

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter gives explanation more about Grice's theory of conversational maxims. Grice's theory is related to this object research, such as devise types of flouting maxims, the ways of flouting maxims and the reason of flouting maxims. This theory is taken from books and online references in internet. The writer also took previous study conducted relevant with this study, in order to make comparison with the other study.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker or writer and interpreted by a listener or reader. According to Grundy (2000: 3), pragmatics is about explaining how to produce and understand the language which is used in communication everyday but apparently rather peculiar uses of language. Watts in Sell (1991: 26) explains that pragmatics deals with the study of meaning beyond that which is encoded in the linguistic structures themselves. It thus involves the relationship between utterances (rather than sentences) and their users and contexts of use. Pragmatics is a systematic way of explaining language use in context. It thus involves the relationship between

utterances (rather than sentences) and their users and contexts of use. Pragmatics is a systematic way of explaining language use in context.

It is a way of investigating how sense can be made of certain texts even when, from a semantic viewpoint, the text seems to be incomplete or to have a different meaning to what is really intended. Leech (1983) stated pragmatics as a study of discussing the speaker meaning linking with discourse situation. He also adds the pragmatics is a study of linguistics communication according to conversational principles.

Yule (1996:3) also adds four definitions of pragmatics. Firstly, pragmatics is the study of speaker's utterances and the effort of the hearer to interpret those utterances. Secondly, pragmatics is "study of a contextual meaning". This definition concerns the interpretation of the speaker's utterance each utterance related to a particular context and how the context influences what the speaker said. In this case, both of the speaker and the hearer have to be aware of the context that follows the speaker's utterance. Thirdly, pragmatics is a study that explores how the unsaid is recognized as a part of what is communicated. It explores how a hearer can make an assumption on the speaker's utterances in order to gain at a correct interpretation. The last, pragmatics is a study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the uses of those forms. Based on explanation about definition of pragmatics given by Grundy, Leech, Watts and Yule, it can be concluded that pragmatics deals with intended meaning which is communicated by speaker or writer then interpreted by hearer or reader based on context that happen in the time of speaking. Hence, this study also includes to the

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsb

facts of speaker's intention and the way of speaker does the rules of conversation in order to get good conversation. Thereby, the writer used theory of pragmatics because it relates with the conversational principle. Thus, Pragmatics is useful to analyze data in this study related to the context.

2.2 Presupposition

Presupposition is information which is assumed by hearer about the speaker's talk. The hearer often catches what the speaker said by assuming what is being told by speaker based on the context of situation.

Stalnaker in Brown and Yule (1983:29) argued that presupposition is what is taken by the speaker to be the common ground of the participants in the conversation. Notice that, in both these quotations, the indicated source of presuppositions is the speaker.

This is an example "My uncle will come from Canada tomorrow". From the example, the hearer may assumed that (1) The speaker has uncle and (2) his/her uncle in Canada now. The writer also illustrates by the following example:

Example:

A: Do you like ice cream?

B: Ice cream is really delicious. Strawberry is more delicious than chocolate.

Presupposition: 1. B likes ice cream

2. Ice cream is delicious

3. Strawberry ice cream is delicious

4. Chocolate ice cream is delicious

5.Strawberry ice cream is more delicious than chocolate ice cream

6.B likes strawberry ice cream

7.B maybe likes chocolate ice cream

2.3 Implicature

Implicature is a term in the pragmatics subfield of linguistics, introduced by H. P. Grice, which refers to what is *suggested* in an utterance, even though neither expressed nor *strictly implied* (that is, entailed) by the utterance. It means, that something in the speaker means but does not say. This explanation also supported by Grice, Implicature is an inferred meaning, typically with a different logical form from the original utterance. Implicature is something implied and means from what is said. For example, "*Mary had a baby and got married*" strongly suggests that Mary had the baby before the wedding, but the sentence would still be *strictly true* if Mary had her baby after she got married.

Grice claimed that there were two types of implicature. They are Conventional and conversational implicature. A **conventional implicature** according to Grice , determined by “the conventional meaning of the words used”(1975:44). It means that The conventional implicature happens when the conventional meaning of words used determine what is implicated.

Grice makes a similar point about ‘therefore’:If I say (smugly), *He is an Englishman; he is, therefore, brave*, I have certainly committed myself, by virtue of the meaning of my words, to its being the case that his being brave is a consequence of (follows from) his being an Englishman. But while I have said

that he is an Englishman, and said that he is brave, I do not want to say that I have said (in the favored sense) that it follows from his being an Englishman that he is brave, though I have certainly indicated, and so implicated, that this is so. I do not want to say that my utterance of this sentence would be, strictly speaking, false should the consequence in question fail to hold (Grice 1989, p. 25).

‘Therefore’ is not the most convincing example, for it seems that the truth of the utterance *does* require that the second proposition be a consequence of the first. More plausible is Grice’s earlier example involving ‘but’. She is poor *but* she is honest. Where the putative contrast between being poor and being honest is, he claims, “implied as distinct from being stated” (Grice 1961, p. 127).

While **Conversational Implicature** according Grice that is derived from a general principle of conversational plus a number of maxims which speakers will normally obey. Then, this principle called Cooperative Principle which Grice (1975:45) delivered “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”. Sometimes implicature is produced intentionally by speaker but can be understand or misunderstand from hearer. The writer comes the following example :

Ann: Where does Grice live?

Bob: Somewhere in the Bay Area

From the explanation above that Ann must be understand with literally said by Bob. While, in implicit meaning that Bob does not know which town Grice

live in. Thereby, the writer relates implicature to catch the messages if sometimes the speaker or writer implied something.

2.4 Cooperative Principle

Cooperative Principle is outstanding with Grice's Maxim or Grice's theory. Grice developed a theory designed to explain and predict conversational implicatures. Through Cooperative Principle can identify how people normally behave in conversation, how people interact with one another and how effective communication in conversation. This principle is formulated by Grice (1975:45) "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage of the conversation at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you find yourself".

Cooperative Principle are grouped together into four categories, called the Maxims of Conversation: the maxim of quality (truthfulness), the maxim of quantity (informativeness), the maxim of relation (relevance), and the maxim of manner (be brief). According to Grice (1975) that speakers intend to be cooperative when they talk and people will have a successful conversation if they fulfill the cooperative principles that are related in the four maxims of conversation. The categories are :

2.4.1 Maxim of Quantity

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

Both of clues should be done by speaker in order to say in brief. These clue expects the speaker says based on the necessary or to contribute as informative as is required and does not expected to say too much and too little information than is required.

Thereby , the speaker supposed to be informativeness as is required. The speaker could not talk in less or more information. If the speaker contributes in maxim of quantity, the speaker and hearer will success in conversation. It's mean that conversation between speaker and hearer will be understanding one anothers.

Example:

Andy : Do you have brother and sister?

Rani : Yes, I have brother and don't have sister

The example above showed that Rani understand what is talking by Andy. Therefore, Rani answerd informative as required.

2.4.2 Maxim of Quality

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

The speaker is supposed to say based on the clue above. It expects the speaker says true. These mean that the speaker should say what she/he believes to be true and does not say in less evidence.

Thereby, the speaker must be true in conversation. The speaker must say what he/she believes with the evidence. By saying in true one, the conversation will be success. Example:

Antok : Drew, do you know where is the Big Ban Clock Tower is?

Andrew : It's in London

The example above explained that Andrew fulfill maxim of quality because Andrew does not say what he believes to be false. Factly, Big Ban is in London.

2.4.3 Maxim of Manner

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

The speaker is recommended to say in accordance the contribution above. The speaker are expected to say in easy understand for listeners, say clearly, say the real intention, say briefly and say orderly. These contribution is helpful in creating good communication, likes an example below :

Nisa : What will you buy?

Alika : I will buy an apple

Nisa : How price is it?

Alika : It is about ten thousand

These example, showed the good conversation, where Alika answerd in easy to understand, clearly, briefly and orderly. So, this conversation work perfectly.

2.4.4 Maxim of Relation

This maxim expected the speaker to say in relevant. It means that the speaker's say must relate and connect with one topic to another topic. It is helpfullin success conversation. Example :

Dony : Where are you now?

Gita : I am on the way.

Based on example above showed that Gita's answerd is connection with Dony's question. Gita makes her answerd relate with what is talking by Dony. Gita says on the way because when Dony ask her. She is on the way to see Dony. It will be different if Gita says "sorry, I will come late".

Thus, all of the explanation above has showed the way of maxims work in Cooperative Principle. Cooperative Principle is useful for speaker or writer creates good communication.

2.5 Flouting Maxims

Based on the explanation about Cooperative Principle above, could be concluded that some of hearer and reader usually catches the assumption about the speaker intention when the conversation happens. Then, some of speakers break Cooperative Principle. It is called Flouting Maxim.

Flouting maxims is done by uttering something absurdly false, uninformative, completely irrelevant and obscurity. Flouting maxims are produced about the speaker literally says is different with the speaker intention. So that, flouting maxims force the reader to understand hard about what the speaker intends to convey. Grundy (2000:78) states that flouting maxim is a particularly salient way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an implicature thus there is a trade-off between abiding by maxims. Flouting used always creat conversation become disconnected, too much information, lies and unclear in habitual communication.

Grundy (2000) states that whenever a maxim is flouted there must be an implicature to save the utterance from simply appearing to be a faulty contribution to a conversation.

Another explanation also stated that unlike the violation of maxims, which takes place to cause misunderstanding on the part of the listener, the flouting of maxims takes place when individuals deliberately cease to apply the maxims to persuade their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind the utterances; that is, the speakers employ implicature (S. C. Levinson, 1983)

Thereby, flouting maxim is an utterances that produced by speaker that disobey cooperative principle. Through disobey cooperative principle the conversation will failed. Here are the types of flouting maxim :

2.5.1 Flouting Quality

Flouting maxim of quality occurs when the speaker contributes in untrue utterances. Sometimes, the speaker or hearer does not know about her/his is saying, if is true or not. Some of people also says without the evidance. While, if the conversation obey maxim of quality. The conversation will be success but some of people often misunderstanding about what is talking about. It cause of flouting maxim.

There are some reasons for flouting this maxim (1) To convince the addressee (2) to cover something (3) to hide something. Example:

John : Where is Juanda Airport?

Mingky : Surabaya

John :Then, Abdul Rahman Shaleh Airport is in Jakarta.

The example above showed John flouts the maxim of quality. John says is untrue because Abdul Rahman Shaleh in Malang.

John should say in true then it will make the hearer understand what is talking by him. If the speaker disobey maxim likes the example above. Automatically the conversation is failed.

2.5.2 Flouting Quantity

The reasons of flouting maxim of quantity is to explain more about something; usually someone tries to explain about something by giving much information and expecting that the hearer will understand more about the topic, people use many words when they want to stress something in order to make the intended meaning more clear for the listener to follow, To expect something; Sometimes people act and say more words to show something but factly, the hearer even didn't understand about the speaker says. Example :

Kanaya : Are you ready with mathematic olimpiade?

Kinara : I do worry. Even though, I have studied almost six hours a day

Based on the example above, Kinara flouts a maxim of quantity, where Kinara says in too much information. Kinara should says "I am ready" it will be better than say in much information. May much information make the hearer difficult to understanding what is said exactly.

2.5.3 Flouting Manner

Flouting manner occur when the utterances is ambiguity, not brave, unclear and obscurity. Example :

Kayana : What will you buy?

Kirani : Some fresh

Based on example above that Kirani's answer is unclear because "some fresh" may have another literal meaning. Automatically, kayana misunderstands Kirani's statement.

Kirani is not supposed to say "Some fresh" only, but Kirani should say "a glass of lemon tea", because "Some Fresh" makes the reader or hearer confused then the conversation is failed. So, Kirani's answer indicates flouting manner.

2.5.4 Flouting Relation

Flouting relation occurs when the speaker says irrelevant information. Irrelevant information is created when the speaker says in different topic. Some of reasons why the speaker flouts maxim of relation : first, to change the conversation topic; in a conversation people usually change the topic of conversation to avoid talking about something that is embarrassing or just to end the conversation. These reason is showed in the example below:

Nihay : Hi, Nad. When will you graduate?

Nadan : I am going home

Second, to give unnecessary additional information; sometimes people flout the maxim of relevance by giving unnecessary additional information to the topic being talked about. It is showed by the example below:

Area : Nadin was not in the class, even though there was
final test

Jane : Final test will be held early tomorrow. We must come on time.

Third, to avoid talking about something; people usually say about something else when the partner of the conversation does not hear or understand about what they say because they do not want he or she know about it, example:

Anindit :When will you get married?

Arinah : Soon

Anindit : What did you say?

Arinah : I'm finishing the task

Another common example that shows flouting maxim of relation is showed below:

Anindit : When will you get married?

Arinah : I'm still studying

Based on example above that Arinah's answer is irrelevant with Anindit's question. Arinah is not expected to answer "I'm still studying" because it isn't exactly answerd. Arinah should says in period because the question arises with "When". It could be caused of Arinah does not want to talk about marriage, so she changes another topic by flouting maxim of relation. Those conversation is not cooperative, because the conversation between speaker and hearer is ineffective.

2.6 Context

Context is characteristic outside of the text. Context helped us to know when the conversation was created and what are the reason of speaker produces her or his utterance. Context is helpful for some of people to catch the literally meaning by speaker's say. Moreover, some speakers could not produce the utterances without knowing the context. So that why, context is really important in the interpretation of sentence.

Hymes in Wootton(1975:44), states the use of linguistic form identifies a range of meaning. A context can support a range of meaning. When a form is used in a context it eliminates the meaning possible to that context other than those the form can signal: the context eliminates from consideration the meaning possible to the form other than those the context can support.

Nunan states context as a situation that gives rise to a discourse and it is within the discourse. So, different chance means different context.

2.7 Review of Related Studies

This study focuses on the flouting of the conversational maxims. The writer uses Grice's theory of cooperative principle (1975) as the basic in this analysis. Flouting is deliberate and apparent violation of maxims. Grundy (2000:78) states that flouting maxim is a particularly salient way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an implicature thus there is a trade-off between abiding by maxims. Flouting used always creat conversation

become disconnected, too much information, lies and ambiguities in habitual communication.

Thereby, based on the explanation above, the writer relates this study to those filed with some previous study that have similar areas but the focus of this study is different.

At 2013, Setyoko Cahyo Dwi Putro and Emalia analyzed about Flouting The Quality Maxim In Baby Milk Slogans Shown On Tv *Advertisements*. Based on cooperative principle in his analysis that study found four reasons for flouting the quality maxim in English baby milk slogans shown on Indonesian TV advertisements, they are: interestingness, increasing the force of the message (effectiveness), competing goals and politeness. Weakness of this study is only using quality maxim in baby milk slogans. Whereas, this slogan is also supported by quantity maxim, manner and relevant.

At 2013, Lailil Julia Afza doing research entitled *Study Of Flouting Maxim Found In Some Cosmopolitan Advertisement Slogans*. Based on her research that advertisement does not briefs enough if the readers do not know the context, less informative, lack of evidence, and one of them is no direct relevance to the product. It happens due to the intention of making the slogan short. Consequently, producers sacrifice information, relevance, clarity, and believability. Context is needed in analyzing the hidden meaning of the slogan. Without knowing the context of the slogan, the readers will have a difficulty in understanding the meaning of the slogan related to the product that is advertised.

The hidden meaning of the slogan always brings the intention to promote the product and to persuade the customers to buy it. In his study, the writer intends to identify the type of conversational maxims flouted in the advertisement slogans and to find out the meanings of the slogans based on Grice's implicature theory.

At 2013, Praisya Jovani K. M analyzed about *Flouting And Hedging Maxims In Bbc Podcast The English We Speak Taken From Bbc Learning English* here are 37 utterances containing flouting maxims, which maxim of quantity takes the dominance as shown in 17 utterances. The speakers benefit from rhetorical strategies, such as irony, metaphor, tautology, overstatement and understatement to communicate the implied meaning. Second, 120 utterances of hedging maxims are found. Most speakers express uncertainty and inexactitude regarding the truth or their utterances so that hedges are used to avoid breaking the maxim also to minimize the imposition that may occur. As a result, 74 utterances are said to hedge the maxim of quality. Overlapping incidence between flouting and hedging maxims also can be found referring that the speaker hopes the listener to interpret the meaning and to feel the speaker's hesitation all at once so that a proper response can be derived.

At 2013, Niclas Andresen analyzed about Flouting the maxims in comedy: An analysis of flouting in the comedy series Community. This paper explores how flouting of the Gricean maxims is used to create comedy in the television series Community. The aim of the paper is to find out what maxims are flouted the most to create comedy and what maxims the different characters flout in order to create comedy. The paper examines the use of flouts in different situations and explores

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsb

in what situations the different characters flout the maxims for comedy. The paper is based on transcription of eight episodes of the series. The results show that the maxim of quantity was flouted most often, and some characters used more flouts than others. These results suggest that the use of flouts has to do with their different personalities, which is why some characters did not use as many flouts in order to create comedy, since it would not be in line with their personality.

Based on another researchers that had been defined, study of Grice's theory used by some research. Most of the object of those studies are TV and newspaper. Meanwhile, this study analyzed different object. It is testimony often used by some online shop to persuade customer. Object in Testimony might become the newest object in this field. Not only the object, this study also relate flouting maxim with the four maxims, they are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner and maxim of relation.

Then, the related study as in Setyoko only focuses on Flouting maxim of quality, while Lailil Julia only focuses on types of flouting maxim. Praisya Jovani only focused on Flouting maxim of quantity, but her study increase more in hedging. Niclas focused on the maxim that often flouted by some characters. It means, that this study includes all of study above.