direct method includes characterization through the use of names, characterization through appearance, and characterization by the author. Characterization through names means using a name to create an idea to be shown in character.

While indirect characterization is showing things that reveal the personality of a character. It ignores the author's appearance as Pickering and Hoeper (1981, p. 27-28) says:

The other method is the indirect, the dramatic method or showing, which involves the author's stepping aside, as it were, to allow the characters to reveals themselves directly through and their action. With showing much of the burden of character analysis is shifted to the reader, who is required to infer the character on the basis of the evidence provided in the narrative. (cited in Minderop, 2005, p. 22)

This method can characterize the characters through their dialogue and their action. It is known that the reader can infer the characters from their conversation or dialogue by his/her speaking. The other hand, the character's action has a big influence to draw the character's personality.

As the research reveals the characterization of the main character in the movie, the indirect way through a dialog can influence the characterization of Chris Gardner. The dialogues which contain of flouting maxims are the main focus to reveal the character.

2.2 Previous Study

The study about flouting conversational maxims has been conducted by many people. The most famous study of flouting conversational maxims is conducted to create humor through the Grice's theory. One of thesis which provokes humor by using this theory comes from Aguslani, 2012, from Petra Christian University. The second thesis which concerned in the same field comes from Diastuti, 2012, from State Islamic Studies Institute (STAIN) Salatiga. The other one comes from Fajrina, 2014, from State Islamic University Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

2.2.1 The study of Aguslani (2012)

Aguslani (2012), from Petra Christian University, conducted an analysis of flouting conversational maxim entitled "Flouting of Maxims Which Provokes Humor in The Big Bang Theory and Office Boy Shift 2 Movie Series". This thesis used Gricean maxims to look for the humor which was created in Big Bang Theory and Office Boy Shift 2 Movie Series. In this study, he compared two movies for looking the frequently appearance of flouting maxim in both movies. He also gave a detailed explanation how the characters create humor through the flouting maxims.

As a result, the study found that the characters in two movies flouted all maxims in the way to make humor appears in the movies. In The Big Bang Theory and Office Boy Shift 2 Movie, the maxim of relation was the maxim that often flouted with ratio of 18:10. The second most flouted was maxim of quantity with ratio 12:4. Maxim of quality was put on the third place maxim flouted with ratio 5:4. And the last was maxim of manner with ration 5:2.

Different with this study, the researcher's study do not focus on the humor. Provokes humor through flouting maxim has been conducted by many people. There were many studies of co-operative principles in focusing on flouting maxims to look for humor. Humor became a favourite one in doing research of flouting maxims. In the researcher's study, the character that is elected is not the kind of humorist person. He is a typical of serious person. Since looking for the flouting maxim in the humorist person has been so many, the study is conducted to serious person as the main character of the movie.

2.2.2 The study of Diastuti (2012)

Diastuti (2012), from State Islamic Studies Institute (STAIN) Salatiga, conducted a research entitled "The analysis maxims in "Tears of The Sun" Movie". Her research concerned in analyzing the cooperative maxims which was used by all characters in the movie through their conversation. Different with the first thesis above, if the first thesis used flouting maxim, this thesis analyzed in observing maxims. In this thesis, the she focused to seek the kinds of maxims that were obeyed by all characters. In this case, she also gave a detailed expression for showing that the characters observed the maxims. In the second focus, she intended to find the characterization of the characters that were drawn through obeying maxims. The result is it has found that the actors and actress obeyed all of Gricean maxims in Cooperative Principle. For maxims of quality, she characterized the character as loyal soldier, brave, honest, satirist and responsible. The maxim of quantity could show the kind of person which is patience, brave, distinct, and charitable. The characteristics of a person convey maxims of relations was loyal soldier, brave, honest, satirist and responsible. For the last, maxim of manner was loyal, brave, distinct person, and responsible.

Although Diastuti's (2012) study focused on obeying maxims to describe the character of the actor and actress that was played in the movie, the researcher's study uses flouting maxims to characterize the character in the movie. This kind of study has not found yet.

2.2.3 The study of Fajrina (2014)

Fajrina (2014) used the Grice's theory to analyze her research entitled "An Analysis of Flouting Maxims Used by Elizabeth in Austen's Pride and Prejudice The Movie". She said that movie contains the dialogue of the character which uses all of communication to transfer the message of the story to the audience or hearers. Pride and Prejudice is the movie adapted from Austen's novel Pride and Prejudice which directed by Joe Wright in 2005. In this research, the she looked for the kinds of maxims which flouted by Elizabeth as the main character. After it found, she continued to look the reason of Elizabeth flouted the maxim and she also described the context when Elizabeth flouted the maxim. In her research, she conducted the study by using descriptive-qualitative approach. It focused on the conversation between Elizabeth and the characters who did dialogue with her. By the approach, she showed the context to create meaning.

The result of this research found that Elizabeth flouted all maxims; maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation and maxim of manner. It was found that the aims of Elizabeth flouts maxims are because she wanted to add the information to the hearer to make it clearer. The second aim was Elizabeth wanted to create a humor as the speaker is humorist person. The last was breaking the maxims because the speaker wanted to make the conversation alive.

Although this study and the researcher's study uses flouting maxim in the main character, a research on flouting Gracean maxims to describe the characterization of the main character has not found.

