CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the theory that use to support the analysis of the subject of research. They are pragmatic and politeness principle. In addition, this also provides the previous research regarding the applying of politeness principle as the consideration of this research.

2.1 Pragmatic

Pragmatic is one of the branches of linguistic part which expand in America since 1950. Pragmatic have known since the era of Charles Morris (as cited in Abdurrahman, 2012, p. 2). After that era, pragmatic was famous in Austin, John Searle, Paul Grice, Brown and Levinson, Leech and the other expert until now.

Systematically, pragmatic was introduced by a philosophy names Charles Morris in 1983. When Morris talked about the form of semiotic, he explain that semiotic have three branch of research, that are syntax, semantics and pragmatics (Levinson, 1983 p. 1). Syntax is a linguistic field which learns about the formal relationship with signs. While, semantic is a research of linguistics which learn about signs with the person who interpreted the signs.

Since that time, pragmatic has developed. The research also used in some books or even research which discussed psychopathology communication and the evolution system of symbol and the other research in that time. Besides that, pragmatic experiences a constriction in its meaning even the definition of Morris still hold out. Then in the other hand, Levinson (1983, p. 21-24) state his definition about pragmatic was modified as the research of language which have reference or else relate with the factor and the contextual aspect. In this case, Levinson explain at least seven definitions of pragmatic and two of it is: (as cited in Abdurrahman, 2012). First, “pragmatics is the research of the relation between language and context that are basic account
of language understanding.” This definition explain that to understanding the meaning of language, a speaker demand not only to know the meaning and the grammatical of each words but also have to find out the conclusion which connect the words that utterances and the assumption or even the words that was utterance.

The second definition is pragmatic as a “research of the ability of language user to pair sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate.” The second definition is emphasizing to the uniformity of the sentences which utterance by the speaker with the context. The third definitions state that pragmatics is the research of those relations between language and context that is grammatical, or encoded in the structure of a language. Based on the explanation above there are two important things should be carefully explain, that is the using of language and context of utterance. The using of language in this case is about the language functions (Abdurrahman, 2012, p. 2).

In a simple way, the definition of pragmatic by Levinson is give a general design of how to make the exact and effective communicates with using language as the media. For the reason that, Leech prefers to use general pragmatic for discussing the research about the using of language for communicate. Leech also based his idea from the fact that the cooperative and politeness in communication be in different effect in society.

After Levinson’s and Leech theory above there are many experts who acknowledge their idea about pragmatic. In this case, Verschueren (1999, p. 6) state that pragmatics is a research which people use of language, a form of actions or common action which is give approaching involving language and human life in common. Verschueren (1999, p. 7) put in “pragmatic also is the link between linguistics and the rest of humanities and social science”. Based on the
definition, it means that pragmatic is a research about the relationship between language and common action in human life which is linked with linguistics.

On the other hand, Cruse (2006, p. 3) affirms a different definition about pragmatic. Cruse state that pragmatics is the research of language which deals with aspects where context must in use addicted to account aspects of meaning that are not ‘looked up’ but which are ‘worked out’ on exacting occasions of use, non truth provisional aspects, and the uses made of those meanings. It can be concluded that; pragmatic in Cruse statement is a research about language which compact with aspects and context in social life.

As well Levinson, Leech, Morris, and Cruse there is Yule who also recognize his theory about pragmatic. Yule (1996, p. 3) point out four definitions there are; pragmatic is a field of research which concern to examine the meaning of a speaker, second pragmatic is a field of research which concern to examine meaning based on the context, third pragmatic is a field which exceed then to examine meaning which utterance, it is examine meaning which communicate by the speaker and the forth pragmatic is a field of research that examine the form of expression based on the social distance which limits the participant which involve on the dialogue. It can be seen that Yule means pragmatic is a ground of research which not only talk about context and meaning but also about the interpreted meaning of the speaker and also the expression that showed by the speaker.

Starting from all of the definition above, it can be conclude that pragmatic is a field of linguistics research which discuss about the relationship among language which contains of context that has meaning and also observe the speaker while the intention and the expression.

2.2 Context
Context is “*any background of knowledge assumed to be shared by s (speaker) and h (hearer) and which contributes to he’s interpretation of what speaker means by a given utterance.*” (Leech, 1993, p. 13) thus, context theory is used in this research. In addition, context also used to guide people to understanding utterances because context assists in interpreting a discourse.

Moreover Malinowski (as cited in Palmer 1981, p. 46) describe that context is connected with two scholars with stating meaning in term of the context in which language is used, but in different ways. Besides that, Tarigan (1990, p. 35) acknowledge that context is every background of knowledge which is acceptable of the speaker and the hearer and then make the hearer understood what the speaker say. So it can be conclude that context is every background of knowledge presupposes which is shared by speaker to hearer to guide them to interpret the meaning of utterances that they said.

### 2.3 Speech Acts

Searle, in his book Expression and Meaning state that the problem create by indirect speech acts is the problem of how it is achievable for the speaker to say one thing and mean that but also to mean something else (Searle, 1979, p. 31).

On the other hand, J. L. Austin (1962) acknowledge that when speaking (or writing, for that matter), we perform various “acts”: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. The difference between locutionary and illocutionary acts is sometimes referred to as, respectively, the difference between “saying” and “doing.” (As cited in Meyer, 2009, p. 50)

Although speech act theorists have proposed these three general types of speech acts, they are mostly interested in speaker intention that is the illocutionary force of utterances (Meyer, 2009, p. 50). To study this illocutionary act, various types of speech act have been
proposed. But in case there are five categories was proposed by Searle (1979). These are (as cited in Meyer, 2009, p. 50):

a) Assertive/Representatives: Utterances reporting statements of fact verifiable
   
   As true or false (e.g. I am old enough to vote; Columbus discovered America
   
   In 1492; Water freezes at zero degrees centigrade)

b) Directives: Utterances intended to get someone to do something (e.g. Stop
   
   Shouting; take out the garbage)

c) Commissives: Utterances committing one to doing something (e.g. I promise
   
   To call you later; I’ll write your letter of recommendation tomorrow)

d) Declarations: Utterances bringing about a change in the state of affairs
   
   (e.g. I now pronounce you husband and wife; I hereby sentence you to ten years in jail)

e) Expressive: Utterances expressing speaker attitudes (e.g. that’s a beautiful dress; I’m sorry for
   
   being so late)

This also same with the explanation of Searle in Leech (1983, p. 105-106) which is categorized the illocutionary into five points but in detail categorized. These are

1. **Assertive** which aims to declare something like stating, complaining, reporting and etc.

2. **Directive** like ordering, commanding, begging, and advising. For this category Leech use the term impositif.

3. **Commissives** here speakers will do something like promising  Offering and vowing.

4. **Expressive** the purpose of this group is expressed feelings and attitudes about thanking, congratulating, apologizing, and Condoling.

5. **Declarations** this illustrates the changes in a state of relations such as resigning, baptizing, and Sentencing.
2.4 Politeness Principle

One of the studies in pragmatic is politeness principle. It is learned concerning how speaker or person speak with the other or called as the listener. There is a context when the speaker and the listener speak each other. Whereas they speak, there is some sentence or statement which contains with politeness principle which Leech, Paul Grice and the other expert stated.

According to Watss (2003, p.20) politeness is a form of behavior of a given society and at the same time as one dimension of culture. On occasion, people assumed that politeness is a strategy which used as a result of a speaker to obtain their idea. Afterward, this concept was expanding as the theory of politeness languages.

This theory was extended by Leech who establishes some maxims which have an identical with the cooperative principle in Paul Grice. In that case, Grice proposed the cooperative principle to explain how conversation involves a certain level of “cooperation” among communication (Meyer, 2009, p. 55).

Grice (1989, p. 26) acknowledge that “Our talk exchanges do not normally consist of a succession of disconnected remarks, and would not be rational if they did. They are characteristically, to some degree at least, cooperative efforts; and each participant recognizes in them, to some extent, a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction.” (As cited in Meyer, 2009, p. 55).

Paul Grice also proposed the four maxim of cooperative principle; they are maxim of quantity which means all the conversation should be strike stability between provide too much and too little information when they speak or write. It means should be avoiding making a contribution more informative than is required, the second is maxim of quality that fancy the
speaker give a contribution one that is factual. Sometimes, speaker should give evidence when they speak. The third, is maxim of relevance which needs the speaker present a contribution which relevant with the topic that they talk about. “The notion of what is relevant in discourse will vary from one context to another.” Meyer (2009, p. 58) In the simple way, build the contribution have a relation each other. The last, is maxim of manner which means Clarity the expression that is highly valued in what we say and write (Meyer, 2009, p. 55-59).

Based on the explanation, Leech also has enlightenment about politeness principle. Leech (1983) state that politeness principle and conversational maxim are similar to those formulated by Paul Grice. According to Leech (1983, p. 131) politeness concerns a relationship between two participants whom they may be called ‘self’ and ‘other’. In dialogue, ‘self’ will normally be identified with speaker and other will typically be identified with hearer; but speakers also show politeness to third parties. Leech (1983, p. 132) proposed six politeness principles that should be considered in dialogue, called maxims that are;

a. Tact Maxim
b. Generosity Maxim
c. Approbation Maxim
d. Modesty Maxim
e. Agreement Maxim
f. Sympathy Maxim

a. Tact Maxim

The stand idea of tact maxim in politeness principle is require the speaker toward hold the principle to minimize benefit to self and maximize benefit to the hearer while they speak. The people who converse by hold this principle might be call as the politeness person, if the
speaker using this principle in the direction of make a dialogue with the other, it can decrease dispute to them. Besides that, it makes the speaker avoid some awful demeanor like envy, jealous, at all (“Pragmatik, Tindak Tutur”, n.d.)

In a simple way, it can be called that according the tact maxim; politeness might be done by applying this maxim because, these maxims always give benefits to the hearer.

For example:

Mitta : May I bring your book to your room please?
Tike : Thank you but, it might be make difficulties for you.

These utterances are a short dialogue between Mitta and Tike. Mitta is a student and Tike is a teacher. Mitta was minimizing her cost to Tike as the hearer it seen from Mitta’s statement to bring Tike’s book. Besides that, Mitta is maximizing benefit to Tike and Tike as the hearer or the second speaker also minimizing her cost to Mitta. It is means that Mitta and Tike applying the principle, on tact maxim.

While, if the speaker violate this maxim it means the participant is impolite. As the impact they will be envy or even jealous. For example;

Mitta : May I bring your book to your room please?
Tike : yeah, it will be right.

This dialogue showed that Mitta did politeness strategies because she was minimizing her cost to by offering help to Tike while Tike is impolite because she was not minimizing her cost to Mitta or even maximize benefit to Mitta. It can be called that Tike brake the tact maxim politeness. She made a violation inside tact maxim.

b. Generosity Maxim
The maxim of generosity or charity, substitutions participants are expected to respect others or the hearer. Respect for others will happen if people would minimize their benefit to self and maximize their cost to self. For example:

A: They were so kind to us
B: yes, they were, weren’t they?

(Leech, 1983, p. 137)

The short dialogue above is about Anny and Bella who stay together on dormitory. Anny wants to help Bella to wash her clothes. It showed that Anny maximize her cost to self and minimize her benefit to self. Bella who is Anny’s friend reject it but with polite utterance. The utterances show a politeness dialogue using politeness principle that is generosity maxim. Because, the speaker offer her help to the hearer by maximize her cost to self.

While, if the speaker violate this maxim it will be the participant is impolite and as the impact they will be not respect. For example;

Anny: May I wash your clothes? Mine is not much
Bella: yes you may. It is a friend for!

This second dialogue showed that the second speaker is impolite and brake the generosity maxim because she not minimize her benefit to self or even maximize her cost to self.

c. Approbation Maxim

This maxim also called as the maxim which gave appreciation to the hearer. In this maxim, the speaker should attempt to speak polite and always give their appreciation to the hearer. With this maxim, it hopes that the speaker do not ridicule each other, do not abuse
verbally, or humiliate the other. When people do that, it can be called they are impolite. For example:

Jem : “Why don’t you come over, Charles Baker Harris?”

“Lord, what a name.”

Dill : “’s not any funnier’n yours. Aunt Rachel says your name’s Jeremy Atticus Finch.”

(To Kill A Mockingbird, Part One Chapter One p. 4)

In this situation showed Jem’s and Dill’s speak. Jem called Dill’s full name and feel strange with his name, it shows because Jem’s statement “Lord, What a name” which means he ridicule dill’s name. These case shows that Jem is not maximize praise of Dill. In the other hand, Dill also did the same thing with Jem. Dill also ridicule Jem’s name. He tells that Jem’s name is funnier than him.

It is show that Dill as well not minimizes dispraise of Jem. It can be concluded both Jem and Dill are impolite because they ridicule each other. In maxims politeness it called as violation in approbation maxim.

d. Modesty Maxim

In this maxim, the speaker should minimize the praise of self and maximize dispraise of self. It means that the speaker should not maximize the praise to self. If that happened, it showed that the speaker is impolite. For example:

Dill : “’s not any funnier’n yours. Aunt Rachel says your name’s Jeremy Atticus Finch.”

Jem : Scowled. “I’m big enough to fit mine,”

(To Kill A Mockingbird, Part One Chapter One p. 4)
The short dialogue above is from *To Kill a Mockingbird* which tells about Dill and Jem. Dill breaks the modesty maxim politeness because Dill is not minimizing his praise of self and even Dill maximizes his praise of self. While Jem also did it as fact he assist his self with show his proud of his name. It illustrate from Jem’s statement “I’m big enough to fit mine,” this means Jem says that his name good enough for him because he is tall then Dill. It facts that Jem was maximize praise of self.

**e. Agreement Maxim**

This maxim also called as agreeable. This maxim aim the speakers build their agreement when they speak. If it happens, it can be called that they are polite. For example:

Jem : -It’ll be in all the grades soon. You don’t have to learn much out of books that way—it’s like if you wanta learn about cows, you go milk one, see?”

Scout : “Yeah Jem, but I don’t wanta research cows, I-”

*(To Kill A Mockingbird, Part One Chapter One p. 4)*

The dialogue above is about Jem and his old sister Scout. Scout tells that she is disappointed with her teacher who gave them a new role of researching in school but Jem tells that scout will be customary use that. Jem moreover said that if Scout want to learn about cows, she will see milk as the example of their teacher role teach but in case Scout is not agree with Jem’s explanation. It is illustrate that Scout is impolite and break the agreement maxim politeness because she is not build agreement with Jem. So that, this maxim want the speaker make an agreement when they speak as the reason that the different opinion might make a fight of them.

**f. Sympathy Maxim**

In this maxim, the speaker should build their sympathy to each other. It can be impolite if they show antipathy. It is better if the speakers maximize sympathy or express the positive
feelings towards hearer or else, minimize antipathy as the expression of negative feelings
towards hearer. Example:
Mehta : I lose my novel
Hassan : Poor you. I will help you to find it.

It illustrate that Hassan is polite because he build his sympathy to Mehta. But this
dialogue also can violate if Hassan not build his sympathy with say: “it is your own fault” and it
can be called that Hassan brake the sympathy maxim politeness.

2.5 Pragmatic Scale

To know the aspect that said an utterance is polite, less polite or more polite Leech (1983,
p. 123) suggests scales that operate in the maxim. These are the cost benefit scale, the
Optionality scale, the indirect scale, and the indirectness scale.

a. The Cost-benefit Scale

The cost-benefit scale is scale that leaning in cost and benefit for the speaker or the
hearer. In this case, if the cost for the hearer is higher than the gain, the utterances are less polite.
Meanwhile, if the benefit for the hearer is higher than the cost, the utterances are more polite. It
can be conclude that the higher cost to the hearer is less of politeness, while the higher benefit to
hearer is more politeness.

b. The Optionality Scale

The Optionality scale is referring too much or less of the options that the speaker gave to
the hearer when they are spoken. When the speaker gives much option to the hearer to answer or
give respond, it can be called that the speaker are polite. On the contrary, it can be called that the speaker is less polite or impolite if the speaker did not give an option to the hearer.

c. The Indirectness Scale

The indirectness scale is refer to the level of the direct or indirect speech when the speaker and hearer talking to. The figure of obliqueness will pressure the raise of the cost to the speaker and the decline of the advantage to the hearer. In this case, when the speaker’s utterance is directly to the hearer, it can be said that the speaker is impolite. On the contrary, when the speaker’s utterance is indirectly, it called that the speaker is polite. It can be conclude that the higher indirectness means the higher politeness.

2.6 Relevance of Research

To prove the originality of the research, the research presents the previous studies that have been conducted in the different research on the pragmatic analysis. The first research is written by Dwi Irmawaty Septiani Djuuna (UNG, 2012) her mini thesis entitled The Violation of Maxims Cooperative principle in a Movie “The Last Voyage” Narnia 3 (Pragmatic Approach). In her research, she analyzed the kinds of maxims cooperative principle which has violated by the speaker in that movie. There are four maxims cooperative used in this research that is developed by Paul Greece that are maxim quantity, quality, manner and relevant. The researcher found some dialogue which contains of the fourth maxim. Beside of analyze the kinds of the violation of maxim cooperative in that movie, the researcher also explain the interpreted meaning of the dialogue which contains of that maxims.

The second research is written by Fitri Mokoagow (UNG, 2012) entitled
The Analysis of Maxims Politeness Principle in Othello film. She analyzed the maxims politeness principle in the movie. Her findings are some dialogue which contains of six maxims politeness principle that is tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy maxim. She also explains why the dialogue called as a politeness maxim.

Both of these research are also describes the character in that movie, where the dialogue take place, when the kind of situation and language varieties which contains maxim and purposes are used. While in this research the researcher is going to analyze the violation of approbation and agreement maxim politeness, but in case there are two different things from the previous research. That are the researcher using Novel as the written text as the data collection. For the reason that using novel is more complete than watching film which sometimes separated the part of story. Besides that, this research entitled the violation of approbation and agreement maxims politeness which is compared the two previous studies with different object of data (Muhammad Irvan, 2010).

2.7 Synopsis of “To Kill a Mocking Bird” novel

This story took place in Maycomb, Alabama. Maycomb is the most boring Town in America. Few people move in, fewer move out, so it is just the same families doing the same things for generation after generation. One such family is the Finches: Scout, her brother Jem, and their father Atticus. Every summer Scout and Jem are joined by Dill Harris, who shares their obsession with the local haunted house, the Radley Place, and the boogeyman that lives there, Boo Radley. Jem makes up hair-raising stories about Boo’s bloodthirsty ways, but that just makes Dill want to see him all the more.

When fall comes, Dill leaves, and Scout starts school. The Radley Place is in between Scout’s house and school, so she has to go by it every day, usually at top speed. There is some
phenomenon that occurs to scout and Jem with that house. First, one day she notices something odd: a couple of pieces of gum stuck in a hole in the tree. Second, when Miss Maudie’s house was fired scout found that she uses a blanket but she never go to take it. The third when they try to in to that house, Jem forget his pants in the backyard hook into a nail and when they back to take it they found that the pants was fine and fold out.

At school, Scout gets flak from her classmates because her father, a lawyer, has taken on a new client, an African-American man named Tom Robinson. Atticus tells her that a lot of people think he shouldn’t defend Tom because of his race, but that it’s the right thing to do.

Christmas comes, one week Atticus is out of town for a Sunday, so the family’s cook, Calpurnia, takes the kids to her own African-American church, First Purchase. Everyone welcomes them except a woman named Lula, who says that they don’t belong there. The priest, Reverend Sykes, holds a collection to support Tom Robinson’s family, and doesn’t let anyone leave the church until he’s sure they have enough money. When they get home from church, they find Aunt Alexandra, who’s come to stay with them for a while. She has two goals: to teach the kids some family pride, and to get Scout to be a proper lady. One evening a week later, Mr. Tate and some other men turn up at the Finch house to talk to Atticus about the Robinson case. Their manner scares Jem and Scout, but Atticus assures them that the men are friendly.

The next evening Atticus goes out, and when the kids go looking for him they find him sitting in front of the jail where Tom is held. They were about to head home when some men pull up, who want Atticus to get out of the way so they can get to Tom. Atticus refuses to move, and Scout thinks something exciting is going to happened so she runs up to him, with Jem and Dill on her heels. It is only then she realizes this is a different group of men from the ones that turned
up at her house, and they are definitely not friendly. But her innocent attempts at dialogue deflect the men’s anger, and they leave without violence.

The next day is Tom Robinson’s trial. Atticus tells the kids to stay home, so they just sit on their porch and watch everyone go by on the way to the courthouse apparently the trial is the must-see event of the season. After lunch the kids head over to the courthouse. They can’t find a seat, so Reverend Sykes takes them to sit with him in the balcony segregated for African-Americans. At the trial, Sheriff Tate testifies that Mr. Ewell and his daughter Mayella told him that Tom had beaten and raped Mayella, but that he hadn’t called a doctor to examine her. Tate also says that Mayella’s worst injuries were on the right side of her face. Then Mr. Ewell, who reminds Scout of a rooster, takes the stand and says basically the same thing, only with more offensive language. Atticus gets Ewell to write something, showing that he is left-handed.

Mayella is the next witness. She gives her version of the crime. Atticus’s first questions to her are less about what happened than about her home life more generally, showing how lonely it is. Atticus has Tom stand up so Mayella can identify him, and Scout sees that Tom’s left hand is shriveled and useless. Mayella breaks down under questioning and then refuses to answer Atticus’s questions at all.

Finally Tom Robinson, the only witness for the defense, is up for questioning. Tom gives a very different version of events, in which Mayella was trying to kiss him despite his refusals when Mr. Ewell showed up and Tom ran.

Atticus isn’t scared of Ewell, but the kids are terrified. Atticus calms them down, and tells them that Tom is at a prison 70 miles away, but he can appeal the ruling. Jem and Atticus talk about the legal system, and how it happened that the jury could convict Tom when he was so obviously innocent. Atticus also tells them that there was one man who wanted to acquit Tom a
friend of the Mr. Cunningham whom Scout talked to in the lynching party but he couldn’t hold out against everyone else. Atticus comes home early and calls Calpurnia and Aunt Alexandra aside. Scout and Miss Maudie follow them into the kitchen to hear that Tom is dead – shot while trying to climb over the prison fence right in front of the guards.

One dark night Jem and Scout are on their way back home from the school’s Halloween pageant when they hear someone following them. Suddenly they’re attacked, though Scout can’t see much because of her costume. When things calm down, one man is on the ground, and another carries the injured and unconscious Jem back to the Finch house, while Scout follows. At home Aunt Alexandra calls the doctor and Atticus calls the sheriff. Dr. Reynolds arrives and treats Jem; then Mr. Tate comes in and tells them that he’s found the corpse of Mr. Ewell at the site of the attack. Scout tells them what she heard, and realizes that the fourth man still standing in the room is Boo Radley.

Atticus thinks that Jem killed Ewell and starts planning his legal defense. Tate says it wasn’t Jem, but Atticus says he won’t let Tate hush it up. Atticus finally gives in; though he’s worried Scout won’t understand why. Scout walks Boo home at his request, and then looks at her neighborhood with new eyes from the Radley front porch, thinking about how recent events would have appeared to Boo from this vantage point. Scout returns home and snuggles up with Atticus, who reads aloud to her until she falls asleep (Sparks Note, 2011).