

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews some related topics covering Cooperative Principle, Implicature, Speech Act, Situational Context, and some previous studies related to this topic.

A. 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 current 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.

1. 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.

2. Non-observance Maxims of Cooperative Principle

In daily conversation, people may fail to observe a maxim. People may fail to fulfill a maxim for some reasons. As the example, they are incapable of speaking clearly, or because they choose to lie intentionally (Thomas, 1995:64). According to Grice (1975:49), there are three kinds of non-observance maxim: opting out, violating, and flouting a maxim.

a. Opting Out Maxim

Opting out happens when a speaker would like to signal her/his addressee of how much s/he will observe the maxim by indicating her/his unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. Based on Thomas (1995:74-75), people sometimes opt out the maxim in order to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative, for legal or ethical reasons or giving the requested information that might hurt a third party or put them in danger, furthermore. It can be seen from the used of some phrases: *As far as I know...*, *They say that...*, *By the way...*, or *I'm not sure if, but...*

1) **Opting Out the Quantity Maxim**

Opting out or hedging the maxim of quantity means that speakers try to signal their addressee(s) that they want to limit the amount of the information they are going to share. When speakers hedge the quantity maxim, they sometimes use some expressions like: *As you probably know...; I can't say more...; I probably do not need to say this, but...; etc.* to make it easy, here is the example of hedging the quality maxim:

(2.2) *She is okay now. I'm sorry, but **I can't say more.***

In utterance (2.2), the speaker uses an expression *I can't say more* which means that he signals to his addressee that he wants to limit the amount of information.

2) **Opting Out the Quality Maxim**

The characteristics of an utterance which opt out the quality maxim can be seen from the use of the phrases such as: *I may be wrong, but...; I'm not sure if this is true, but...; They say that...; and many others (Chojimah, 2015:28).* By using these phrases, speakers try to show that the utterances they deliver are not truthful as expected.

(2.3) ***They say that,** Tulungagung has many potential tourisms.*

Imagine that this utterance (2.3) is delivered by foreign people who do not know how the situation of the tourism in Tulungagung yet. He just heard the information from the TV shows or social media. From the utterance in (2.3), the speaker signals the addressee that what s/he says is not truthful as normally expected for he doesn't have an adequate evidence.

3) **Opting Out the Relation Maxim**

People often hedge the maxim of quality for they want to signal that what they are going to say is irrelevant, or in a certain occasion, they want to change the topic they are being discussed. The phrases used to signal this irrelevance according to Chojimah (2015:30) are: *Um, by the way...*; *I don't want to change the topic, but...*; *I'm not sure if this is relevant, but...*; and many others. To make the explanation clear, look at the example below:

(2.4) *Um sorry, by the way, how if we go to the coffee shop after the class?*

From the utterance in (2.4), it shows that speaker tries to change the topic being discussed. Such kind of utterance is commonly found when someone raises an idea to her/his friends immediately before the end of the class to spend the break time.

4) **Opting Out the Manner Maxim**

Opting out the maxim of manner used by a speaker when s/he is trying to signal that the message they are going to deliver might be obscure, ambiguous, not brief, and not in a good order (Chojimah, 2015:30). The expressions that show the hedges are: *I don't know if this makes sense, but...*; *this may be a bit tedious, but...*; *I am not sure if this is clear, but...*; *if you see what I mean...*; and many others. For example, consider the following example:

(2.5) *If you see what I mean, he is a complicated person.*

Saying *he is a complicated person*, the speaker realizes that she presents an obscure topic. She doesn't say orderly why the person is complicated. Then, to signal her obscurity, she hedges her utterance by saying *if you see what I mean*. This expression signals the addressee to consider how complicated this person as the speaker is thinking about him.

b. Violating Maxim

Violating the maxim of cooperative principle means that speaker seems not fail to fulfill the maxim or seems to observe the maxim. "The characteristic of violating a maxim is the unstated connection between or among the utterances is very obvious" (Chojimah, 2015:26). Grice (in Thomas, 1995:72) defined the term of 'violation' very specifically as the unostentatious non-observance of a maxim. If a speaker violates

a maxim, ‘s/he will be liable to mislead’ (Grice, 1975: 49). According to Thomas (1995:74), “violating is the exact opposite of flouting a maxim” where a speaker may say something true in order to imply an untruth. It is different from the flouting maxim, where a speaker blatantly fails a maxim at the level of what is said, however it implies something which is true. Look at the example below:

(2.6) *Kumala* : *What time is it?*
Zakya : ***Look! The sixth class is up.***

From the conversation in (2.6), there is no clear connection between Kumala’s question with Zakya’s answer. *Look! The sixth class is up* as the response of Kumala’s question has violated the maxim of relation since she seems not directly answer Kumala’s question. In this case, both Kumala and Zakya as a student of an institute, they have already known the schedule of the class in their department. Hence, Zakya’s response has an implicature: when the sixth class is over means that at that time was around twelve o’clock.

c. **Flouting Maxim**

Another situation of non-observing maxims is when speaker flouts the maxim deliberately. Grice (1975:49) explained that this condition happens when a speaker deliberately fails to fulfill the maxim. According to Thomas (1995:65), “a flouts occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature”. Chojimah

(2015:32) stated that “flouting a maxim is typically performed by uttering something in totally brief, absurdly, completely different, or totally irrelevant utterances”. From the explanation of the experts, hence it can be concluded that flouting maxim happens when speakers ignore the maxim deliberately.

1) Flouting the Quantity Maxim

Flouting the quantity maxim means that a speaker fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity deliberately. It happens whether the speaker provides information either more or less than is required.

Look at the example below:

(2.7) *Asha* : *Who is the guest?*
Ayra : *Mr. Zafeer, a teacher from Yemen. We have met him in the airport.*

In this conversation (2.7), the required information is just the name of the guest, yet Ayra gives more information. She makes her contribution more than is required. In this occasion, Ayra tries to implicate that ‘the guest is not a stranger’. They have met the guest before.

(2.8) *Deema* : *How do we make the cake?*
Adzkia : *We’ll follow the instruction.*

Deema wants to know how the way to make the cake to Adzkia, however Adzkia blatantly gives less information than Deema needs. The implicature of Adzkia’s utterance is she doesn’t

know exactly how to make the cake, and they will make it by following the instruction on the book.

2) Flouting the Quality Maxim

Flouting the quality maxim means that speakers do not say something that represent what they actually think. The speaker does not observe the maxim of quality that is a maxim which requires the speaker to make a contribution that is true, i.e. avoiding what is believed to be false and not saying that for which the speaker lacks of adequate evidence. The flouting maxim can be analyzed from the use of figure of speech such as hyperbole, irony, and metaphor (Chojimah, 2015:33). Here is the example of flouting the quality maxim:

(2.9) *“Zahwa is so beautiful. **She’s like an angel**”*

This utterance (2.9) means that there is a girl whom extremely beautiful and very kind. Hence, to describe how the prettiness and the kindness of the girl, the speaker refers her to an angel. The strategy used in this utterance is metaphor; the way of speaking that referring a person or thing to something which has the similar characteristics.

3) Flouting the Maxim of Relation

When speakers deliberately say something which is not relevant to topic being discussed, it means that they have flouted the maxim of relation. Nevertheless, being irrelevant does not only for speakers do not want to be relevant during the communication. Furthermore, they are being irrelevant for the reason that they want to say something implicitly or hide something to their addressee(s). Notice the conversation below:

(2.10) *Tinker Bell* : *What's the wagon for?*
Fawn : *Okay, okay. Just don't scream, deal?*

Conversation (2.10) is the excerpt of *Tinker Bell and the Legend of Never Beast* movie. In this occasion, Fawn does not answer Tinker Bell's question directly. Fawn's respond seems irrelevant with Tinker's question. It is because she was hiding something to others. She was taking care of a baby hawk whereas in the fairy land, hawks are the enemy of the fairies for they eat fairies. It is the reason why Fawn made a deal with Tinker Bell to promise that she would not scream when she knew what the wagon for. She asked Tinker Bell to make a deal because she knew if Tinker Bell saw what the wagon for, she would be afraid and she then would scream.

4) Flouting the Manner Maxim

The maxim of manner is flouted when a speaker intentionally does not speak perspicuously. They may use an obscure expressions, an ambiguous term, or do not speak briefly nor orderly.

(2.11) “*Mau sampai kafan nutup auratnya?*”

Such kind of the example (2.11) is an Islamic meme found in memecomicislam.com. The utterance in (2.11) is addressed to moslem women who have not covered their body yet as explained in the Holy Quran. But, the word *kapan* or *when* in English is changed into *kafan* (shroud; a kind of cloth that used to wrap the body of the dead people before they are laid to rest). It implies that the moslem women should cover their body as soon as there is time to cover it and don't wait until the death come first before they can cover their body. This utterance has flouted the maxim of manner. In which the writer of this meme does not use a brief word rather he uses an ambiguous term to convey the message.

5) Strategies of Flouting Maxim

When people deliberately flout the maxim, they may apply some strategies. The strategy are used in order to imply the message of the utterance they deliver. Grice in Levinson (1983:109) stated that the flouting maxims can be seen to give rise

to many of the traditional figure of speech. Based on Grundy (2000:76-77), there are six strategies that commonly used by people to flout the maxim; tautology, overstatement, understatement, metaphor, rhetorical question, and irony.

a) Tautology

Tautology is one of the rhetorical strategies which can flout the maxims. Based on Grundy (in Fatmawati, 2015:28), tautology is an expression used frequently to express the message of an utterance in an easier way. Levinson (1983:110) stated that the uttering of simple and obvious tautologies have no communicative import. To make it easier, here is an excerpt of a conversation taken from *Tinker Bell* movie:

(2.12) *Fairy Mary* : Are you a light fairy?
Tinker Bell : No...
Fairy Mary : Animal fairy? Water fairy, perhaps?
Tinker Bell : No and no.
Fairy Mary : No, you're not. **You are a tinker. It's who you are. Be proud of it.**

The bold typed words in (2.12) which is uttered by Fairy Mary is an example of tautology. It happens when Fairy Mary was trying to convince Tinker Bell that she could not go to the mainland; her dream since she is a Tinker, and her job is in the Pixie Hollow. In this occasion, Fairy Mary has flouted the maxim of relation by uttering *you are a Tinker, it's who you*

are. While in fact, both Fairy Mary and Tinker Bell have already known that Tinker Bell is a Tinker Fairy. Fairy Mary tries to assert Tink that although she cannot go to the Mainland, but she has to be proud as a Tinker Fairies for they have an important role in order to support the duties of the other fairies.

b) Overstatement

Overstatement is one of the rhetorical strategies that commonly used by people. Overstatement is the same with hyperbole (Leech, 1983:145). It is from the word *hyper* means over or more than, hence it can be defined as the way of speaker to describe something more or stronger than the actual state of affairs.

(2.13) *I have loved you for a thousand years,
I'll love you for a thousand more*

The statement in (2.13) is the excerpt of a Christina Perri's song entitled 'A *Thousand Years*'. This lyric has flouted the maxim of quality. In fact, there is nobody who can live for a thousand years. Everybody knows that it is false and it is impossible. However, this lyric has an implicature that there is someone whom truly love her spouse forever after.

c) Understatement

Understatement is the opposite of overstatement. According to Leech (1983:145), understatement is similar to litotes. Understatement is the way of describing something weaker than usual. It makes something understated or less important, whereas the fact is incredible. Leech (1983:145) states that “overstatement or understatement is not used to deceive the addressee(s)”.

d) Metaphor

According to *interaction theory*, metaphor happens when there is relationship between ‘metaphorical’ and ‘literal’ expression (Levinson, 1983:148). In this case, metaphorical expression can change the meaning of literal expression, and vice versa (Fatmawati, 2015:33). Furthermore, it describes a person or object in a literary way by referring it into something which has the similar characteristics. The use of this figure of speech usually flouts the quality maxim since it is lack of evidence and believed to be false.

e) Rhetorical Question

Rhetorical question is a strategy used by delivering a question in order to make a statement, not to get an answer. This kind of rhetorical question is used to invite the

addressee(s) to interpret the question that delivered by speaker (addressor).

- (2.14) *Hamish* : *I'm sorry Ms. Kingsleigh, there will be no further expeditions.*
Alice : *What?*
Hamish : *Now, there is a position in our clerking office. You will start in files, but in time...*
Alice : ***This isn't about China, is it?***

In conversation (2.14), Alice was surprised to hear the policy of the King Ascot, Hamish, to stop the expedition further. She then directly flouts the maxim by using rhetorical question in order to clarify Hamish' statement. The rhetorical question of Alice is not raised to get an answer. However, it is delivered to invite King Ascot to reconsider what the reason of his decision, and to ensure that it is not because of he wants to pay off the refusal of Hamish' proposal marriage to Alice in the past.

f) Irony and Banter

The last strategy used to flout the maxim is irony. Irony is classified into: irony and banter. Generally, irony is a way of speaking which suggests the different meaning than is said (Fatmawati, 2015:35). According to Leech (1983:144), banter is the opposite of irony. Irony is a friendly way of being offensive, while banter is an offensive way of being friendly. In brief, irony states something that seems positive but intends

to convey a negative one. In contrast, banter states something negative but intends to deliver a positive message. This usually indicates the intimacy of friendship: where stating the negative is not a big problem.

(2.15) *Um, you're really an extremely good man*
(he – red: you, has done a bad thing)

Such kind of utterance in (2.15) is an example of irony: where speaker states something that seems positive, meanwhile it intends to convey a negative one.

B. Implicature

Conversational implicature is one of interesting topic that is learnt in pragmatics. Let's consider the utterance of "*I'm hungry*". Semantically, this sentence means that someone is hungry now. But, when it uttered by someone in different situations, it may has another explanation. Look at the examples stated by Kreidler (1998:26): first a child who wants to go to bed; second, a beggar who has not eaten all day; and third, a young man who wants to have a dinner with his co-worker. Although, these three speech events have the same sentence, but they have a different meaning. Consider another example of conversation between two students in a break time below:

(2.16) *Axel : Pergi ke kantin, yuk!*
Alin : Aku kenyang.
Axel : Baiklah, aku pergi sendiri kalau gitu.

Based on the conversation (2.16), it can be seen that semantically, someone can answer Axel's request by saying *Ayuk*, *Ndak*, or *Tidak*. But, in this occasion, Alin does not respond it directly. Rather she says *Aku Kenyang*. This utterance means that Alin has been sated. By interpreting what Alin said, Axel then decides to go to the canteen by herself because she knows that Alin has been sated, so she does not want to go to the canteen. Such kind of example (2.16) shows that there is an additional meaning behind an utterance which then called as implicature.

From the example (2.16), it can be seen that what people said is not always the same with what they meant. It means that in some situation, people may not speak explicitly to convey the intended meaning of their utterances. In other words, there is a hidden meaning behind an utterance. This hidden meaning is then called as conversational implicature. The term implicature was first introduced by Grice. He (in Nick, 2010:118) explained that the term of implicature is introduced to distinguish between logical and conventional meaning. Kreidler (1998:29) defined that "implicature is a bit of information inserted in such a context to be precise". He then explains that implicature is a kind of a bridge which is constructed by the hearer or reader in order to relate an utterance to the other utterances, in which this connection is often made unconsciously. Yule (1996:36) added 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". According to Nick (2010:118), "implicatures of an utterance are what is

necessary to believe the speaker thinking, and intending the hearer to think, in order to account for what they are saying”. From those definitions, it can be concluded that implicature is a hidden meaning or what is called as additional conveyed meaning found in people utterances.

Grice divided Implicature into two subclasses. They are Conventional Implicature and Conversational/nonconventional Implicature (Grice, 1975:50). “Conventional implicature associated with specific words and results in additional conveyed meaning when those words are used” (Yule, 1996:45). Yule added that this kind of implicatures are not based on the maxims or cooperative principle. Based on Nick (2010:118), “conventional implicatures: they are part of the typical force of the word, whether or not they conform to its strict, truth-conditional meaning”. Consider the word *but* in *Mary suggested to turn left, but I turned right*. The interpretation of this utterance is *Mary suggested me to turn left and I turned right* plus an implicature of ‘contrast’ between the information (*left* is contrast with *right*). Contrast becomes the conventional implicature of *but*.

Other implicature is conversational. Nick (2010:118) defined conversational implicatures as “those are arise in particular contexts of use, without forming part of the word’s characteristic or conventional force”. Based on Griffiths (2006:134), conversational implicatures are “inferences that depend on the existence of norms for the use of language, such as the widespread agreement that communicators should aim to tell the truth”. The norm here refers to the four maxims in cooperative principle. Different from

conventional implicature, conversational implicature includes context in understanding the additional conveyed meaning of an utterance. The meaning is implicitly stated in the utterance. Yule (1996) then divided the conversational implicature into three: generalized conversational implicatures, scalar implicatures, and particularized conversational implicatures.

Generalized conversational implicatures is implicature in which people do not need to have special knowledge of calculating the additional conveyed meaning. While scalar implicatures happen when “someone produces an utterance by selecting the scale of the words which is the most informative and truthful in the term of quantity and quality in the circumstances” (Yule, 1996:41). Yule (1996:42) explained that one should be underlined while applying scalar implicature is when the speakers correct themselves on some detail, they typically cancel one of the other scalar implicatures. The last, particularized conversational implicatures, in contrast with generalized conversational implicatures, happen when inferences are required to work out the conveyed meaning.

C. Speech Act

The term of speech act was firstly introduced by J. L. Austin. It believes that “sentence is meaningless unless its truthfulness and falsity can be tested” (Chojimah, 2015: 45). According to Austin (in Chojimah, 2015:46), when someone saying an utterance, it performs three acts simultaneously: locutionary act or locution (the literal meaning of an utterance); illocutionary

act or illocution (what is done by speaker behind an utterance); and perlocutionary act or perlocution (the effects the utterance for the addressee).

Speech act is classified into two. They are direct speech act, and indirect speech act. If the illocution of an utterance (sentence form) is the same with the illocution of the intended meaning, it is categorized into direct speech act. When illocution of the utterance form is different from its function, hence it belongs to indirect speech act.

Here are the classifications of illocutionary act based on Searle (in Leech, 1983:105):

1. Assertives

Assertives relates to the commitment of a speaker to the truth of something. It can be suggesting, stating, complaining, claiming, asserting, assessing, concluding, boasting, or reporting. According to Leech (1983:105), this kind of illocution tend to be neutral as regards politeness. Yule (1996:53) added, representatives or assertives happens when speaker makes words fit the world (of belief).

(2.17) *As far as I know, it's not good for women to hang around the street in the midnight.*

The utterance (2.17) is an example of opting out the maxim of quality. It can be identified from the use of the phrase *as far as I know*. Furthermore, this sentence is uttered by someone to her friend (girl) who has not go home yet in middle of the night. When looking at the next

sentence, *it's not good for women hang around the street in the midnight* has an intended meaning that it is better for you to go home soon. Relating to the theory of illocutionary act, it can be classified into suggestion.

2. Directives

It relates to the attempt of a speaker to produce some effects through action by the hearer. Ordering, requesting, advising, commanding, questioning, asking for help, and recommending are the examples of this illocution.

(2.18) *Wife : I'm starving. Do you feel the same?*
Husband : I know you're a wonderful cook.

The example (2.18) is a conversation between a husband and his wife. In this occasion, such kind of conversation has flouted the maxim of relation since the husband does not reply his wife's question rather he answers in different way. In this case, the husband's utterance has an implicit meaning that he actually feels hungry, then he asks his wife to make some food. Finally, it can be concluded that what the husband says has a requesting act behind his utterance. In order to ease the analysis of this type of illocutionary act, Yule (1996:53) said that in using directives act, speaker attempts to make the world fit with the words (via the hearer).

3. Commissives

Commissives relates to the commitment of someone to some future action. The examples of this illocutionary act are promising, offering,

threatening, warning, or vowing. Yule (1996:53) stated that commissives is a kind of speech act that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action they express what the speaker intends.

(2.19) *Theodore* : ***When I return with my sister and her army the Yellow Brick Road will be red with blood of every tinker, farmer and munchkin in your kingdom.***

The utterance (2.19) is an excerpt of movie transcript entitled *Oz the Great and Powerful*. It was uttered by a cruel witch, namely Theodore. While uttering this, Theodore was in anger because she was disappointed with Oz ‘the Wizard’ for he has deceived her. In order to revenge her disappointment, she then threatened the people of Oz by uttering what she and her sister would do in the future to destroy the kingdom. The intended meaning of Theodore’s utterance in this case is categorized as threatening act. To make the analysis easier, Yule (1996:53) said that in commissives, speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words (via the speaker)

4. Expressives

Expressives deals with the function of expressing the psychology statements such as thanking, pardoning, blaming, congratulating, condoling, or praising. Based on Yule (1996:53), expressives is a kind of speech act that states what the speaker feels in the form of statement of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. He then added, in using this act, speaker makes the words fit with the world (of feeling). Notice the example (2.20) to make the understanding clear:

- (2.20) *Dessa* : *I could give you some tips on conserving your supply.*
Zarina : *I may just take you up on, Dessa.*

The conversation between Dessa and Zarina is an excerpt of a transcript movie entitled *Tinker Bell and the Pirate Fairy*. From the conversation in (2.20), it can be identified that Zarina fail to observe the maxim. Although Zarina ignore the maxim, however she tries to keep in polite in order to respond Dessa's question. Her utterance of *I may just take you up on* has an intended meaning that she express her gratitude to Dessa for her care. She actually does not need the tips, but she still expresses her gratitude. From this utterance, it can be said that behind Zarina's utterance, it contains a thanking act.

5. Declaratives

Declaratives relates to act having immediate changes. The examples are resigning, dismissing, naming, appointing, excommunicating, proclaiming, firing, etc. according to Yule (1996:53), declaratives happens when speaker changes the world via words.

- (2.21) *Glinda* : *I have here a missive from the great Wizard himself, "With little more than pluck and belief, we made the impossible happen. As your Wizard, I hereby decree the Land of Oz will forever be free."*

The utterance in (2.21) was taken from the transcript of *Oz the Great and Powerful* movie. In this situation, Glinda announced the message from the Wizard, Oz. On his message, Oz declared to the people of the Land of

Oz that their land would forever be free after the cruel witch unsettled them. Finally, it can be analyzed that behind The Wizard's message, there is a proclaiming act.

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 characteristics 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 *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 social characteristic of the addressor. For example, the speaker's age, sex, level of education, profession, 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 addressees 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 a 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 characteristic, 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 a 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 in 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 is. Biber and Conrad (2009:45) divided the communicative purpose into some subclasses: general purposes, specific purposes, factuality of information, and the expression of the stance. General purposes 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, journals, 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 a large extent determined by the topic of the text.

E. Previous Studies

Cooperative principle and speech act 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 be done. In order to avoid the study from similar corpus and explanation, therefore the previous studies are needed

to be reviewed. Here are some previous studies related to cooperative principles and speech act.

First, a graduating paper for the bachelor degree conducted by Wijiyanti entitled *Parents' and Children's Use of Cooperative Principle in Despicable Me 2*. This research was published by State Islamic University Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta in 2014. This research is aimed to describe how parents and children observe or fail to observe the maxims of cooperative principle in the data. The data are analyzed descriptively based on related theory of Cooperative Principle by Grice. The result of the study shows that, first, parents and children do not only observe a maxim, but also fail to observe it. It is caused for the reason that they want to cooperate with the hearer and they want their conversation to flow slowly. Besides, they fail to observe the maxim of cooperative principle because they know that the hearer has the same knowledge with them in the situational context.

Second, a study entitled *The Flouts of Grice's Cooperative Principle: The Case of Verbal Humor in Srimulat* by Prasetyo. It was published by State Islamic College (STAIN) of Tulungagung in 2013. This study is attempted to analyze pragmatically the flouted maxims as seen in Srimulat comedy show. The research design used is qualitative research which employs content analysis. The result of this research shows that maxims of Cooperative Principle are often flouted to produce humor. It shows that maxim exploitation is one of the strategies used by the comedians to amuse the audience.

Third, a study of Arifiyah entitled *A Study on Conversational Implicature in Sentilan Sentilun Talkshow on Metro TV*, a thesis of bachelor degree published by Universitas Wijaya Putra in 2014. The study is aimed to identify what type of violation of the maxim and the type of maxims which is flouted and its implied meaning. The finding of this research is: there are 20 violence of maxim. From this result, then the writer concludes that one of the utterance can be violated more than one maxim of conversation and the utterances that flouted the maxim contain implied meaning.

Shortly, those previous studies are different from this research. The first difference lies on the object of the study. This study used the utterances performed by the Barden Bellas in *Pitch Perfect 2* movie. Second, although the basic theory which is used is the same, Grice's Cooperative Principle, but it also used another theory to reinforce the analysis, i.e. Searle's theory about Illocutionary Act. Moreover, this study focused on non-observance maxims of Cooperative Principle performed by the Barden Bellas in *Pitch Perfect 2*. Different from the previous studies, this research is not only discussed one type of non-observance maxims but it also discussed the other non-observance maxims: whether an utterance belongs to opting out maxims, violating maxims, or flouting maxims.