CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one of linguistic branches elaborating the study in which the context contributes to the meaning. Besides, pragmatics can be a study how people understand a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation or in a conversation. It means to achieve the meaning in the certain speech situation, the context has to be included and considered appropriately. As stated by Parret (1983:89), "pragmatic is the discipline which connects meaning and the signifying process with use in all kinds of context, with reasoning, and understanding."

Basically, pragmatics and semantics have the similarity; they are concerned on how to deal with meaning. Richard in Trigia (2006:9) gave an opinion about the relation between Pragmatics and Semantics, "Pragmatics is sometimes contrasted with semantics, which deals with literal or sentence meaning: that is, meaning without references to users or purpose of communication." Leech (1983:6), however, assumed the difference of them is that semantics traditionally deals with the meaning as a dyadic relation, whereas pragmatics deals with meaning as triadic relation. In other words, pragmatic is not only defined relative to the speaker and hearer but also to particular situations.

McManis (1988:197) also declared pragmatics cannot be separated from the context, "the study of the contribution of context to meaning... Pragmatics

concerns itself with how people use language within a context and why they use language in particular ways". Besides, Brown and Yule (1983:26) also agree with the argument that pragmatics is very closed with the context, "..any analitic approach in linguistics which involves contextual consideration. Necessarily belongs to that area of language study called pragmatics."

Furthermore, Murcia (2000:19) stated pragmatics is "...the study of relationship holding between linguistic forms and the human beings who use these forms". It happens since human being is a part of linguistics, when somebody talked something to the others automatically; he was involved in linguistics term by his conversations.

To sum up, Pragmatics is a study exploring the relationship between people and meaning in communication by comprehending the contextual situation. It also explains the reason why people use language in particular ways by comprehending the contexts.

2.2 Context

Pragmatics is concerned with the meaning in relation to a speech situation that cannot be separated with the context. It means that context is relevant to the determination of what is said. The explanation of the context in the conversation can be helpful to find the goals of the speaker in utterance as stated by Leech (1983:13) "any background of knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer and which contributes to hearer's interpretation of what speaker means by a given utterance".

Besides, Djajasudarma (1994:29) argued "*konteks dalam wacana dibentuk oleh berbagai unsur seperti situasi, penutur, petutur, waktu, tempat, adegan, topic, bentuk amanat, kode dan saluran."* It means whole aspects; situation, speaker, hearer, time, place, act, topic, message, code and genre, can be the features to understand the intention of the speaker in using language.

McManis (1988:197) defined the context into four parts:

1. Context of Physic: where the conversation takes place, what object are present, and what action is taking place.

   For example, when a mother tells a bedtime story to her kids by reading the story book, mostly the situation takes place in the kids' room a minutes before they are going to sleep in the night. The object is the telling of the story. In addition, the action is shown by the process of telling the story by the mother and the kids listen that story.
2. Context of Epistemic: background knowledge shared by speaker and hearers.

   For example, the kids often feel lonely because their mother is a career woman who always go abroad every Monday till Friday. Their mother only reads the bedtime story in the weekend. That is the reason why the kids become happier in the weekend than in the weekdays.
3. Context of Linguistics: Utterance previous to the utterances under consideration.

For example, before telling about the bedtime story, the mother also asks about their activity they did in that day and shares the experience she got to the kids.

4. Context of Social: The social relationship of the speaker and hearer.

   For example, the relationship is between the mother and her kids.

2.3 Conversation

Coversation is an activity of social interaction that is influenced by social environment, as stated by Verschueren (1999:50) that conversation is interaction between two or more people as co-ordinate and collaborative social action. It is same as stated by Grice, conversation is a rational and cooperative activity when the participants can be cooperative between one and another.

Conversation is an activity of talking to somebody informally by giving a statement, opinion, idea, or everyday matters to reach certain goal. In other words, it can be a tool to exchange information between speaker and hearer by conducting oral interaction. However, in the conversation, there is not only to exchange the information, but also to express feelings to the others.

Besides, as stated by Richards in Trigia (2006:11) "conversation is seen as an activity which is directed to social goals (e.g. The establishment of roles, presentation of self) as well as the linguistics goals (communication meaning)"; conversation relates to linguistic field since there is a meaning beyond the communication in conversation. Sometimes the speaker does not deliver the meaning explicitly.

2.3.1 Conversational Implicature

In the conversation, the speaker may often mean to deliver the message implicitly in certain goals. He often expresses the meaning beyond the word used and it has to be understood by the hearer. Grice in Levinson (1983:101) stated that "....the concept of implicature, is essentially a theory about how people use the language."

Implicature, according to Horn and Ward (2000:3), is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. It means that when the speaker says something, the hearer may construct what the speaker says and then conclude what actually the speaker means. They also stated that (2000:6) conversational implicature derives from the share presumption that speaker and hearer are interacting rationally and cooperatively to reach a common goal.

The term of implicature can be used to know what exactly the purposes of the speaker using the language. As stated by Grice in Yule (1983:31), the purposes of the speaker can be known by analyzing the conversational implicature and the purposes are :

1. Imply

   It means that the speaker expresses something indirectly by using inference.

   For example :

   X : I think I have to finish the assigment right now.

   Z : Ok. We'll delay to go to Jakarta.

The possible inference of speaker X is that he doesn't want to go to Jakarta by giving the statement that he has to finish the assigment in that time.

2. Suggest

   It means that the speaker refers something or somebody for consideration.

   For example :

   A : My mother has to take a care in hospital.

   B : I have a cousin who is a doctor in the bonafide hospital.

   The possible inference is that B suggest A to take his mother to the hospital where B's cousin works in.

3. Mean

   It means that the speaker intends to do something.

   For example :

   Y : I do not have a breakfast.

   Z : Let's go.

   The possible inference is that Z intends to invite Y to go to a place where they can have a meal.

The examples above are the conversational implicature where the speaker and hearer can be coorperative in inferring the message, although the messages are implicitly delivered.

2.3.1.1 Cooperative Principles

The message in a communication will be successfully delivered by speaker to hearer if they can build cooperation one and another. Even less, the speaker often means more than what he/she literally says and it is not easy to be comprehended by hearer. Grice argued some kinds of cooperative principles must be assumed to be in operation. Thus Grice (1983:32) stated the cooperative principles that have to be conducted appropriately, "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."

According to the cooperative principles above, Grice also stated the other cooperative principles where in common conversation, the speakers and hearers share the cooperative principles. The speakers shape their utterances to be understood by hearers. The cooperative principles involve four maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Speakers give enough and not too informative contribution: quantity. They are genuine and sincere, speaking the truth or facts: quality. The utterances are relative to the context of the speech: relation. Speakers try to present the meaning clearly and concisely, in order to avoid the ambiguity: manner as stated follows.

> *Maxim of quality:*
> *Do not say what you believe to be false*
> *Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.*
> *Maxim of quantity:*
> *Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).*
> *Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.*
> *Maxim of relevant:*
> *Be relevant.*
> *Maxim of manner:*

Be perspicuous.
Avoid obscurity of expression.
Avoid ambiguity.
Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
Be orderly.

2.3.1.1.1 Maxim of Quantity

Quantity is about amount. Maxim of quantity means that speakers should be as informative as is required, that they should give neither too little information nor too much. Grice stated the rule of maxim of quantity as follows:

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

The following conversation is the example of the conversation that the speaker and hearer obey the maxim of quantity by giving the required contribution.

Gail : how far you can run without stopping?
Kim : twenty-four miles.
Gail : I guess you can't run a whole marathon without stopping
Kim : Nonsense, I've done it a number of times.

2.3.1.1.2 Violating the Maxim of quantity

If the speaker does not obey the maxim it means he/she has violated the maxim. In some cases, the speaker violates the maxim intentionally to certain purposes. When speaker gives more or less informative contribution than it is required, it can be said as violating the maxim of quantity. When someone

violates the maxim of quantity, there is a message implied which is wrapped in being economical with the truth.

a. Giving Less Informative Contribution

Some speakers like to point to the fact that they know how much information the hearer requires or can be bothered with. The speaker giving less informative contribution risk the hearer cannot be able to identify what he is talking about because of making not enough information. The following conversation is the example when the speaker violates the maxim of quantity by giving less informative contribution.

Ann : My sister is very clever. She always gets best score in the class.

John : I don't think so.

In above conversation, Ann violates the maxim of quantity because she does not give the informative contribution. She only says her sister without mentioning the specific information about her. The impact is that there is the misunderstanding between them. Actually, she has two sisters in her family. The older sister is studying in the university; she is very clever and the other one is still studying in the same school as Ann and John; she is very lazy. Ann does not mention that the sister they are talking about is the older one. Whereas John thinks that the sister she means is the young one.

b. Giving More Informative Contribution

The speaker who gives more informative contribution than the hearer needs risk boring them. However, by violating the maxim of quantity, the given statement can be the stronger, or more informative, that can be made in the situation, as shown in the following example based on Cook in Paltridge (2000:41).

Judge : "What did you do on Friday?"

Witness : "I woke up in bed. I was in bed. I was wearing pajamas. After lying still for a view minutes, I threw back the duvet., got out of bed, walked to the door of the bedroom, opened the door, switched on the landing light, walked across the landing, opened the bathroom door, went into the bathroom, put the basin plug into the plughole, turned on the hot tap, ran some hot water into the washbasin, looked in the mirror."

In this case, the witness has violated the maxim of quantity in order to be truthful for explaining the facts. It means that the violation of maxim of quantity can be resulted in order to make the message more clearly delivered.

The violation of maxim of quantity is not always impacted to occur a misunderstanding between speaker and hearer. Sometimes the speaker has to

violate the maxim of quantity in some case. As stated by Cook in Paltridge (2000:41), there is a situation where someone has to violate the maxim.

Besides, the speaker is possible to violate more than one maxim in the same time, as stated by Tupan and Natalia (2008:64) and Levinson (1983:102) as shown in the following example.

A : Where's Bill?

B : There's a yellow VW outside Sue's house

B's contribution fails to answer A's quaestion and seems to violate the maxim of quantity because B gives more informative contribution than A's required. In addition, B's contribution violates the maxim of relevant because B's answer is not relevant with A's question. However, in this research, the writer just focus on analyzing the violation of maxim of quantity accouring in the common conversation as making a statement.

2.3.2 Speech Act

In the conversation, as explained in the previous, the speaker can mean more than what he literary says to indicate something. Speech act is an utterance which has both a literal meaning and a particular illocutionary force. Austin in Levinson (1983:236) argues that there are three basic acts occurring in any sentence or utterance.

1. Locutionary Act

   It is the utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference. It means it refers to the literal meaning of the actual words. For instead, if the speaker says “I sell some beautiful dresses”, the locutionary act is that there is someone selling some beautiful dresses.

2. Illocutionary act

   It is the making of a statement, offering, promissing in uttering a sentence. Illocutionary is an act performed in saying something. In other word, it can be said as the intention of someone in saying the utterance. For example, if the speaker says “I sell some beautiful dresses”, the illocutionary act is that there is someone offering some beautiful dress to other.

3. Perlocutionary Act

   Performing an act by saying something. It is the bringing about effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of utterance. It means that it refers to the effect of the speaker intention. For example, if speaker says “I sell some beautiful dresses”, the perlocutionary act is that there is someone buying his dresses.