CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will describe the theory used in this research. Some important points like definition and explanation about pragmatics, implicature, cooperative principle, and teaching and learning English.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is that branch of linguistics which studies how meanings are derived from the context of an utterance (Trask in Hei, 2007:1). Meanwhile Yule in Lestariningsih (2010:21) says that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. Based on the statement above can be concluded that pragmatics is focused on the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in particular context and how the context influences what is said.

In making such interpretations based on utterances, it can be said that pragmatics thus concerns the ability to use language appropriately in context and such ability can only be accomplished as a result of cognitive development as well as through social interactions with others, and almost always, through trial and error.

According to Yule in Lestariningsih (2010:21) the coverage of pragmatics are as follows:

1. Entailment

    Entailment is the relationship between two sentences where the truth of one
    (A) requires the truth of the other (B).

2. Implicature

    Implicature is the relationship between two statements where the truth of the
    one suggests the truth of the other but the divergence from the entailment is
    does not require two statements.

3. Presupposition

    Presupposition is an assumption about the world whose truth is taken for
    granted in discourse.

4. Speech Act

    Speech act is the study of how we do things with utterance. There are basic
    acts in saying utterance namely: locutionary act, illocutionary act, and
    perlocutionary act.

5. Deixis

    Deixis is the way in which languages encode-feature of the context and thus
    concerns ways in which the interpretation of utterance depends on the
    analysis of that context of utterance.

2.2 Implicature

Implicature is systematically study utterances by which the speaker means
something more than, or different from, what the sentence s/he used means in
itself (Nemesi, 2013: 129). Lafi (2008:19) stated implicature may be said to be
extra meaning attached to, but distinct from, the sense of the utterance. The term

implicature signifies what speaker implicates (as opposed to what he actually says) and its approximation arrived at by the hearer by making use of some inferences mechanism.

In the communication, every utterance basically implicates something. The implication is a proposition is usually hidden, behind utterance conveyed and that is not part of the utterance. The difference between utterance and implicature occur occasionally make hearer hard to understand, yet generally among speaker and hearer have shared experiences and knowledge so the conversation can run smoothly. Thereby, implicature hints difference among utterance and purpose conveyed.

According to Wijana (in Mutaqin, 2009:10), with no correlation semantics and utterance implied, those can be estimated that an utterance raise implicature in number. For the example:

(1) It is raining. (Irmer, 2013:30)

Irmer (2013:30) this utterance delivers the information that it is raining in a particular location. This location may be specified by the contextual information, or else, if no extended information is given, set by random to the location of the utterance. Thus, the meaning of (1) is narrowed down to a default interpretation which can be expressed as "it is raining here".

2.3 Cooperative Principle

Cooperative principle is a special case of situations in which the perceived meaning extends beyond the literal meaning (Wang, 2011:1162). Bouton in Derakhshan (2014:14) points that cooperative principle is an inferential message

or the process through which the speaker and/writer and listener or reader derive meaning. Bouton in Derakhshan (2014:14) argues that the meaning of an utterance is perceives through inference in terms of the context, rather than through direct reference.

In order to describe the meaning implied, explain and predict cooperative principles and describe how they are understood Grice in Wang (2011:1162) develops an influential theory called "Cooperative Principle" and associated "Maxim". According to Grice in Lestari (2013:26) the cooperative principle consists of four maxims with their sub maxims. The four maxims are:

2.3.1 Maxim of Quantity

a. Make the contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes exchange).

b. Do not make the contribution more or less informative than is required.

Grundy in Lestari (2013:26) stated the maxim quantity as one of the cooperative principle is concerned in giving the information more than it is required and is not giving the information more than it is required. The speakers just say the information needed, it should be less informative or more informative.

In normal circumstances, the maxim quantity provides that the speakers say just enough, that they do not supply less informative or more that is necessary.

Example:

Teacher : *Oke, once more and then the next be your turn.*

Triangle!

Students : *Triangle.*

> Teacher   : *Josi!*
>
> Students and Josi   : *Triangle.*

2.3.2 Maxim of Quality

a. Try to make the contribution one is true.

b. Do not say what is believed to be false.

c. Do not say that for which lack evidence.

Add by Grundy in Lestari (2013:27) maxim quality can be defined as truthful as required. That means the speaker should inform the truth and they are not allowed to say what they think false and give the statement that run short of proof.

Here speakers are expected to say only what they believe to be true and have evidence for what they say. However, the speakers must aware of this expression, that the listeners expect them to honor the maxim of quality.

Example:

Simon   : *A lot of people depending on you.*

Elizabeth   : *Thanks, that really takes the pressure off.*

<div align="right">(Potts, 2007:03)</div>

2.3.3 Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation or maxim relevance means the utterance must be relevant with the topic that being discussed. Cutting in Lestari (2013:28) states that the speakers are expected to give information about something that is relevant to what has been said before. Furthermore, Grundy in Lestari (2013:28) states that maxim of relevance is fulfilled when the speaker gives the information that is relevant to

the topic proceedings. Therefore, each of the speaker or listener must be relevant to the topic of conversation.

Example:

Meredith   : You really love me?

Mommy   : I like Ferris wheels, and college football, and thing that go

real fast.

(Potts, 2007:3)

2.3.4 *Maxim of Manner (Be clear in giving information)*

a. Avoid unclearness of expression.

b. Avoid ambiguity.

c. Be brief.

d. Be orderly.

Add by cutting in Lestari (2013:28) maxim of manner is when the speakers put information briefly and ordinary, the speakers must avoid the obscure and ambiguous information from listeners. Therefore, each participant must give the information directly and reasonably, and it should not be vague, ambiguous, or excessive.

This maxim is related to the form of speech we use. Speakers should not to use the words they know but the listeners do not understand or say things. The speakers also should not state something in along drawn out way if they could say it in simple manner.

Example:

Simon   :   *When are you coming?*

Elizabeth   :   *I will codify that question to my superiors and respond at such a time as an adequate answer is preparable.*

(Potts, 2007:3)

2.4 Conversation Implicature

Unlike conventional implicature, conversational implicatures are dependent on the context. They must occur in conversation and adhere to the cooperative principle or the maxims. Conversational implicatures happen when one gets what is said. In Mey's words (2014: 45), a conversational implicature is something which is left implicit in utterances. It is important to note that it is speakers who communicate meaning via implicatures and it is listeners who recognize those communicated meanings via inference.

This implicature can be broken down into two categories; they are generalized and particularized conversational implicatures.

2.4.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Generalized conversational implicatures happen when the hearer is able to interpret the necessary inferences without having special knowledge of any particular context (Yule, 2009: 41). An indefinite article of the type 'a/an X' such as 'a garden' and 'a child' is a common example as in "I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence." The implicatures in that example shows that the garden and the child mentioned are not the speaker's.

Another instance of generalized conversational implicature is exemplified below:

Jake : *Did you buy the ice cream and the milk?*

Jill   : *I bought the ice cream.*

Upon hearing Jill's response, Jake has to assume that Jill is cooperating and not totally unaware of the maxim of quantity. Jill expects Jake to understand that by not mentioning 'the milk', he will acknowledge that she only bought 'the ice cream'. In this case, Jill has communicated her meaning via generalized conversational implicature.

2.4.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

This implicature requires the hearer to have special knowledge of a context in order to interpret the messages (Yule, 2009: 42). This happens because most of the time conversation takes place in very specific contexts in which locally recognized inferences are assumed. For example:

Jake : *Hey, will you come to the party tonight?*

Matt : *Sorry, I have to study.*

In this case, it seems that Matt's response does not appear to be relevant with the topic. Thus, Jake has to use some special knowledge to make Matt's response relevant so that he can get the additional meaning conveyed by Matt. If Jake recognizes what Matt said, he will understand that Matt will not be able to join the party because Matt has to study. With this regard, particularized conversational implicatures are usually just called implicatures since they are the most common implicatures used by the interlocutors.

2.5 Teaching English and Learning English

Teaching and learning English has been started long time ago and then it becomes world-wide since English uses in international communication and its issue to enhance communicative skill has been carrying out. Various methods and approaches have been invented and developed accommodating teaching and learning English communicatively.

Each method or approach definitely has its own advantageous and disadvantageous, where the many factors take into account to learners' success in EFL, namely:

1. Intellectual intelligent (verbal, numerical, and reasoning abilities).

2. Emotional intelligent (motivation, attitude, interest, aptitude, self-esteem, perception, memory).

3. Social intelligent (curriculum, personal, and interpersonal interactions).

4. Adversity intelligent (ability to adverse weakness into strength, and constraint into opportunity).

5. Ecological intelligent (setting, participant, end, act, channel, intention, norm, and genre).

6. Spiritual intelligent (practice, enthusiasm, and learning style). (Hymes in Tantra, 2015:4)

Based on the explanaition above it can be concluded in gaining each factor the use of language is a must. Without saying nothing there is no teaching and learning activity.

2.5.1 Interaction in Class

In the class teacher has a role to undertake teaching and learning activity. In that process there is a communication between teacher and students that employ language as a media. Stubbs in Prayogo (2015) groups various conversation between them through his observation as following:

1. Attracting or showing attention.

   This kind of utterance is to attract the students' attention. For the example: *"Attention please!"* That is kind of utterances commonly used in teaching and learning English.

2. Controlling of the amount of the speech.

   To control class' atmosphere, this kind of utterance is to give or ban students in saying. For the example: *"Silent please!"*

3. Checking or confirming understanding.

   This kind of utterances is to check the students understanding. Here is the example: *"Do you understand?"*

4. Summarizing

   In the last time of teaching and learning activity, teacher commonly summarizes what have been learned on that period. For the example: *"what we've learned today?"*

5. Defining

   Defining is kind of the teacher makes definition or explains about what have been explained or teacher asks the definition to the students. Here as the example: *"Do you know the meaning of rectangle?"*

6. Editing

   In teaching and learning activity teacher occasionally gives a comment to students' utterance that can be interpreted as assessment or criticism. For the example: *"Is it circle? Correct?"*

7. Correcting

   Teacher also gives correction to the students, not only what students say but also what students write. For the example: *"Not circle but circle."*

8. Specifying topic

   In teaching and learning activity, there must be a topic as a guideline, so the utterances produced will not be out of the topic being discussed. For the example: *"Today we are going to learn about shape."*