

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LINGUISTICS

In this chapter, the researcher presents review of related theories and review of related research which bases her analysis. The researcher uses the theory of discourse analysis. Moreover, the researcher uses the theory of speech act and focus on illocutionary acts and utterances that describe the politeness of two waitress to the old man in short story *A Clean, Well-Lighted Place*. Then, she also identifies the five type's illocutionary acts by Searle and kinds of politeness maxim by leech of every utterance in the short story *A Clean, Well-Lighted Place*.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis focuses on the record (spoken and written) of the process by which language is used in some context to express intention. It is general term for a number of approaches to analyzing written, spoken or signed language use. The object of discourse such as writing talk, conversation, communicative event, so on are variously defined in term of coherent sequences of sentences, prepositions, speech acts. Discourse analysis is not only study of using language beyond the sentences boundary, but also prefer to analyze 'natural occurring language use.

Yule defines discourse analysis covers an extremely wide range of activities from the narrowly focused investigation of how word such as 'oh' or 'well' are used in casual talk, to the study of the dominant ideology in culture as

represented (1996:83). Discourse analysis is concerned with the study of relationship between language and the context in which it is used all kinds of written text and spoken data from conversation to highly institutionalized form of talk (McCarthy, 1991:5).

From the statement above, it can be concluded that a discourse analysis is not only study about how the way organizes the sentences and utterances but also the study of linguistic units such as conversational exchanges or written discourse that are usually used in society. It is very clear that discourse analysis concerned with the language that is used in social context in particular with interaction or dialogues between speaker and hearer. All of conversation always has the meaning behind that.

2.2 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study that concern by using language tools in meaning communication. Pragmatic is interaction of semantic with the word taking into account context of using. According to Richard, Platt, and Weber (1985:225), pragmatic is the study of the use language in communication, particularly the relationship between sentence and the context in which they are used. Furthermore, pragmatic is explained that the study of interpretation and meaning are also included in pragmatic.

Levinson (1983:32) states that proposes some pragmatic studies concerned with context. These are some theory proposed by him. First, pragmatic is the

study of relation between language and context that are grammatically, or encoding in the structure of language. Second, pragmatic is the study of relations between language and context that a basic to an account of language understanding. Third, pragmatic is the study of ability of language user to pair sentences with the context in which they would be appropriate.

Yule (1996:3) states that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. This type of the study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influence s what is said. It requires a consideration of how speakers organizes what they want to say in accordance with how they are talking to, where, when and under what circumstances.

From the definition above, it can be concluded that pragmatic is a study of discussing a meaning of language by regarding the relation between language and context. It has to do with the interpretation of what people in particular context and how such a context influences what is said.

2.3 Speech Act

According to Yule's view can be concluded that speech act is be able to appear when someone says something such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, request, suggestion (1985:100). Someone needs to learn the using of utterances is conventionally put in the new language community and how these uses are signaled. As hearer/ reader, part of understanding the

meaning of an utterance knows whether someone has been asked a question, invite and ask to do something, promise complaint and given a suggestion. Such function of utterance is called speech act.

The speaker—at least in Yule's view—normally expects that his or her communicative intention will be recognized by the hearer (1996:47). It means speakers/ writers expect listeners/ readers to recognize the function of utterances they speak/ write and to act accordingly. Whenever they speak, for example, they expect the listeners to realize that it is requested for information. So, each sentence has served specific function. Mostly we don't just produce well formed utterances with no purpose (Yule, 1996:48). It means, when people produce utterances in communication, they do two activities at the same time; speaking and expressing what they speak (performing) of utterances and the hearer understand what the speaker talking about.

Language is full of implicit promises, warning, and so on. Sometimes when people utter something, they not only produce utterances, but also they mean something implicit beyond the utterance. Based on Schrifin (1994:52) propose three classes of speech acts macros, they are:

2.3.1 Locutionary Acts

The production of an utterance—Cruse's view in Azza—with a particular intended structure, meaning, and reference (2011:6). On the other hand, a locutionary act is an act producing a meaningful linguistic expression.

According to Yule, “a locutionary act, which is the basic of utterances, produces a meaningful linguistic expression (1996:47). Based on Cruse and Yule’s view, locutionary is an utterance that produces by the speaker that has linguistic meaning. The meaning of the utterance can be found on dictionary. In other words. A locutionary act is an act producing a meaningful linguistic expression.

2.3.2 Illocutionary Act

Illocutionary act is an utterance with some kinds of function in mind (Yule: 1996). The illocutionary act carried out by speaker making an utterance is the act viewed in terms of utterance’s significant. The illocutionary act is performed via the communicative force of utterances (Yule,1996:48). According to Yule’s, illocution is an intended meaning of the utterance. For example, “would you open the door?” the illocution of the utterance is asking someone to do something. That’s way; illocution is what is the meaning and purpose the speaker to produce an utterance.

There are five types of illocutionary act—at least in Searle’s view (1985:24)—performed by: representatives, expressive, directives, commissives, declarative. They are:

2.3.2.1 Directives (Requests)

Directives are the speech acts that are used to get someone to do something. The speakers say and express what the speaker wants, such as

commands, orders, requests, suggestions, prohibitions, and others. Some verbs include: *suggest, prohibit, order,* and so on.

For example: “Don’t cheat!”

“Be silent please!”

2.3.2.2 Commissives

The kind of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends. Such as *promises, threats, refusals, pledge.* They can be appeared by the speaker or hearer as a member of conversation.

For example: “We will not go down.”

“I’ll visit your home.”

2.3.2.3 Representatives/ Assertives

The speakers express their belief that the content of the utterance is true, so modality is an important element here. They may express an attitude of belief using several types of acts such as *asserting, predicting, describing, advising,* etc. In this case the speakers that their friend is happy.

For example: “She is Happy.”

“This is new book.”

2.3.2.4 Expressives

They are utterances that have an expressive function, stating what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and can be statements of

pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow. They are about the speaker's experience.

For Example: "I do love you."

"I'm sorry to hear that."

2.3.2.5 Declaratives

Declaratives are kind of speech acts that change the world via the utterances. For example, the speakers have to have a special institutional role, in a specific context, in order to perform a declaration appropriately. The person who utters it must have the power to do so.

For example: A priest says, "I pronounce you man and wife."

(The status will change unmarried to—couple—married)

A court magistrate says, "I pronounce you're guilty of this case."

2.3.3 Perlocutionary Act

A speech act—Cruse's view in Suhartono's thesis—which depends on the production of a specific effect (2010:11). Depending on the circumstances, you will—Yule's view—utter on the assumption that the hearer will recognize the effect you intended" (1996:48-49). According Cruse and Yule's view, perlocutionary act refers to the effects caused by the speech generated by the speaker. Perlocutionary acts will be shown by the hearer or partner's speech. If the hearers understand what the speaker says, he will do it. For example,

“would you open the door?” if the hearers understand, without saying “yes, I would”, the door is open. That is the perlocutionary acts.

2.4 Politeness

The politeness principle is a series of maxims, which Geoffrey Leech has propose as away of explaining how politeness operates in conversational exchanges. Politeness—at least in Leech’s view—is strategic conflict avoidance which can be measured in terms of the degree of effort put into the avoidance of a conflict situation (1980:19). Politeness describe as a social norm, or a set of prescriptive social rules. It is another level to conversational interaction besides the rules of the cooperative principle. In Leech’s view, politeness is a type of behavior that allows the participants to engage in a social interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony. Leech states that politeness involves a set of politeness maxims (1983:132), among these are:

2.4.1 Tact Maxim

Iryani (2012:3) states that the tact maxim is the most important kind of politeness in English speaking society. The tact maxim applies to Searle’s directive and commissive which is only applicable in illocutinary functions classified as ‘impositive’ for example ordering, requesting, commanding, advising, recommending, etc., and ‘commissive’ e.g promoting, vowing, offering, etc. Tact maxim according to leech, involves minimizing the cost and maximizing the benefit speaker/hearer.

It is oriented towards the hearer. There are positive and negative sub-maxims. The main statement is: Minimize cost to the hearer and Maximize benefit to the hearer (Leech 1983: 108). An example for the maxim would be the following:

(a) “Lend me your wife”

(b) “Have another sandwich”

In this examples the linguistic form of the dispositive is not going to effect the real cost or benefit to the hearer. Example (a) fouls the Tact Maxim, and is extremely impolite. Example (b) seems to break the Tact Maxim too, but it is not meant like this.

2.4.2 Generosity Maxim

The generosity maxim involves minimizing the benefit and maximizing the cost to self. It is only applicable in impositives and commissives. Generosity maxim focuses more on the speaker/sender. Leech’s states that generosity maxim minimizes the expression of beliefs that express or implies benefit to self; maximize the expression of beliefs that express or imply cost to self. Unlike the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker, and says that others should be put first instead of the self. The example of generosity maxim:

(c) “You relax and let me do the dishes.”

(d) “You must come and have dinner with us.”

(e) “You can land me your car.” (Impolite)

The offer (c) and invitation are presumed to be polite for two reasons. First, they imply benefit to other. Second less crucially, because they imply cost to self. (d) And (e) the relation between self and other on both scales is reversed. Benefit to other but doesnot imply any cost to self apart from the verbal effort to giving the advice itself.

2.4.3 Approbation Maxim

The approbation maxim involves minimizing dispraise and mazimizing praise to speaker/hearer. The approbation maxim is only applicable in illocutionary functions classified as ‘expreeisive’ for example thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blamming, praising, condoling, etc. And ‘assertives’ such as stating, boasting, complaining, reproting etc. Approbation maxim is closed to politeness strategy of avoiding disagreement.

The approbation maxim states that minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other. It is preferred to praise others and if this is impossible, to sidestep the issue, to give some sort of minimal response (possibly through the use of euphemisms), or to remain silent. The first part of the maxim avoids disagreement; the second part intends to make other people feel good by showing solidarity. The example of approbation maxim as follow:

(f) “I wonder if you could keep the noise from your Saturday parties down a bit. Im finding it very hard to get enough sleep over the weekends”.

(g) “I heard you singing at the karaoke last night. It sounded like you were enjoying yourself!”

The example (f) and (g) will serve to illustrate the illocutionary functions of thanking and complaining, in which the speaker maximize praise of the addressee in (f) and minimize dispraise in (h).

2.4.4 Modesty Maxim

The modesty maxim involves minimizing praise and maximizing praise of self. The modesty maxim is only applicable in expressive and assertives. It is found in self deprecating expression. The Modesty maxim minimizes the expression of praise of self; maximize the expression of dispraise of self.

(h) “Oh, I'm so stupid - I didn't make a note of our lecture!
Did you?”

2.4.5 Agreement maxim

The agreement maxim involves minimizing disagreement and maximizing agreement between self and other. It is only applicable in assertives and seeks agreement and avoids disagreement. The Agreement maxim runs as follows: minimize the expression of disagreement between

self and other; maximize the expression of agreement between self and other. It is simply observed that they are much more direct in expressing agreement, rather than disagreement. Example:

(i) A: "A referendum will satisfy everybody"

B: "Yes, definitely."

(j) A: "It was an interesting exhibition, wasn't it?"

B: "No, it was very uninteresting."

As (i) shows, it is agreement maxim because agreement was happened between self and other, in (j) partial disagreement happened so agreement maxim was fault it is often preferable to complete disagreement.

2.4.6 Sympathy maxim

The sympathy maxim involves minimizing antipathy and maximizing sympathy between self and other. The sympathy maxim is only applicable in assertives. Sympathy maxim can be found in polite speech acts as to congratulate, commiserate or express condolence.

The sympathy maxim criteria are:

1. Minimize antipathy between self and other
2. Maximize sympathy between self and other

For example:

(k) I'm was sorry to hear about your father

(l) I'm was sorry to hear your father's death (impolite)

Can be intepreted that (k) as a condolence, an expression of sympathy for misfortune, and it might be preferable to say, intead of (l).