

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter was deal with relevant theories to this research. In details, this chapter would explain about previous studies and theoretical foundation which involves pragmatics, implicature, cooperative principles, and flouting maxims.

2.1. Previous Studies

There are many researchers that conduct a research about implicature and cooperative principles. The first research has been conducted by Husna (2013), entitled *An Implicature Analysis on "Oh, Brother!" comic strip serials*. This research focused on analyzing comic using theory of implicature and cooperative principles proposed by Grice. The researcher found that there were 45 implicatures which categorized into three; conventional implicature, conversational implicature and scalar implicature. The conversational implicature was the mostly used in this comic. Moreover, the writer also found 4 maxims but maxim of quality was the mostly appear in this comic. There was more than 30 % of violate the maxim of quantity.

The second research was done by Fatmawati et al (2017), entitled *The Implicature in The Play Zootopia Movie*. The writer used a movie script as the object of analysis. From this research, the researcher found that there were four maxims; quantity, quality, relevance and manner. Those 4 maxims are contained in the movie script. But most of the conversation used the maxim of relevance either break or follow the rule.

The last research is about conversational implicature analysis conducted by Risdianto (2016), entitled *A Conversational Implicature Analysis In Oscar Wilde's Short Story Happy Prince*. A qualitative research was used in this study. This research aimed at revealing the implicature utterances and describing the implied meaning uttered by the characters in Oscar Wilde's-Happy Prince. The writer found that there were ten conversational implicatures in this short story. Then, there were some variation meanings of the conversational implicature. They were cooperative, politeness and ironical principle. Moreover, there were six maxims of politeness principle, two maxims of cooperative principles and two maxims of ironical principles.

Overall, the current and previous research have quite similar, they discussed about implicature and cooperative principles using pragmatics approach. Meanwhile, this research also has different thing especially in the object of research. Previous research used some conversations or utterances in the movie script, short story, and comic. While, this current study uses English textbook entitled *Pathway to English* as the object of the study.

2.2. Theoretical Review

2.2.1. Pragmatics

Yule (1996:3) defines pragmatics is the study of how get more communicated than what is said. It means that in a communication, hearers should make inferences to the speaker's implied meaning. People commonly have different ways in using their language to deliver the

messages. Sometime, there is hidden meaning produced by speaker in communication. Interpretation is very important in terms of pragmatics. Yule also defines that pragmatics is the study of contextual meanings. It concerns not only the utterances but also the contexts in the utterances.

Pragmatics concerns to study of the relationships between linguistics forms and the users of those forms. The advantage of studying pragmatics is that one can talk about people's implied meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of action that they are performing when they speak. The big disadvantage is that all these very human concepts are extremely difficult to analyze in a consistent and objective way (Richard, 2000: 67).

Based on the definition above, Pragmatics refers to the study of meaning as produced by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. The meaning which is investigated focuses on the context. It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those. On the other hand, contextual meaning is concerned with the intepretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said.

According to Yule in Fatmawati (2015: 21), pragmatics covers some aspects as follows;

a. Entailment

It is the relationship between two sentences where the truth of one (A) requires the truth of the other (B)

b. Implicature

It is the relationship between two statements where the truth of the one suggests the truth of the other.

c. Presupposition

Presupposition is an assumption about the world whose truth is taken for granted in discourse.

d. Speech act

It is the study of how we do things with utterance. There are basic acts in saying utterance namely: locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act.

e. Deixis

Deixis is the way in which language encode-feature of the context and thus concern ways in which the interpretation of utterance depends on the analysis of that context of utterance.

2.2.2. Implicature

Implicature is the way to describe something which is conveyed beyond the semantic meaning of the words in a conversation, something that adds an extra level of meaning (Yule, 1983:6). Moreover, Grice (1989: 372) said that implicature denotes either the act of meaning, implying, or suggesting one thing by saying something else, or the object of that act. Implicatures can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context, and can be conventional (in different senses) or unconventional. Whereas, Levinson (1983: 98) defines that implicature

promises to bring the gap between what is literally said and what is actually said.

Based on the definition above, implicature is something that speaker suggests or interprets with utterance although it is not explicitly stated by the speakers' partner. The meaning depends on the context that occurs in the conversation.

2.2.2.1. Conventional implicature

Grice (1975: 44) describes that the conventional implicature is not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. It usually does not appear in conversation and it does not need special contexts for the interpretation of meaning. Moreover, conventional implicature is always associated with several words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used. The example of words are *but*, *even*, *therefore*, and *yet* (Thomas 1995:57). The English conjunction "but" is one of those words. Example:

Joe is poor but happy

This sentence describes poverty and happiness is not compatible but in spite of this Joe is still happy. The word "but" will always create the implicature of a sense of contrast. So *Joe is poor but happy* will always necessarily imply "Surprisingly Joe is happy in spite of being poor". Other example of sentence;

she was cursed with a stammer, unmarried but far from stupid

The word “but” in sentence has function to convey the opposite of the expectation which is to say that unmarried people are usually stupid. Other English words such as “even, therefore and yet” also have conventional implicatures. When “even” is joining in any sentence, it describes an event, there is an implicatures of “contrary to expectation”. Other word is “yet”. It presents the situation is expected to be different, or perhaps the opposite, at a later time.

2.2.2.2. Conversational implicature

A conversational implicature is when an utterance in a conversation has more meaning than the words uttered. Thomas (1995:58) provided the example of an ambulance man, who has someone vomit in his lap and utters “*Great, that’s really great! That’s made my Christmas*”. Here something other than the words uttered is being implied; there is an additional set of meaning, the man is actually expressing that he does not enjoy getting vomit all over his lap.

Yule (1996: 40) divides conversational implicature into two types. They are generalized and particularized conversational implicature.

a. Generalized conversational implicature

Levinson (1983: 126) said that generalized conversational implicature is implicature that occurs without any particular context or special knowledge being necessary. As said by Yule (1996: 41), “When no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the

additional conveyed meaning, it is called a generalized conversational implicatures”.

Moreover, Grice (1975: 45) states that this kind of implicature is done by the application of a certain form of words in an utterance (in the absence of special circumstances). He also adds that generalized implicature is a conversational implicature that can be inferred without referring to a special context or knowledge, for example:

John walked into a house yesterday and saw a tortoise.

This utterance can be interpreted that the house is not John’s house. In generalized conversational implicature, a speaker can use the maxim of quantity to invite the inference that no more can be said, as in:

*Charlene : I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.
Dexter : Ah, I brought the bread.*

The sentence above means that Dexter does not bring cheese and it can be understood that the utterance is informative as required for the speaker. A number of other generalized conversational implicature are commonly communicated on the basis of a scale of values and are consequently known as scalar implicatures.

Horn and Ward (2006: 6) has mentioned the lexicon of a language items in scalar implicature which can be arranged in scales. Here are some examples of such scales: (*all, most, many, some, few*); (*and, or*); (*excellent, good*); (*hot, warm*); (*always, often, sometimes*); (*know, believe*); (*certain, probably, possible*).

When producing an utterance, a speaker selects the word from the scale which is the most informative and truthful (quantity and quality) in the circumstances, as the following example:

I am studying linguistics and I've completed some of the required courses.

The use of word “some” in the example above, the speaker creates an implicature (+> not all). So, it can be concluded Generalized Implicature are inferred on the basis inferential heuristics which are derived from (some of).

b. Particularized implicature

A particularized conversational implicature can be understood depending on particular features of the context. Yule (1996: 42) clearly said “Particularized conversational implicature is an implicature where some assumed knowledge is required in very specific contexts during a conversation”. Shortly, this implicature that rely much on the special context, it is can be classified into particularized conversational implicatures (Horn and Ward, 2006: 5).

For example:

A: “I'm so sorry for making you wait in a long time”

B: “That's fine, it just like waiting for one year”

In the context of situation from conversation above shows that the speaker A is asking apologize because A makes B waiting for him in a long time. But in particular context, the hearer B is getting angry

even he says “that’s fine” and he actually feel bored as he says “it just like waiting for one year”.

Shortly, a conversational implicature is an implicature that is applied accordance with pragmatic principles such as the cooperative principle rather than being interpreted from the meaning of a lexical item or a sentence structure.

2.2.3. Cooperative principles

The meaningful conversation depends on the way of speaker make interaction. The way in which people try to make conversations work well is called Cooperative Principle. Cooperative principle can be defined that making conversation with other people by trying to cooperate with them to construct meaningful conversations. Grice (1975) in Yule (1996: 36) suggested that conversation is built based on a shared principle of cooperation, he said, “Make your conversational contribution what is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”. In other words, the speakers should provide meaningful, productive utterance to approach the conversation while listeners should do the same because they are partner in conversaion. Here is an example of cooperative principle:

*Tom : Are you going to Mark’s party tonight?
Annie : My parents are in town.*

The example above shows that speaker have little trouble because she says “My parents are in town”. It can be infered that Annie refuses the invitation. According to Grice (1975: 46), there is a concept of cooperative

principle between speakers and hearers which guide the way how they speak. He divides cooperative principle into four maxims. The four basic maxims are:

2.2.3.1. Maxim of quantity

Grundy (2000: 74) states that maxim of quantity is one of the cooperative principles that concern in giving the information as it is required and is not giving the information more than it is required. Therefore, speakers' and hearers' contribution in conversation should be just as informative as required. It should not be less informative or more informative. In a normal circumstance, the maxim of quantity requires the speaker to say just enough and they are not required to supply less or more information. Example ;

A : Where is the hospital?

B : In the next of that store.

It can be seen that B information is informative and give enough contribution toward A's question about the exact location of hospital.

2.2.3.2. Maxim of quality

Added by Grundy (2000: 74), maxim of quality can be defined as truthful as required. It means the speaker should give information truthly and they are not allowed to say false and give the statement that is not true. Here, speakers are expected to say only what they believe to be true. However, the speaker must aware of this expression, that the hearers expect them to honor the maxim of quality. The maxim of quality requires

that you ; 1) do not say what you believe to be false, 2) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. For example;

A : Where is Borobudur located?
B : In Magelang

Here, B gives the correct answer which shows about the true fact

2.2.3.3. Maxim of relation

Maxim of relation or relevance is the utterance produced by speaker must be relevant with the topic that being discussed. Cutting (2002: 35) states that speakers should give information about something that is relevant with what being discussed before. Furthermore, Grundy (2000: 74) states that maxim of relevance is achieved if the speaker gives information related with the topic. Therefore, each of the speaker or hearer must be relevant to the topic of conversation. Example :

A : How about your score jane?
B : Not too bad

Here, B's utterance fulfilled the maxim of relevance, because the answer is relevant with the question.

2.2.3.4. Maxim of manner

This maxim requires speaker to make utterance not to be ambiguous, obscure, and unnecessary prolixity. Therefore, each participants should contribute well as expected both speaker and hearer, that is, it should not be vague, ambiguous or excessive wordy. Cutting (2002: 35) explains maxim of manner is when the speakers put information briefly and orderly, the speaker must avoid the obscure and ambiguous information from the

hearer. Therefore, each participant must give the information directly and reasonably, and it should not be vague, ambiguous or excessive. Speaker should use the words that hearer knows or understand it. They speaker also should not state something in a long drawn out way if they could say it in a simple manner. For example:

A : What did you think of that drama?

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

B's answer can be stated as maxim of manner because B can answer the question from his partner about the drama clearly.

The explanation of cooperative principles above presents us about how participants make conversation well through cooperative principles and the rules of maxims although it is very difficult to obey and use all of the cooperative principles and its maxims in making utterance or writing the sentences, but it is essential to follow one or more cooperative principle in order to make communication run effectively

2.2.4. Flouting maxim

Another situation of cooperative principles is that when speaker breaks cooperative principles, called flouting the maxim. Grice (1975:49) explained that this condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. In addition, Thomas (1995:65) said that a flouts occurs when a speaker blantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature.

2.2.4.1. Flouting the maxim of quantity

This flout means that a speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity deliberately. It occurs when the speaker provides information either more or less than is required. Look at the example below:

Keenan : Who is the guest ?

*Kylie : Mr. Vijay, a lecturer from Latin. We just met
him in the park.*

In this conversation, the speaker just needs the name of the guest. But, Kylie gives more information. She makes her contribution more than is required. In this occasion, she tries to implicate that ‘the guest is not a stranger’. They already met the guest before.

2.2.4.2. Flouting the maxim of quality

Flouting the maxim of quality means that speakers do not say something that represents what they actually think. The speaker does not meet the maxim of quality because he or she says false thing. The example is “*Marry is so beautiful. She is like an angel*”

This utterance means that there is a girl who is extremely beautiful and very kind. Hence, to describe the prettiness and the kindness of the girl, the speaker refers her to an angel. The strategy used in this utterance is metaphor, the way of speaking that referring a person to something which has the similiar characteristics (Andresen, 2013:8).

2.2.4.3. Flouting the maxim of relation

This flouting maxim appears when the speaker says something which is not relevant to topic being discussed. It means that they have

flouted the maxim of relation. They are being irrelevant for the reasons that they want to say implicitly or hide something to the addressee. Look at the conversation below:

A : What time is it ?

B : Look! The second class is begin.

From that conversation, there is no clear connection between A's question with B's answer. "Look! The second class is begin" as the response of A's question has violated the maxim of relation since B seems not directly answer A's question. In this case, both of them are classmates in a same university and they already know about their schedule of their class. Hence, the response has an implicature: when the second class is begin means that at that time is around 8.40 a.m.

2.2.4.4. Flouting the maxim of manner

Flouting maxim of manner is when speakers make ambiguous utterance or expression. They do not speak perspicuously and they do not speak briefly nor orderly. Notice the example below:

Interviewer : Did the US Government play any part in the Duvalier's departure? Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?

Official : I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion.

In this conversation, the person who is answering the interview's question is not being deliberately unhelpful since the person could have refrained from responding or said "No comment". The implicature in this case tells the interviewer that the official does not want to admit to their involvement directly, but does so indirectly by not being direct with the answer (Thomas 1995:71).