

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Pragmatics

The theory that I am going to use for analyzing the data is Pragmatics. Pragmatics is one of sub-divisions of Linguistics. Pragmatics is “The study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the users of those forms” (Yule 4).

Therefore, I conclude that pragmatics is the study of the intended meaning through a speaker’s utterance interpreted by a hearer. According to Jenny Thomas, Pragmatics is a meaning of interaction which means that:

This reflects the view that meaning is not something which is inherent in the words alone, nor is it produced by the speaker alone, nor by the hearer alone. Making meaning is a dynamic process, involving the negotiation of meaning between a speaker and a hearer, the context of utterance (physical, social and linguistic) and the meaning potential of an utterance” (Thomas 1).

2.2 Cooperative Principle

In general, people tend to refuse to be cooperative in speaking, they cannot give a clear utterance or can be known as the implied meaning (implicature) in their utterance. In order to make a conversation run smoothly, people who are involved in the conversation have to know about cooperative principle. When people are cooperative, they can avoid having a conflict with their listener, or else the conflict itself will rarely occur.

According to Grice, cooperative principle could make the conversation run smoothly, “Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of talk exchange in which you are engaged.” (Thomas 56)

2.3 Implicature

Generally, implicature can happen because people give such an unclear utterance to their listener. As a result, people can misunderstand the utterance. Specifically, implicature is the meaning of what they want to deliver to a listener which is not stated directly. (Thomas 57)

2.3.1 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature is different from conversational implicature. Conventional implicature does not occur in a form of dialogue. According to Grice, in conventional implicature, the implied meaning lies within the words. For example: but; even; therefore and yet (Thomas 57). It can be seen in the following sentence: She is clever but she is lazy. (Yule 148)

From the example above, the statement carries an implicature. It means that after stating that she is clever, actually the statement can be fallen into another expectation that she has the opposite meaning which states that she is lazy. The word *but* carries the meaning of the opposition apart from the context. (Yule 148)

2.3.2 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is associated with the cooperative principle and four conversational maxims which are proposed by Grice. According to him, the cooperative principle and four conversational maxims are needed to make a conversation run smoothly. According to Thomas, the cooperative principle must, “Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of talk exchange in which you are engaged.” (58)

For example:

Carol: Are you coming to the party tonight?

Lara: I've got an exam tomorrow. (Yule 149)

From the example above, Lara's utterance actually does not answer Carol's question because she does not say “yes” or “no”. It is possible for Carol to think about a possible meaning of her utterance which can be “no” or probably “not”. Considering the four types of non-observance of the conversational maxim which are explained by Grice, Lara's statement can be categorized as flouting the maxim of quantity and relation. Lara flouts the maxim of quantity because she does not give a clear answer by saying “yes” or “no” toward Carol's question; moreover, she flouts the maxim of relation because she gives an answer which is unrelated with Carol's question at all.

Therefore, Lara's utterance carries an implicature explaining that tonight's activities are not just about a simple utterance but also about tomorrow's activities. In order to describe the conversational implicature involved in Lara's statement, we have to know some background knowledge; for example, about exams, studying and partying that must be shared by people who are involved in a conversation. (Yule 149)

Referring to the previous explanation, there are four types of flouting a maxim which are explained in detail by Grice, namely the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner.

2.3.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

According to Grice, the maxim of quantity would run smoothly by obeying the rule which says, "Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange). And do not make your contribution more informative than is required" (Yule 64). Grice also says, "A speaker flouts the maxim of quantity by blatantly giving either more or less information than the situation demands" (Thomas 69).

For example:

A: How are we getting there?

B: Well we're getting there in Dave's car. (Thomas 69)

From the example above, B flouts the maxim of quantity. B flouts the maxim of quantity because B gives less information than is required by A. B seems to have a plan not to take A to go with her. Thus, her utterance carries an

implicature. The implicature is that she actually does not want to go with A. (Thomas 69)

2.3.2.2 Maxim of Quality

According to Grice, the maxim of quality would run smoothly by obeying the rule which says, “Try to make a correct information. Do not say what you believe to be false. And do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence” (Yule 64). Grice also says, “Flouting the maxim of quality occurs when the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue and for which he or she lacks adequate evidence. By flouting the quality maxim, again the speaker wishes or even forces the hearer to look for another plausible interpretation” (Thomas 67).

For example:

The ambulance man has expressed pleasure at having someone vomit over him. (Thomas 67)

From the example above, the utterance flouts the maxim of quality. It flouts the maxim of quality because it gives information which is blatantly untrue or false. It means that the ambulance man does not actually want to express his pleasure after someone vomits over him. The utterance carries an implicature. The implicature is actually the ambulance man wants to express his opposite feeling after the stranger vomits over him. (Thomas 67)

2.3.2.3 Maxim of Relation

According to Grice, the maxim of relation would run smoothly by obeying the rule which says that we should be relevant. Grice also explains, “A speaker

flouts the maxim of relation by making a response obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand. This can be done by suddenly changing the subject or by overtly failing to address the other person's goal in asking a question" (Thomas 70).

For example:

I finished working on my face. I grabbed my bag and a coat. I told Mother I was going out... She asked me where I was going. I repeated myself, 'Out.' (Thomas 70)

From the example above, Olivia flouts the maxim of relation. She flouts the maxim of relation because she fails to achieve her mother's goal in asking the question. She does not give a certain answer toward her mother's question. Therefore, her mother knows that Olivia is going out, but she wants know to where actually Olivia is going. (Thomas 70)

2.3.2.4 Maxim of Manner

According to Grice, the maxim of manner would run smoothly if people obey the rule like, "Be clever. Avoid obscurity of expression. Avoid ambiguity. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity). And be orderly" (Yule 64). Grice also says, "A speaker flouts the maxim of manner when a speaker makes a long-winded response. The speaker actually can just give a simple response" (Thomas 71).

For example:

This interaction occurred during a radio interview with an unnamed official from the United States Embassy in Port-au-Prince Haiti:
Interviewer: Did the United States Government play any part in David's

departure? Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?

Official: I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion. (Thomas 71)

From the example above, the official flouts the maxim of manner since she actually can simply say “yes”. However, from the situation above, it seems that she makes a long-winded response toward the interviewer’s utterance. She does not say something directly. She does that because she wants to make the interviewer look for the implied meaning toward the interviewer’s utterance. (Thomas 71)

Besides, Grice, proposes types of non-observances of the conversational maxims. They are violating a maxim, infringing a maxim, opting out of a maxim and suspending a maxim. According to Grice, they are formulated as follows:

2.3.2.5 Violating a Maxim

This type of non-observance happens when a speaker gives such an answer which has an implied meaning. According to Grice, this happens when a speaker is inclined to mislead (Thomas 72). In other words, the speaker wants to lead the hearer to have another understanding to believe in what actually happens.

For example:

Alice has been refusing to make love to her husband, Martin. At first, he attributes her refusal to post-natal depression, but then he starts to think she may be having an affair.

Martin: Alice, is there another man?

Alice: No, there isn't another man. (Thomas 72)

From the example above, Alice violates a maxim. She violates a maxim because she seems to want to mislead Martin to have another thought about what he has already asked before. She does that because she wants to keep the truth that she actually has an affair with a woman not a man. (Thomas 72)

2.3.2.6 Infringing a Maxim

Infringing a maxim happens when the speaker actually gives an unusual response, because they have an imperfect linguistic performance experienced by a foreign learner or a young child. According to Grice, in the case, a maxim is infringed “ ... because of the speaker’s impairment in some ways such as nervousness, drunkenness or excitement” (Thomas 74).

2.3.2.7 Opting out of a Maxim

According to Grice, a speaker opts out of observing a maxim by indicating unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. The example of opting out frequently happens in public life. It happens when a speaker cannot reply normally because of legal or ethical reasons. According to Thomas, a speaker might also opt out of a maxim because the requested information might hurt “a third party” or “put them in danger”. (Thomas 74)

For example:

1. If the situation might hurt a third party.

Ruth Rendell, a famous crime novelist, was being interviewed by an equally famous psychiatrist, Prof Anthony Clare. Clare asked Rendell about her husband.

AC: You married him twice. You've been interviewed many times, but I've never seen a satisfactory explanation for that very interesting about her husband.

RR: Well (pause) I don't think I can give you one. That is not to say that I don't know it but I do know it but I cannot give it. I don't think that to give it would be a very good idea, particularly for my husband.

2. When a situation might put them in danger.

Caller: ... um I lived in uh a country where people sometimes need to flee that country.

Ross: Uh, where was that?

Caller: It's a country in Asia and I don't want to say any more. (Thomas 74)

2.3.2.8 Suspending a Maxim

A maxim can usually be suspended when the suspension is allowed to happen by the circumstances, events and also the culture. According to Grice, in the case “there is no need to opt out of a maxim because the participants involved understand the need to have suspension” (Thomas 76).

For example:

In the acting community in Britain, people refrain from uttering the name

of Shakespeare's play Macbeth because to do so is supposed to bring bad luck. Therefore, they refer to it as The Scottish Play. (Thomas 76)

2.4 Conflict

Generally, people who are involved in a conversation can have a conflict, because sometimes their interlocutor refuses to be cooperative in speaking. Conflict can happen in some different situations and it can be caused by some particular reasons.

According to Perrine, conflict is, "A clash of actions, ideas, desires, or wills. In others it is multiple, various and subtle. A person may be in conflict with other persons, with society or nature, and with himself, all at the same time, and sometimes he may be involved in conflict without being aware of it" (44).

(2,110 words)