CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

This chapter presents the grand theory used in the research, as well as other supporting theories which help completing the analysis. The grand theory is Politeness Maxim supported by other theories: Pragmatics, Speech Acts, and Pragmatic Scales.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics, according to George Yule (1996:3), has four different areas in which this study concerns. The first is that pragmatics is a study of what the speaker means. The next is that pragmatics is the study of meaning obtained from context which is also known as contextual meaning. Also, it is a study of how one utterance can have a deeper meaning more than just it is uttered. The last is that pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. Based on these definitions, it can be concluded that pragmatics not only concerns with literal meaning in an utterance but also with several aspects surrounding the utterance. The speaker's intention, implicature of an utterance, and context are some of them.

2.1.1 Aspect of Pragmatics

Geoffrey Leech (1983:13) then introduced two of many aspects of pragmatics. The first one is the aspect of the participants, addresser and addressee

or can also be said as speaker and listener. The second one is the aspect of context which specifically concerns with the situation surrounding one utterance which can determine the actual meaning. These two aspects are the ones that are used in this research.

2.1.1.1 Addresser and Addressee

The first of these two aspects is called the addresser and the addressee or also known as speaker and listener. The addresser or the speaker is the one who expresses utterances, who sends the messages. The addressee or the listener is the one who receives the messages from the speaker. This specific aspect is chosen and used as the purpose of this research is to find the intention and implicature of utterances which requires the analysis to see the aspect of the speaker or the listener.

In uttering an utterance specifically an impositive or commissive, the speaker must have an intention and within the utterance, there lies an implicature that can be taken. The intention and implicature of the utterance can be used to measure which party gets the cost and which party gets the benefit—to the speaker or the listener. Therefore, this aspect is essential in determining the violation of politeness maxim.

2.1.1.2 Situational Context

The next one is called the context. It means that the context surrounding the utterance being uttered is considered as an important factor. So, to fully understand one utterance or obtain the actual meaning of it, the context is then used. The context itself concerns about the participants, the location where one utterance

expressed, and under what condition the utterance is expressed. This aspect is chosen and used in this research as to acquire the actual meaning of the utterance which could lead to the discovery of the intention and the implicature, it is very essential to see the context. As a result, the objectives of this research would be then successfully reached.

The importance of context in discovering the actual meaning of utterances would be shown in the following example:

(a) Here, have another sandwich!

From the example of (a), it can be seen that the speaker intends to give a sandwich to the listener. 'Another' indicates that the listener has had one before this utterance was expressed. So, it seems that it is a nice gesture from the speaker seeing what he offers. However, if the context differs from what it looks which can change the intention of the speaker, it can no longer be considered as a nice gesture. For instance, the utterance has a context that the sandwich the speaker offers is known to be contained with rotten vegetables by the listener. It is because of the previous one the listener had. The speaker is also aware of it, but, still, he wants to give it to the listener—having intention of making the listener sick. So, from the explanation, it can be seen that intention can change the meaning of one utterance. So, the meaning of the utterance may have different meaning depending of the situation, the context. Consequently, this is the reason why the aspect of situational context is important and used in this research.

2.1.2 Speaker Implicature and Intention

In uttering an utterance, especially impositive and commissive utterances, a speaker must have an intention as to why he utters the utterance. When one speaker says he wants to give money to the listener, it means that he intends to do something that benefit the listener. However, sometimes, the actual meaning of the utterance is well hidden and it can only be understood by certain people who meant to understand it or who can read the pragmatics aspects surrounding the utterance. If the speaker wants to give money to the listener because he wants something in return, it means that there is a hidden meaning implied in the utterance. This phenomena is called implicature. To understand what implies within the utterance, the listener should know what intention the speaker has in uttering the utterance.

2.1.2.1 Implicature

Implicature is a theory that first introduced by Herbert Paul Grice in 1975. According to him, implicature is a way of one speaker to express one thing by expressing something else. So, one utterance would mean different than what appears in the language expression (Grice: 1975). Grice introduced this theory to categorize the case in which there is a distinction in meaning from what one speaker says. In order to understand implicature, listeners have to infer what speakers actually mean by saying utterances or what speakers implicate in utterances.

Regarding the reason, there are several goals in using implicature in communication. The first is maintaining good social relation. It means that in order to keep a good social relation, a speaker must try to not use language expression

that would make the relation bad and implicature can be used as a way to do that. The next is misleading without lying. It means that a speaker could speak in one language expression whose meaning is to give misleading information but it cannot be considered as lie. The next is style and verbal efficiency. Implicature can be used as a style of one speaker in expressing language but in order for his implicature to be understood, he must know to whom he speaks by using this style. It is also considered as verbal efficiency as one utterance can have more than one meaning. In short, these goals are the reasons as to why a speaker implies the actual meaning in uttering one utterance.

2.1.2.2 Intention

Grice stated in order to implicate something for a speaker, he must express an utterance whose actual meaning is hidden within the utterance (Grice: 1975). Thus, it means that he must say something else in order to mean something. For that reason, what one speaker means in uttering one utterance could be determined by his intentions. When a listener understands the intention of one speaker in uttering an utterance, the implicature or the implicated messages will then be conveyed successfully. If not, then it will mislead the listener from what the speaker actually intends. To sum up, intention can be used to see implied messages in utterances thus the actual meaning will then be understood by the listeners.

2.2 Speech Acts

In expressing language, there are many purposes. One could tell what he feels, ask what he wants, or greet others (Kreidler: 1998). So, various functions could present in uttering one utterance, depending on situation occurs and the intention of one utterer. For that reason, speech acts theory was introduced. Kreidler (1998:176) mentions that there are seven commonly known speech acts which are separated by their general purposes.

Usually, sentences are only divided by declaratives, imperatives, and interrogatives. Declarative is used when we express our feeling, tell what we know, or make a statement. Imperatives is used when we ask for something, give command, or request action. Interrogative is used when we question something or ask information. However, these categories are only made based on the structures not the actual meaning. For example, when we use interrogative sentence, it only means that we ask for information while actually it could mean something else, based on the speaker's intention.

On the other hand, there is theory of speech acts that defines more in separating utterances based on general purposes than those three categories. Speech acts (Kreidler: 1998) has seven categories. Those are Assertives, Performative, Verdictive, Expressive, Directive, Commissive, and Phatic utterance. However, as tact and generosity maxim are only applied in impositive or directive and commissive utterances, only these two kinds of utterance that are explained.

2.2.1 Directive or Impositive Utterance

The function of this kind of utterance is to ask the listener to do something or perform action. The subject of the utterance is the second person *You* as an actor whether it is shown or not. There are three kinds of directive utterance: commands, requests, and suggestions (Kreidler: 1998). Commands are where we ask the listener to perform action. Requests are where we beg the listener to do or refrain the action from doing. Suggestions are where we tell the listener what to do or give recommendations.

(b) Go make some money!
(c) Eat my pancake!

In (b), the speaker expresses an utterance which requires the listener to do a particular thing. The speaker wants the listener to work to get some money. Therefore, as the utterance requires the listener to do something, this utterance is categorized as impositive. Likewise, in (c), the speaker also asks the listener to do a particular thing. He asks the listener to eat his pancake. It is certainly a command as it requires the listener to take an action. Consequently, as both of these two examples show that the speaker asks the listener to do something, they are categorized as impositive.

2.2.2 Commissive Utterance

The function of this kind of utterance is to make the listener knows that the speakers are about to do something or perform an action. Promises, pledges, threats, and vows are the ones categorized as Commissive. A commissive utterance is used

to commit oneself in doing something or promising to do something in the future. (Kreidler: 1998)

(d) I will take care of you.
(e) I promise to make you happy.

These two utterances are the example of Commissive. Both examples show that the speaker commits to do something or perform actions in the future. In (d), the speaker commits to do a certain thing for the listener; he wants to take care of the listener. Thus, it is categorized as commissive utterance. Similarly, in (e), the speaker also wants to commit himself to do something for the listener. He promises to make the listener happy. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as commissive.

2.3 Politeness Maxim

Politeness Maxim is a group of maxim introduced by Geoffrey Leech (1983:133). This particular set of maxim concerns with polite manner in expressing language. These maxims can be used as one of many ways to measure whether utterances are more or less polite. There are six maxims contained in it. Those are tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. Leech specifies the rules for each maxims. The rules itself centers on maximizing one thing, and minimizing the other opposite thing. Nonetheless, every maxims always involves with either the speaker or the listener. However, in this research, there are only two maxims chosen. Those are tact and generosity maxim. For that reason, only these two maxim that are described thoroughly.

2.3.1 Tact Maxim

Tact is one of the six maxim contained politeness maxim. According to Leech (1983:132), in this maxim, there are only two kinds of utterances that can be categorized as tact. Those are impositive utterance whose function is to give commands and commissive utterance whose function is to give promise or a will to do something. The rule of this maxim is that oneself should maximize benefit for other and minimize cost to other. It means that in giving order or committing to do something for somebody, the speaker must give benefits to the listener and does not give cost to the listener. **Therefore, if this rule is broken or the speaker gives cost rather than benefit to the listener, it is then considered as the violation of tact maxim.** The example of tact maxim is as follows:

(f) You haven't eaten anything since this morning, **go eat some food!**

(g) I will help you in making this paper

In (f), the speaker understands that the listener has not yet eaten since morning, thus he commands the listener to do something which is to eat some food. This impositive utterance gives the benefit for the listener as if the listener follows the speaker's order, the listener will no longer feel hungry. In (g), the speaker intends to help the listener by uttering that commissive utterance. The listener will get the benefit from the action committed to do by the speaker. In conclusion, as both of these utterances give benefit for the listener, these utterances have followed the rule of tact maxim.

However, the violation of tact maxim will occur if the speaker give cost the listener instead of benefit. The example of tact maxim violation is as follows:

(h) Mom, go tidy up my room!

(i) I will make you suffer.

In (h), the speaker commands the listener to tidy his room up. As it is not the listener's room the speaker ask to be tidied up and speaker requires the listener to take action, the listener will get the cost and not get the benefit. Therefore, the speaker has violated the tact maxim as he does not follow its rule. In (i), the speaker intends to do something to the listener. He commits to make the listener suffer. Thus, as the listener will get the cost from the action the speaker wants to do, this commissive utterance also has violated the tact maxim. In short, as both of the examples show that the speaker gives cost rather than benefit to the listener, these utterances have not followed the tact maxim rule which are considered as violation.

2.3.2 Generosity Maxim

Generosity maxim is another one of the six maxim of politeness proposed by Geoffrey Leech (1983:132). Similar to tact, kinds of utterances that can be categorized as generosity are only two, impositive and commissive. Impositive utterance has a function of giving command or asking somebody to do something while commissive utterance has a function of willingly committing to do something for somebody. Leech stated that the rule of this maxim is to maximize cost and minimize benefit to self. It means that in giving command or committing to do

something for other, we have to make sure that we do not obtain benefits from it, instead we have to get cost. The examples of this maxim can be seen below.

(j) Here, just use my money if you really want that book! I'll walk on my way back home.

(k) I'm also already late to work, but I will take you there first if it's really important.

In (j), the speaker has money only enough to use it for getting back home by using public transportation. However, he is willing to give it to the listener as he knows the listener needs it to buy a book. Thus, he commands the listener to just use his money so that the listener can buy that book even though it will cost him as he cannot take public transportation to get back home. This impositive utterance does cost the speaker as he will lose the only money he has. Also, the action the speaker asks to the listener will make the speaker get no benefits whatsoever. In (k), the speaker, same as the listener, says that he is already late but anyway he offers to do something for the listener. He, even though it is already late for him, still offers to give the listener a ride to a place where the listener needs to be. Thus, this commissive utterance will cost the speaker as he will be coming to work even later than it already is. The speaker will also get no benefits from this committed action. These two examples show that the speaker has fulfilled the rules of generosity maxim as he gains no benefits but gains cost from either utterances.

On the other hand, the violation of generosity maxim can occur if its rules has not been followed by the speaker. The examples of generosity maxim violation can been below.

(l) Go make me a sandwich, I'm hungry!

(m)I know you're late to work, but I will make you drive me to school first.

In (l), the speaker asks the listener to do something for him. As he states himself that he is hungry, he commands the listener to make him a sandwich. Thus, if the listener follows his order, the speaker will get benefits which is having a sandwich to eat so that he will no longer feel hungry. The action the speaker commands also will not cost the speaker. In (m), knowing the listener is late to work, the speaker commits do to something that will make the listener to do something for him. He states that he will make the listener to drive him to school before the speaker goes to work. Therefore, this action will make the speaker obtain benefits while no cost will be gotten by him. These two examples show that the rules of generosity maxim have not been followed. Thus, these two utterances have violated the generosity maxim.

2.4 Pragmatic Scales: Cost/benefit Scale

In expressing language, especially regarding politeness, there has to be something to measure how polite an utterance is. Regarding this matter, Leech (1983:123) also introduced *Pragmatic Scales* theory to see the measurement of one utterance. He stated *"Pragmatic Scales is a polite and impolite beliefs that could be favorable or unfavorable whether it is to the speaker or to the listener*". There

are five scales proposed by Leech in Pragmatic Scales theory. Those are cost/benefit, optionality, indirectness, power/authority, and social scale. However, as this research only focuses only on tact and generosity maxim which focus on the cost and benefits of the speaker or the listener, only one pragmatic scale is chosen in this research which is the cost/benefit scale.

As can be seen from the name, cost/benefit scale only centers on the cost and benefit for either the speaker or the listener. Leech (1998:123) stated that this scale is used to measure the cost and the benefit of an action proposed by the speaker. So, an utterance is measured by seeing the amount of the cost and benefit to see which party gets cost or benefits the most. Therefore, by using this scale, one utterance can be determined whether it is a tact maxim, generosity maxim, or even the violation of one or both of them.

For example, the speaker states *"it's raining outside, use my umbrella!"* The speaker is aware that the listener is about to go out and he knows that it is raining. Thus, he asks the listener to use his umbrella. As a result, the listener will get the benefit from this action as he is not going to be wet when he gets outside. Moreover, the listener will also not get the cost from this action as it benefits him the most. So, as the cost and the benefit has been measured to which it goes, the kind of maxim can now be determined. It is a tact maxim as the benefit goes to the listener.