

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews some related topics covering Pragmatics, Cooperative Principle, Hedging maxims, Situational context and some previous studies related to this topic.

A. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a science that examines the meaning of relation to the speakers. There are many benefits gained when learning language with a pragmatic approach. Yule (1996) says that pragmatics is the study of relationship between form and linguistics users of reviews those forms. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meanings, reviews their assumptions, reviews their purposes or goals, and the kind of actions (for example, request) that they are performing when they speak.

Still according to Yule, pragmatics studies including the study of interpretation of a person's intent when speaking in a particular context and how context greatly affects what was discussed. Leech (1991: 18) defines pragmatics as "the study of meaning in relation to speech situations". Leech looked pragmatic meaning attributed the user language ("What did you mean by X?") so that the meaning pragmatics here is different from semantic meaning ("What does X mean?"). While, Fraser(in Schmidt, 1996: 30) defines pragmatics as the theory of linguistic communication. Things that are included in the pragmatic, according to

Fraser, is the question of what can be communicated, how speakers convey utterance and why he uses certain strategies in certain situations. House (1997: 27) states that science Pragmatics aligned with science discourse advanced by Widdowson (1973), namely the use of language as a communicative when performing actions social.

B. Cooperative Principle

Cooperative principle is a principle used by people to interact with others in order to be precise. This principle is proposed by Grice. He stated that listeners and speakers must speak cooperatively and mutually accept one another to be understood (Grice in Triyatun, 2013:5). He claimed that “conversation is (and should be) governed by the Cooperative Principle, a general condition on the way rational conversation is conducted” (Grice in Nick, 2010:119). The cooperative principle is actually the principle in which both participants (addressor and addressee) cooperate or work together in order to control their conversation in the most efficient way. Grice (1975:45) stated that Cooperative Principle: “Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”. The cooperative principle which proposed by Grice is reflected in the norms. Grice (in Griffiths, 2006:134) identified some of the communicational norms and showed how they are involved in the reasoning that makes it is possible for utterances to convey rather more than is literally encoded in sentences. He called these norm as maxim. According to Griffith (2006:135), maxim is a pithy piece of widely-

applicable advice. Grice then divided these maxims into four: maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, where each is broken into sub-maxim (Grice, 1975:45-46) as follows:

Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the purpose of the exchange).

Quality: Do not say what you believe to be false.
Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relation: Be relevant.

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

Related to the Cooperative Principle, there are possibilities in which the maxims are observed or non-observed by the addressors (speakers). Observed Cooperative Principle happens when speakers fulfill the maxim. In contrast, non-observed cooperative principle happens when speakers fail to fulfill the maxims.

Observance Maxims of Cooperative Principle

In observing the cooperative principle, speakers fulfill the maxims as the way of being cooperative. As seen in the following example:

(2.1) Joko : Where is my hat?

Ulin : Your hat is on the table beside the bookshelf in the living room.

In conversation (2.1), Ulin has fulfilled the maxims of cooperative principle. She has answered as informative as is required (Quantity), truthfully (Quality), clearly (Manner), and has directly addressed Joko's goal in asking the question. She speaks precisely, no more and no less. There is no implicature on her utterance. It means that there is no distinction to be made between what Ulin says and what she means, there is no additional conveyed meaning.

C. Hedging Maxims

Hedges is certain kind of expression speaker's use to mark that they may in danger or not fully adhering to the principle.

The Hedging Maxim

The hedging maxims means that an addresser would like to signal his/her addressee how much he/she observes or obeys the maxims. Dealing with this, Grundy states that hedges tells others how informative, well-founded, relevant, and perpicuous our message are. Using hedges, the utterances get more neutral and plain (Chojimah: 28).

- a. Hedges of the Quantity maxim: the degree of informativeness of messages can be eliminated by using some phrases *as far as I know...; I may be mistaken...; but...; I guess...;* and many others. When there is no hedges or the phrases are ommited, the addresser is fully responsible with the quantity of the information he shares.

- b. Hedges of the Quality maxim: the well foundedness of utterances can be hedged with some phrases, such as, *they say, as you probably know, I can't say more, I probably do not need to say this, but...*, and many others. Those phrases signal the addressee that the speaker's information is not as truthful as normally expected.
- c. Hedges of the Relation maxim: the hedges of relation maxim are used to show that what as speaker says is not relevant. Some expressions are *oh, by the way...; I don't want to change the subject, but...* ; many others. These hedges are usually found in the middle of the speaker's talk. Then they go on to mention some potentially unconnected information during conversation or they want to stop talking.
- d. Hedges of the Manner maxim : It shows that a speaker delivers messages in perspicuous way. It means that the messages might be obscure, ambiguous, not brief, or not in a good order. Some expressions of the hedges adhering to the manner maxim are *I am not sure if this is clear, but...; this may be a bit confused/ tedious, but...; if you see what I mean...;* and many others.

D. Situational Context

In the daily communication, what people said is not necessarily what is meant. Nick (2010:9) stated that speaker's meaning is not always coincides with addressee interpretation. To make sure what the meaning behind an utterance, hence it is important for the participants to know not only the literal meaning but also the situational characteristic of the communication held. According to Biber and Conrad (2009:40), there are some aspects that can be analyzed to identify the situational characteristic. It covers participants, relation among participants, channel, production circumstances, setting, communicative purposes, and topic.

1. Participants

Participants are people whom involved in a circumstance. Biber and Conrad explains that participants are those who produce the text which called as *addressor* and those whom the text is addressed which called as *addressee*. Further, both addressor and addressee is broken down into some classifications (Biber and Conrad, 2009:40). First, addressor can be single, plural, institutional, or unidentified. However, in the daily conversation, which is in the form of spoken language, the addressor is single, the speaker him/herself. Then, another aspect of participant that may influence the situational context is the situational context is the social characteristic of the addressor. For example, the speaker's age, sex, level of education, professional, social class, and many others.

Second, addressee: the reader or listener of the text can be classified into single or individual, plural, or un-enumerated. Biber and Conrad (2009:41) explained that individual addressee happens in a face-to-face conversation, while plural addresses can be found in a dinner-table conversation or a group of individuals who are discussing the same topic; “everyone except the speaker can be the addressee of an utterance”. Then, in certain situation, there may be un-enumerated set of addressees. For example, it is impossible to determine the number of individuals who listen to the radio broadcast or watch the TV program.

The last classification of participants to analyze the situational context is whether there is on-lookers or not. According to Biber and Conrad (2009:42), on-lookers are “participants who observe but are not the direct addressees”. For example, the audience of a dramatic play they do not involve in the conversational interaction during the play, but they just observe it. In a certain occasion, on-lookers might have an important role than addressee. It happens for example in a debate competition where each team has to persuade the juries as the on-lookers (Biber and Conrad, 2009:42). The most important point to be underlined is how much the participants influence each other.

2. Relation among Participants

The next step after identifying the participants, it is important to know the relation among participants. To identify the situational characteristics, Biber and Conrad (2009:42) classified it into some categories: interactiveness, social roles, personal relationship, and shared background knowledge among participants.

In interactiveness, it is important for us to know whether or not there is interaction among participants. The more interactive, the closer relation among participants. Then, in addition to the extent of interactiveness, Biber and Conrad (2009:42) stated that “it is important to consider the social roles and personal relationships among participants”. The social roles among participants can be equal or different. Two classmates having conversation is the example of socially equal participants. However, in some cases, there can be social differences among participants. In this situation, power differences can influence the language choice (Biber and Conrad, 2009:42). It can be seen from the conversation between a teacher and his student. The student will consider what language that she will use in order to have a conversation with her teacher. According to Biber and Conrad, participants can also have different degrees of shared background knowledge since what someone have experienced in the past is not always the same with other’s experience.

3. Channel

Channel or mode is the way of how the text is delivered, whether it is the form of spoken or written. In movie, the channel is in the form of spoken. Based on Biber and Conrad (2009:43), spoken mode always has a specific addressor and addressee, it is often interactive; furthermore.

It is also possible to differentiate among specific mediums of communication. According Biber and Conrad (2009:43), medium of communication is divided into: permanent medium; and transient speech. Permanent medium covers taped, transcribed, printed, handwritten, or e-mail. While face to face, telephone, radio or TV belong to the medium of transient speech.

4. Production Circumstances

Production circumstances are influenced by the choice of the spoken or written mode. In spoken mode, the speakers usually do not have much time to carefully plan what they are going to say (Biber and Conrad, 2009:43). If they spent too long thinking, their partner of conversation may be bored or it will be end with miscommunication. In other words, the text in the spoken mode cannot be edited or revised. It is different from the written mode where the writers can easily delete, edit or revise the text they want to write.

5. **Setting**

Setting refers to the physical context of the communication. It consists of time and place. According to Biber and Conrad (2009:44), time of communication can be categorized into: relatively contemporary; and a historical time period. While place of communication, it can be classified into private (personal letter, or conversation); and public (classroom teaching, textbooks).

6. **Communicative Purposes**

In order to analyze the situational characteristics of a certain text, hence it is very important to know what the purpose of the communication. Biber and Conrad (2009:45) divided the communicative purpose into some subclasses: general purposes, specific purpose, factuality of information, and the expression of the stance. General purpose of communication can be identified whether a text functioning as narrating or reporting past events, describing someone or something, explaining or interpreting information, entertaining the addressee(s), arguing or persuading, revealing personal feelings or attitude, and providing procedural information about how to perform certain activities (Biber and Conrad, 2009:45).

Further, specific purposes of a communication is the result section of the general purpose that has been identified before. For example, if the general purpose of a text is procedural, hence the

specific purpose of the text will be describing the methods of a certain activity.

Factuality and expression of stance are the other parameters of determining communicative purposes. Factuality means whether the addresser intends to convey factual information, speculation, personal opinion, or fiction/fantasy. While expression of stance includes expression of both of personal attitude (the expressions of personal feeling such as, (*'it is wonderful'*) and of epistemic stance (expressions commonly found in news, journal, or articles, such as *'according to...; it is possible that...; in general...'*) (Biber and Conrad, 2009:46).

7. Topic

The last situational context that should be identified in a text is topic. Topic is a subject or open-ended category being discussed that can be described at many different levels. Topic can be divided into: general topical domains such as religion, politics, science, and sports; and specific topics. According to Biber and Conrad (2009:46), topic is the most important situational factor influencing vocabulary choice; the words used in a text are to large extent determined by the topic of the text.

E. Previous Studies

The maxim hedging are famous topics that have been studied since years ago. Although those have been studied for many times in different objects, still those are interested to do be done. In order to avoid the study from corpus and explanation, therefore the previous studies are needed to be reviewed. Here are some previous studies related to hedging. The first study had been done by Mita Alfira Rosalita, with the entlited “*Pragmatic Analysis of Hedging on English Teacher’s Talk In MA Nurul Islam Tenggara*” in the academic year of 2017/2018. This thesis study about the most dominant the use of hedging by English teacher in learning proces and the reason of the teacher’s use of hedging. The researcher in this research used teacher as sample and learning process in the classroom as a situation. The suggest to other researchers from this reseach in order to make with different sample and situation.

The second study had been done by LIU Jixin^(a); LI Xiaoting^(b)with the entlited “*The Clausal Realization of Hedges in Teacher Talk*”. This research is focused on definition, clasification, and reseach domain of hedges. This reseach is aimed at the application of hedges by teachers in the spoken English class context through classroom observation and transcription from the teacher-student interaction. In this reseach the analysis suggests that interpesonal metafunction is the predominant determinant in the hedges application by teacher, so the tenor, or rather, the classroom environment or teacher-student relationship becomes a concern for the registarial features of teacher talk in EFL classroom.

The third study had been done by Vicky Margareta Purnamasari, Syamsul Anam, Agung Tri Wahyuningsih , with the entlited "*Hedging in George W. Bush 2003 Press Conferences as the Reflection of his Evasion on his Policy of Iraq War*". This research focus in what dominant hedging that is frequently used by George W. Bush in the selected press conferences and how the dominant hedging can reflect avoidance through selected press conferences. In this article, the writer give suggestions to the reseacher that the study give contribution for a better concept and understanding about hedging, also be used as a reference for those who are interested in studying hedging because hedging is a kind of pragmatics study that learn about mitigating devices which used to lessen the impact of the utterance.

Shortly, those previous studies are different from this research. The difference lies on the object of study. This study used a movie, movie is a form of symbolic expression of human being. It can be the most suitable media for understanding human's conversation since it resembles the real world of human. It is inspired by human, made by human, and played by human. In its best value, a movie or a film has the ability to record people and the events around them (Graham, 2005: 117). It differs from a novel which only provides narrations and conversations without performing it in reality. As a result, analyzing of hedges used in a movie can somehow represent an analysis of hedges using in human life.