CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature review consists of some theories, and the previous study related to this study. The main purpose of the existence of literature review is to strengthen the arguments through some theories. In this chapter the literature review is divided in two general discussions. First, it is about the theory related to this study itself, and second, it is about the previous study inspiring of conducting this study.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatic is a study that concern about meaning of the word or sentence which relating to the context in spoken and written. The contexts that include in pragmatics are social context, situational context, textual context, or background knowledge in context. According to Paltridge (2007:53) pragmatics assume that when people communicate with each other the normally follow some kind of cooperative principle, that is, they have a shared understanding of how they should co-operate in their communication. Meanwhile Yule (1996:3) state that pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by speaker and interpreted by a listener.

The advantage of studying language by using pragmatics is that we can talk about people's intended meaning, their assumption, their purposes and also the kind of action. Therefore, pragmatics concerns about the function of language in communication and the speaker's intention or meaning while stating the utterances toward hearer. Meanwhile, in pragmatics, the study about intended meaning is explained in implicature.

2.2 Implicature

When the speaker and the hearer are doing successful communication it is mean there is no misunderstanding. It occurs if the hearer is able to catch what the speaker mean correctly. Understanding meaning of speaker's utterance is not sufficient by using syntax and semantic since the meaning of an utterance is not only stated but it is also implied.

Implicature is the aspect of meaning that a speaker conveys, implies, or suggests without directly expressing. Grice (1975) in Brown and Yule (1983:31) the term 'implicature' is used to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says. Grice (1975:43) was first introduced the term implicature whose makes two distinction between what is said by the speaker of a verbal utterance and what is implied. In other hand, Levinson (1981:98) in Wahyu adds the notion of implicature promises to bring the gap between what is literally said and what is actually said.

In implicature Grice distinguished two kind of implicature, those are conventional implicature and conversational implicature (nonconventional implicature). In conventional implicature, no particular context is required in order to get the implicature. Meanwhile, in conversational implicature are derived from a particular context.

2.3 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is implicature that is part of a lexical item's or expression's agreed meaning, rather than derived from principles of language use, and not part of the condition for the truth of the item or expression (Levinson, 1983). The difference between conversational implicature and conventional implicature lies in the fact that what a speaker conventionally implicates by uttering a sentence is tied in some way to the timeless meaning of part of the sentence, whereas what a speaker conversationally implicates is not directly connected with timeless meaning.

Grice quoted by Murphy (1975:44) "in some cases the conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said. 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 (follow from) his being an Englishman". This implies a consequence link between the two sentences. Grice makes it clear that what a speaker conventionally implicates by uttering a sentence is part of what the speaker means in uttering it, and that it is also closely connected to what the sentence means.

2.4 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature are pragmatic inferences: unlike entailments and presuppositions, they are not tied to the particular words and phrases in an utterance but arise instead from contextual factors and the understanding that

conventions are observed in conversation. The theory of conversational implicatures is attributed to Paul Herbert Grice, who observed that in conversations what is meant often goes beyond what is said and that this additional meaning is inferred and predictable. According to Paltridge (2006:70) conversational implicature refers to the inference a hearer makes about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from their use of the literal meaning of what the speaker said, the conversational principle and its maxim.

Of much greater interest to the discourse analyst is the notion of conversational implicature which is derived from a general principle of conversation plus a number of maxim which speaker will normally obey (Brown and Yule, 1983:31). To working out a conversational implicature, the hearer will rely on the following data: (1) The conventional meaning of the words used, together with the identity of a reference that may be involved. (2) The cooperative principle and its maxims. (3) The context, linguistic or otherwise, of the utterance. (4) Other items of background knowledge. (5) The fact (or supposed fact) that all relevant items falling under the previous headings are available to both participants and both participants know or assume this to be the case (Grice, 1975:50).

Grice introduce a distinction between two types of conversational implicature, those are Particularized implicatures and Generalized implicatures. Paltridge (2007:71) states that most implicatures in fact, are particularized conversational implicature. Particularized conversational implicatures, however, are derived from a particular context, rather than from the use of the words alone.

In other hand Levinson (1983:126) defines Generalized conversational implicatures occur without reference to any particular features of the context. In other words, special background knowledge or inferences are not required in calculating the additional conveyed meaning.

Paltridge states in Wahyu that implicature can be created in one of three ways.

- 1. A maxim of cooperative principle can be followed in a straightforward way and the hearer implicates what the speaker intends.
- 2. A maxim of cooperative principle might also be flouted because of a clash with another maxim.
- 3. A maxim of cooperative principle might be flouted in a way that exploits a maxim.

Therefore, flouting a maxim of cooperative principles is as a way to produce conversational implicature.

2.5 Cooperative Principle

When the hearers and the speakers speak cooperatively and mutually accept one another to be understood in a particular way successful communication occurs. The way in which people try to make conversation work is called the Cooperative Principle.

Grice (1975) in Paltridge (2007:61) argues that in order for a person to interpret someone else says, some kind of cooperative principle must be assumed

to be in operation. People assume, he argued, that there is a set of principles which

direct us to a particular interpretation of what someone says, unless we receive

some indication to the contrary. Grice (1975:45) states "make your conversational

contribution such as is required, as the stage at which it occurs by the accepted

purpose or the direction of the talk exchange which you are engaged". In other

word, cooperative principle must be assumed to be in interaction in order for

person to interpret what someone said is appropriate with the speaker said.

In order to fulfill the cooperative principle, Grice divides cooperative

principle into four basic conversational maxims.

1. Maxim of Quantity (informativeness)

Maxim of quantity is primarily concerned with giving information as

it is required and not giving the contribution more informative than is

required. Below are the examples of an utterance that obeys the maxim of

quantity and one that violates the maxim:

Example of obeying:

A: Where are you going?

B: I'm going to the post office.

In the example, B gives comments to A's statement without adding

other information.

Example of disobeying / violation:

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 like yes or no. Instead, B gives more

information which is not required or expected at all.

2. Maxim of Quality (truthfulness)

Maxim of quality purposes that the speakers should only say what

they believe to be true and have the evidence. Below are the examples of the

utterance that obeys the maxim of quality and that one violates the maxim:

Example of obeying:

A: Why did you come late last night?

B: The car was broken down

In t he example, B gives the truth that his car was broken down so that

he came late.

Example of disobeying / violation:

A: The Teheran's in Turkey, isn't bob?

B: And London's in America I suppose.

In the example, B's reply is supposed to suggest that A is incorrect

and B violates the maxim of quality.

3. Maxim of Relation (relevance)

Maxim of relation required the speaker to be relevant. The utterance of the speaker must be relevant with the topic discussed. Below are the examples of utterance that obeys the maxim of relevance and that one violates the maxim:

Example of obeying:

A: Where is my box of chocolates?

B: It is in your room.

In the example, B's reply relates to the question, not talking about something else. Example of disobeying / violation

A: Where's my box of chocolates?

B: I don't know mine either.

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. Maxim of Manner (perspicuity)

Maxim of manner requires the speaker to avoid obscurity of expression, ambiguity and demands the speaker to be brief and orderly. Below are the examples of utterance that obeys the maxim of manner and that one violates the maxim:

Example of obeying:

A: Where was Andi yesterday?

B: Andi went to the store and bought some coke.

In the example, B's answer obeys the manner maxim: be orderly, because she gives a clear explanation where A was.

Example of disobeying / violation:

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 the 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.

2.6 Motivation

Motivation is the act or process of giving someone a reason for doing something and also a force or influence that causes someone to do something. Furthermore, motivation involves a constellation of beliefs, perceptions, values, interests, and actions that are all closely related.

According to Lai (2011) in her research report, motivation refers to reasons that underlie behavior that is characterized by willingness and volition. Intrinsic motivation is animated by personal enjoyment, interest, or pleasure,

whereas extrinsic motivation is governed by reinforcement contingencies. Motivation involves a constellation of closely related beliefs, perceptions, values, interests, and actions. Meanwhile, Lahey (2007:365) stated the term motivation refers to an internal state that activates and gives direction to our thoughts.

In other hand, Dirguanarsa in Sobur (2003:270-271) states motive in psychology means stimulating, urge (motivate) or something that cause an action and it is called "motivation act". That act happen because of needs and aim to a goal, so the need is fulfilled and the desire is satisfied. Motive is not only a physic urge but also orientation cognitive elementary those purpose to satisfaction of needs, which is why there is a central concept in psychology called "Needs".

We have touched on only a few of the human motives, but it's already obvious that we are creatures of many and variety needs. Abraham Maslow (1970) put forward an interesting theory about our many motive. According to Maslow, we are not a crazy-quilt confusion of motives; rather, our motives are organized in a hierarchy arranged from the most basic to the most personal and advanced (Lahey, 2007:379). In motivation there is hierarchy of motive (needs), Mashlow hierarchy of motives in which the needs at the bottom are the most urgent and need to be satisfied before attention can be paid to the others. According to Maslow's theory, there are five levels of need that must be satisfied before a person can act unselfishly. The needs are arranged in a hierarchical order. The upward climb is made by satisfying one set of needs at a time. The most basic drives are physiological. After that come the need for safety, then the desire for love, and then the quest for esteem. Note the softening of terminology used to

describe the move up the ladder. We're driven to satisfy the lower needs, but we're *drawn* to meet the higher ones (Alex Sobur, 2003). Maslow's hierarchy of needs categories is the most famous and to make it clearer the writer put it in table:

self-actualization	
Este	em
Belo	ngingness
Safe	ty
Phys	iological

The needs here are in the order of importance in life.

Physiological needs: this are needs which according to Abraham, consist of the basic need of life such as food, shelter, clothing, rest, water. They are the first level of needs for human in life, without which it would be difficult for man to live. Thus failure to satisfy this need will make an individual locked up in that level, but ability to satisfy this need will make an individual move to the next level of needs which is safety and security.

Safety and security: These needs according to Abraham are security from physical attacks, protection from danger. Basically they are the need to know that you are physically protected and your job is secured. According to Abraham once this

needs are satisfied they no longer motivate you instead the next level of need keeps motivating the individual.

Social needs: it is the need to interact and mix up freely with people and have a warmly relationship with people, it also include the need to belong to an organization. After this according to Abraham the next motivating need is esteem needs.

Esteem need: this need is egoistic in nature, it consist of needs such as prestige, status and achievements. That is, it is a need where people want to be recognised wherever they are. They are basically needs for self respect and being valued by others. After this the next is level of needs which continues to motivate the individual is self actualization.

Self actualization: this is similar to becoming what one wishes to become in life, this is a feeling of satisfaction, and it is a feeling that you have done a good job and totally achieved your objectives positively. This however is a difficult stage to achieve; even so Abraham argued that everybody is capable of attaining self actualization. Therefore considering the views and augment under Abraham Maslow level of needs money does not motivate.

2.7 Previous Study

The writer uses four research papers consist of two theses, one journal and one article which correlate with implicature and song to develop her thesis.

 Research by Rudy Haryanto (2008) entitled "A Pragmatic Analysis of Praise Expression Used in English Love Songs".

The study focuses on analyzing song using the theory of implicature.

The problems of this study are what are the forms of praise expression used in English Love Songs and what are the implicature.

The different between Haryanto's research and the writer's are located in the object that is being analyzed. The researcher only focus on English loves song without focusing on certain singer. However, the writer chooses the object with two certain singers who have similarity and theme in their songs.

2. Research by Adhi Hangga Nurzani (2015) entitled "A Pragmatic Analysis of Conversational Implicature in English Zone Coursebook for Senior High School Students Year XI".

The study focus on analyzing English coursbook using the theory of implicature. The problems of this study are identifying the types of conversational implicature that is used in English Zone Coursebook for senior high school year XI and describing the implied meanings of the conversational implicature that is used in English Zone Coursebook for senior high school year XI.

The different between Nurzani's research and the writer's are located in the theory that is being applied. The researcher used conversational implicature proposed by Yule and Levinson and the theory of cooperative principle proposed by Grice. However, the writer only focuses on implicature that shows in songs.

3. Journal by Xiaoliang Zhou (2013) entitled "Implicature: A Significant Feature in Liu Mazi's Lines in Lao She's Cha Guan".

This journal discussed about implicature that show in drama. The aims are to find out the significance of implicature as a feature in the lines of Liu Mazi, a character in *Cha Guan* (Teahouse). To offer an objective perspective on this issue, the researche narrow the research object to one character Liu Mazi and statistically analyzes the use of this pragmatic means in the corpus of those lines.

The differences of Zhou's research and the writer's is located in the method, the researcher use quantitative research specifically a corpus study, that will be carried out on all the conversations conducted between Liu Mazi and other characters in *Cha Guan*. However, there is a similarity of research which located on the workings of implicature.

4. Article by Beth Logan, Andrew Kositsky and Pedro Moreno (2004) entitled "Semantic Analysis of Song Lyrics".

This article discusses about song analysis by used semantic to characterize the content. The aims are to explore whether the application of text analysis techniques to song lyrics provides meaningful information. Of especial interest is whether such analysis can help determine music similarity and whether it augments other, particularly acoustic, information. They therefore apply a standard semantic text analysis technique to a collection of lyrics to investigate the properties of such data. We explore the

use of this analysis to determine artist similarity, comparing the results to a state-of-the-art acoustic similarity technique.

The difference of Logan, Kositsky and Moreno's research and the writer is located on the theory. They use semantic to analyze the object. However, there is a similarity of research which located on the workings of song.

