

CHAPTER II

RIEVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews some related topics namely pragmatics, cooperative principle, flouting maxim, implicature and synopsis of Forrest Gump Movie.

A. Pragmatics

Pragmatics deals with the utterance by which we will mean specific events, the intentional acts of speakers at time and places, typically involving language. The focus of pragmatics analysis is in meaning on the word or sentence. Levinson (1983, p.21) defines that Pragmatics is the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding. Leech (1983, p.21) defines that Pragmatics is the study of how utterance have meaning in situation. Yule (1996) states that “Pragmatics is the study of relationship between linguistic form and the users of those form”. Pragmatics concentrates on the aspects of meaning that cannot be predicted by linguistic knowledge alone and takes into account of knowledge about physical and social world. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people’s intended meaning, their assumption, their purpose or goals and also kind of action.

Richard (2000, p.67) states that Pragmatics is especially interested in the relationship between language and context. It includes the study of how interpretation of language is made depending on the speaker's knowledge, how speakers use and understand utterances, and how the structure of sentences is influenced by relationship between speakers and hearers.

Grundy (2000, p.27) also states that pragmatics is the study of language used in contextualized communication and the usage principles associated with it. So Pragmatics concerns about the function of language in communication and the speakers' intention or meaning while stating utterance toward hearer.

B. Cooperative Principle

The success of conversation depends on the various speakers approach to the interaction. The way in which people try to make conversation work is called Cooperative Principle. The Cooperative principle is a basic underlying assumption we make when we speak to one another is that we are trying to cooperate with one another to construct meaningful conversation. Grice (2000, p.74) propose the Cooperative Principle which states “make your conversational contribution such is required, as the stage at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or the direction of the talk exchange which you are engaged”.

In other word, we as the speakers should contribute meaningful, productive utterance to further the conversational. It then follows that, as listeners we assume that our conversational partners are doing the same. Concerning with his Cooperative Principle, Grice divides Cooperative Principle into four basic conversational maxims.

1. Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity as one of the cooperative principle is primarily concerned with giving information as it is required and that not giving the contribution more information than it required. A speaker can expected to give enough information, adequate relative, and as information as possible. That information can not exceeding the real information used by saying partner. And say as much as helpful but not more informative or less informative. Finnegan (2004, p.93) defines that the maxim of quantity provides that in normal circumstance, speakers say just enough, that they supply no less information and no more than in necessary for the purpose of the communication, for example:

A: Where is the bank?

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 bank.

2. Maxim of Quality

The maxim of Quality proposes that the speaker should tell the truth in a conversation in order to communicate cooperatively. Grice (1975, p.44) states that when engaged in conversation, 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 Brobudur temple located?*

B: *In Yogyakarta*

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

3. Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation means that the utterance must be relevant which the topic being discussed. Finegan (2004) states that this maxim directs speakers about their utterance in such a way that they are relevant to ongoing context: Be relevant at the time of the utterance. The maxim of relevant is fulfilled when speaker gives contribution that is relevant to the topic of preceding utterance. Therefore, Grundy (2000, p.74) says that each participant's contribution should be relevant to the subject of conversation, for example:

A: *How about your exam Edi?*

B: *Good enough*

From the example, Edi's utterance fulfilled the maxim of relevance, because his answer is relevant with the question.

4. **Maxim of Manner**

Maxim of manner obligates speaker's utterance to be perspicuous which is not to be ambiguous, obscure, or disorderly and unnecessary prolixity (Grundy, 2000:74). Therefore, each participant's contribution should be reasonably direct, that is, it should not be vague, ambiguous or excessive wordy. For example:

A: What did you think of that movie?

B: I really like of the romance action of each player. They can play their role as like the real life.

The answer of B is categorized as maxim of manner, she can answer the question from her partner about the movie clearly. From the explanation above, we can conclude that although it is very difficult to obey and use all of the cooperative principles and its maxim in uttering or writing the sentences, but it is essential to follow the cooperative principle in order communication run more effectively.

C. Flouting Maxim

If one of the maxims is violated by some utterances and yet we are still assuming that person is cooperating with us in communication, we can take that violation as sign that something being said indirectly. This is called flouting maxim. Flouting is deliberate and apparent violation of maxim.

Levinson (1995, p.109) states that flouting maxims is overtly and blatantly not following some maxim, in order to exploit it for communicative purpose. Grundy (2000, p.78) states that flouting maxims particularly salient way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an implicature, for example:

A: Where is Mr. Smith?

B: The Library or the Office

From example, B's answer violated the maxim of quantity, B does not give as much information as A wanted but instead gave a weaker statement (giving two possible options).

According to Brown and Yule (1989, p.32), they state that flouting maxims is result of the speaker conveying in addition to the literal meaning which is conversational implicature. A speaker who makes it clear that they are not following the conversational maxims is said to be flouting the maxims and this too gives rise to an implicature.

That is, the addressee understands the speaker flouted the maxims for a reason and infers further meaning from this breach of convention.

Here are some examples, they are:

1. Flouting Maxim of Quality

A: Tehran's in Turkey, isn't it, teacher?

B: And London's in Armenia, I suppose

Implicature: Tehran is not in Turkey

B's statement is flouting the maxim of quality because speaker B gives information which is not match with the actual fact but B still seems to be cooperative. B gives the untrue statement to A in order to make A to introspect that her statement is not correct. B's utterance suggests that A's is absurdly incorrect.

2. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

"Either Jhon will come or he won't

Implicature: Calm down, there's no point in worrying about whether he's going to come because there's nothing we can do about it.

The statement above flout the maxim of quantity since the information does not give clear contribution and it is not informative as required. The statement above suggests that either Jhon will come or not it is same. There's nothing we can do because the information is not clear.

3. Flouting Maxim of Relation

A: I do think Mrs Jenkins is an old windbag, don't you?

B: Huh, lovely weather for March, isn't it?

Implicature: B finds A's comment inappropriate (for some reason or other).

B's utterance might implicate that B should not say it in the inappropriate circumstances. B possibly suggests "hey watch out, Mrs Jenkins is standing behind you".

4. Flouting Maxim of Manner

A: Let's get the kids something

B: Ok, but not I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M

Implicature: B strictly forbids the kids to eat ice cream.

B is going out of their way to be a bit obscure, spelling out the words rather than simply saying them. B deliberately flouts maxim of manner that A can infer that there must be a special reason for her being so uncooperative.

D. Implicature

A mutual understanding is inevitably needed by a speaker and a hearer in order to construct a good communication. Understanding an utterance syntactically and semantically is not sufficient since the meaning of utterance is not only stated but it is also implied. The notion of implicature was first introduced by Grice (1967), who defined it essentially as what is communicated less what is said. Gazdar (1979) defines Implicature as anything that is inferred from an utterance but that is not a condition for the truth of utterance. A. Davis (1998) defines Implicature as Grice's term for what a speaker does not say but rather communicates, suggests, implies, etc, in virtue of saying what he does. It also refers to the fact of something's being so communicated.

Grundy (2000, p.97) states the contribution of notion of implicature is that it provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually 'said' (more what is literally expressed by the conventional sense of linguistic expression uttered). Levinson (1981, p.98) adds the notion of implicature promises to bring the gap between what is literally said and what is actually said. In the Gricean model, the bridge from what is said (the literal content of the uttered sentence determined by its grammatical structure with the reference of indexicals resolved) to what is communicated is built through implicature.

Yule (1996, p.36) adds that implicature is a primary example of more being communicated than is said but in order for them to be interpreted, some basic cooperative principle must first be assumed to be in operation. Laurence (2006, p.3) states that Implicature is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in speaker's utterance without being part of what is said.

Furthermore, Grice as quoted by Levinson (1992, p.97) explains that the term of implicature to be a general cover term to stand in contrast to what is said or expressed by the truth condition of expression, and to include all kinds of pragmatics.

Levinson (1981) states that Implicatures are inferred based on the assumption that the speaker observes or flout some principle of cooperation. Lakoff (p.106) states when maxims are blatantly flouted give rise to Gricean Implicature.

E. Context

To grasp the notion of communication, context happens to be completely important since speaker and hearer have to know the context in which the conversation takes place. Therefore, understanding context can be a helpful way to know the speaker and hearer's intention. Grundy (2000: 27) states that in the case of implicature, context helps us to determine what is conveyed implicitly but not explicitly stated by the speaker.

Grundy (2000:107) also add that context is not treated as given common ground, but rather as a set of more or less accessible items of information which are stored in sort term and encyclopedic memories or manifest in the physical environment.

When we think about meaning, it is also important to take into account the contribution of context. In simple terms, then, we can think about pragmatics as the study of the contribution of context to meaning. Besides, Sobur (2001:75) states that there are four kinds of context in communication or in the language use, they are:

1. Physical context

We can think of this in terms of where the conversation is taking place, what objects are present, what actions are occurring.

2. Epistemic context

The epistemic context refers to what speakers know about the world. For example, we need to know the background of participants when we start conversation.

3. Linguistic context

The linguistics context refers to what has been said already in the utterance. For example, if I begin a discussion by referring to Bruno Mars and in the next sentence refer to “him” as being a famous singer, the linguistics context lets me know that the antecedent of “him” (the person “him” refers to) is Bruno Mars.

4. Social context

The social context refers to the social relationship among speakers and hearers. Social context is circumstances surrounding the story, the situation and what is happening in the society.

a. Hymes' Concept of Context

There are factors in the contexts in which language is used that affect both how we use language and how it is received. Dell Hymes (1974) develops the S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G model to characterize all the different features of a communication situation and help to contextualize purely linguistics analysis. He uses the letters of S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G as an acronym to remember the intersecting factors in such a context.

1. Setting and Scene

Hymes (1974:55) defines setting refers to the time and place of a speech act and, in general, to the physical circumstance. Hymes (1974:56) defines Scene is the “psychological setting” or “cultural definition” of a scene, including characteristics such as range of formality and scene of play or seriousness.

2. Participants

Hymes (1974:56) defines participants include the speaker and the audience or audiences. Linguistics will make distinctions within these categories, for example, the audience can be distinguished as addressees and other hearers. This area includes the people present and the roles they play, or the relationship they have with other participants.

3. Ends

Hymes (1974:56) defines ends refers to outcomes, the goals or the purpose of the individuals involved.

4. Act Sequences

Act Sequence relates to form and order of the event of communication and any action can be considered a communication action if it conveys meaning to the participants.

5. Key

Hymes (1974:57) defines key is a cues that establish the “tone manner, or spirit” of the speech act and also how the speech sounds or was delivered.

6. Instrumentalities

Hymes (1974:60) defines that instrumentalities refers to forms and styles of speech used by participants. Thus, the choice of whether to use a strong or weak version of a dialect or accent, or whether to use one language rather than another.

7. Norms

Hymes (1974:61) defines the norms refers to any socially accepted conventions regarding when people can speak, what kinds of thing they can say and who they can say it to. Norms is social rules governing the event and the participations' action and reaction. The norms of communication or the rules guiding talk and its interpretation can reveal meaning.

8. Genre

Hymes (1974:61) defines that genre is not just used to refer to literary works (poem, novel etc) but also to the kind of communication that is taking place. This could include testimony in court (a kind of co-produced story-telling) but also includes interviews, speeches, joke-telling, proverbs, apologies, prayers, small talk, problem talk, etc.

The S-P-E-A-K-I-N-G concept which is proposed by Dell Hymes can be helpful to contextualize and clarify the context of communication based on each element in linguistics research. In this study, they writer just use three of this concept. The writer uses setting and scene, participants, act sequence.

F. Synopsis of Forrest Gump Movie

The film begins with a feather falling to the feet of Forrest Gump who is sitting at a bus stop in Savannah, Georgia. Forrest picks up the feather and puts it in the book *Curious George*, then tells the story of his life to a woman seated next to him. The listeners at the bus stop change regularly throughout his narration, each showing a different attitude ranging from disbelief and indifference to rapt veneration.

On his first day of school, he meets a girl named Jenny, whose life is followed in parallel to Forrest's at times. Having discarded his leg braces, his ability to run at lightning speed gets him into college on a football scholarship. After his college graduation, he enlists in the army and is sent to Vietnam, where he makes fast friends with a black man named Bubba, who convinces Forrest to go into the shrimping business with him when the war is over. Later while on patrol, Forrest's platoon is attacked. Though Forrest rescues many of the men, Bubba is killed in action. Forrest is awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his heroism.

While Forrest is in recovery for a bullet shot to his "butt-tox" he discovers his uncanny ability for ping-pong, eventually gaining popularity and rising to celebrity status, later playing ping-pong competitively against Chinese teams. At an anti-war rally in Washington, D.C. Forrest reunites with Jenny, who has been living a hippie counterculture lifestyle.

Returning home, Forrest endorses a company that makes ping-pong paddles, earning himself \$25,000, which he uses to buy a shrimping boat, fulfilling his promise to Bubba. His commanding officer from Vietnam, Lieutenant Dan, joins him. Though initially Forrest has little success, after finding his boat the only surviving boat in the area after Hurricane Carmen, he begins to pull in huge amounts of shrimp and uses it to buy an entire fleet of shrimp boats. Lt. Dan invests the money in Apple Computer and Forrest is financially secure for the rest of his life. He returns home to see his mother's last days.

One day, Jenny returns to visit Forrest and he proposes marriage to her. She declines, though feels obliged to prove her love to him by sleeping with him. She leaves early the next morning. On a whim, Forrest elects to go for a run. Seemingly capriciously, he decides to keep running across the country several times, over some three and a half years, becoming famous.

In present-day, Forrest reveals that he is waiting at the bus stop because he received a letter from Jenny who, having seen him run on television, asks him to visit her.

Once he is reunited with Jenny, Forrest discovers she has a young son, of whom Forrest is the father. Jenny tells Forrest she is suffering from a virus (probably HIV, though this is never definitively stated).

Together the three move back to Greenbow, Alabama. Jenny and Forrest finally marry. Jenny dies soon afterward. The film ends with father and son waiting for the school bus on little Forrest's first day of school. Opening the book his son is taking to school, the white feather from the beginning of the movie is seen to fall from within the pages. As the bus pulls away, the white feather is caught on a breeze and drifts skyward.

G. Previous Studies

The writer uses three research papers which correlate with the Cooperative Principle and flout maxims to develop her thesis. First, Tantri (2011) conducted a research entitled “An Analysis on Cooperative Principle of Facebook’s Conversation”. That study focuses on analyzing Facebook’s conversation using theory of implicature and cooperative principle by Grice. That study aims to identify kinds of maxim that is used mostly by the Facebook users and kinds of maxim that is violated mostly by the Facebook users. She finds maxim of relevance is the most observed maxim, it took 234 (39, 6%) and the most violated is maxim of quality with 178 (44, 6%).

Second, Faisal Agung Prasetyo (2013) conducted a research entitled “The Flouts of Gricea’s Cooperative Principle: The Case of Verbal Humour in Srimulate”. This paper is pragmatics that aims to investigating the types of flout the maxims of cooperative principle as seen in Srimulate comedy show, how the maxims of cooperative principle are flouted by the comedians in Srimulat comedy show and the message behind the flouts of the maxims of cooperative principle in Srimulate comedy show. He found that the maxims of cooperative principle are often flouted to produce humour. He also found that not only do they flout the cooperative principle the sake of humour, they want to express an additional message or implicature in their humour utterance as well.

Third, Muhammad Solichul Huda (2013) conducted “Analysis of Conversational Implicature Native and Non-Native Guests in CNN Interviews Script”. This study focuses on analyzing what kinds of maxim are used by native and non-native guests in CNN interviews script, what kinds of maxim are flouted by native and non-native guests in CNN interviews script and the last is to compare the comparison between native and non-native in using and flouting the cooperative principle. He found that all types of maxim of cooperative principle are used in the dialogues found in CNN interviews script and both of the guests also flouted the maxims. All of the guests doing their conversation cooperatively, because the total number in using four maxims is higher than flouted cooperative principle.

In this paper the writer conducts some theories that are being applied by on those previous studies above. There is theory of Cooperative Principle that is proposed by Grice (1975). The differences between this paper and previous studies are located in the object that is being observed, Tantri uses Facebook's conversation as her object of research then Faisal Aggung uses verbal humour in Srimulat as his object of research, and Huda uses CNN interviews script between native and non-native as his object of research.

In this research the writer uses movie as object of research. The writer uses dialogue in movie, the writer gives the explanation how to calculate the implicature. This research is made to enrich the other students about the term of implicature and show the application of implicature in conversation.