Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To support the analysis, this chapter reviews several theories related to this research. Those are pragmatics, the role of pragmatics in the resolution of context, the types of context which consist of four kinds and text and related studies to support the analysis.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatic is the study of relations between context and language in the structure of language. According to author “Pragmatic interpretations are relative to a context, viz. the pragmatic context”. Such a context is an abstraction of the cognitive and social context in which the utterance is used. Hence, pragmatics does not for details of our positions and for further references we refer to Van Dijk (1977, 1996). Leech (in Wirotinoyo 2009:8) states that Pragmatic is study about meaning and has connection with utterance. Moreover Levinson (1985:9) states that Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammatical zed, or encoded in the structure of a language. In other words, pragmatic is study of relation between language and context that are basic to understand the language. By those perceptions about pragmatic, thus I can conclude that pragmatic focuses on the language and context itself or emphasize to how the utilizing of language in communication.
Study concerning the meaning is pragmatic and how language is used in a communication, describe about some text and finding the context and pragmatic from the speech. “Yule (2010: 127) also claimed that the study of what speakers mean, or “speaker meaning.” is called pragmatics. Leech (1983: 1) said that pragmatics is about how language is used in communication. It also can be usefully defined as the study of how utterances have meaning in situations. Griffiths (2006: 1) said that pragmatics is concerned with the use of these tools in meaningful communication. Strazny (2005: 872 and 869) explained that pragmatics is the study of language use. Cobuild Dictionary (2006), pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that deals with the meanings which come from the use of language in particular situations.

2.2 Context

There are important elements the use everyday language, which affect the use of language. Such context is very important in the use of language.”Context greatly affect the form of the language that will be used by a speaker. Contexts ranging considered important for linguists since the outset of the 1970s. They realize the importance of context in interpreting the sentence (Brown and Yule, 1996: 35)”.

Further argues that in order for a speech act to conventionally perform a given illocutionary act, it must specify the nature of its context in the form of felicity conditions (Levinson (1983). These felicity conditions are divided into three subcategories, namely, the preparatory conditions, which check the
speaker’s ability to perform A, the sincerity conditions, which are the conditions that the speaker wants in order to perform A (Green, 1996), and the executive condition, which checks the adequate execution of the speech act (Allan, 2001). However, the pressing question facing SAT, and pragmatic theory in general, is “to describe how, for any given utterance, the hearer finds a context which enables him to understand it adequately” (Sperber and Wilson, 1986, p. 16).

Contexts defined as participant definitions, that is, as mental constructs, are able to function as the interface between situational and societal structures and discourse structures, because they subjectively ‘represent’ relevant aspects of situations and society and directly interfere in the mental processes of discourse production and comprehension. If contexts control discourse at all, this is only possible when we conceive of them as cognitive structures of some kind. And only in this way are we able to define the crucial criterion of ‘relevance’, that is, in terms of a selective focus on, and subjective interpretation of some social constraint as defined by the participants.

This also explains why discourse may be influenced by alternative, fictitious or misguided definitions of the social situation, as long as the speaker or writer sees it that way. Thus, it is not objective gender, class, ethnicity or power that control the production or comprehension of text and talk, but whether and how participants interpret, represent and make use of such external constraints, and especially how they do so in situated interaction.
To illustrate the relevance of such an integrated approach, the writer shall show how to account for the important notion of context. The contextual approaches referred to above generally assume a more or less direct relationship between situational, societal, political or cultural aspects of the environment of text and talk, on the one hand, and the structures of discourse itself, on the other. That is, in the example of Jokowi’s Speech.

So far have formulated some ideas on the nature of contexts and some observations on the contextual properties of a political speech. Obviously, this is not yet a theory. In the same way we formulate explicit grammars on the verbal structures of text or talk, or explicit conversation theories on their interactional characteristics, we also need a more explicit theory of contexts as mental constructs. In linguistics, discourse analysis and conversation analysis, we often leave such notions undefined, or treat them as theoretical primitives.

2.3 Context analysis

Before language users are able to match incoming information against the more general linguistic and other knowledge in memory, they must analyse the context with respect to which a certain speech act is performed. One of the methodological principles which should be kept in mind is that the notion of context is both a theoretical and a cognitive abstraction, viz. from the actual physical-biological-etc. situation. That is, a great number of features of the situation are not relevant for the correct comprehension of the illocutionary force of utterances. It will seldom be the case that, whether my speech participant has
red hair or not, I will understand his utterances in different ways (with the possible exception of those cases where such situational details are thematized). Hence a speech understander will focus attention on specific properties of the situation which might be relevant for correct interpretation of both meaning/reference and pragmatic intentions/purposes. A next methodological point is that unlike pragmatics and (the rest of) grammar, a cognitive theory does not (only) have rules and concepts, but strategies and schemata, i.e. devices for a fast and functional processing of information.

Context analysis as a component in speech act comprehension also involves self-analysis of the hearer. In order to understand that the particular speech act is appropriate to him, he must be aware of his own (previous) activities and the underlying knowledge, wishes, attitudes and emotions. Thus if in a particular context somebody offers me help, I must be aware of the fact that I am acting such that such an offer makes sense, and that the offer pertains to a goal which is probably (partly) identical with my own goal. More specifically, the speaker not only has information about the world or the social structure in particular, but also about me, as the participant in communication. The hearer, thus, will have to compare what the speaker apparently assumes about the hearer, with his own self-knowledge. (Context and Cognition: Knowledge Frames and Speech Act Comprehension, Pages 217)
1. Examples of context analysis

In order to illustrate informally our levels and categories operating in pragmatic context analysis of language users, we will give two examples of speech acts and a characterization of a context in which they are appropriate. The examples will be taken from both an institutional and a private kind of context. First, consider the following utterance:

“May I see your ticket, please?”

Although there is set of possible contexts with respect to which this utterance, taken as a request, may be appropriate, only one example will be given, viz. that of ticket inspection on trains, or means of public transport in general:

Social context type: situational context. Public.
Institution: Public Transport
Frame: Ticket Inspection

A. Frame structure

a. Setting: train (during operation)

b. Functions: 
F(x): official ticket-inspector

G(y): passenger

c. Properties: x has visible signs of being inspector of the (railroad)

Company; and/or x can identify himself as being an
Inspector of the (railroad) company; x actually performs his
task of ticket inspection; y is the obvious ticket-holder (e.g. not
a child travelling with his parent)

d. Relations: F(x) has authority over G(y);

e. Positions: (see functions): y is checked by x

x is checking y

**B. Frame conventions (rules, norms, etc.)**

1. Each passenger must have a valid ticket when on means of public transport;

2. Each passenger must show his ticket upon request to officials of the railroad company;

3. A passenger which is not in the possession of a valid ticket will be fined $25.00. n. It belongs to the duties of ticketinspectors to inspect tickets. (Van Dijk, Context And Cognition: Knowledge Frames And Speech Act Comprehension, Pages 221 )

It is roughly in this kind of context that an utterance as may successfully be performed as an acceptable request. That is, the hearer will not only conclude from the form of the utterance itself (see below) that it is a request, but also that the request satisfies the specific request conditions as well as the grounds for these conditions, as defined by the social structure. Only those hearers who have the information available about the context as specified will be able to judge
whether these grounds are sufficient for the acceptability of the act of requesting, and hence whether the request should be complied with or not. Thus, if one of the contextual features does not obtain the request may become spurious and hence socially unacceptable (at least to some degree). If I am not on the train, no request for my train ticket may be made; similarly if the inspector has neither a uniform nor identification: I need not show my ticket to any passenger requesting so; etc. Note that the frame conventions are the basis from which specific knowledge, beliefs, duties/obligations, etc. may be derived. Hence, passenger \( x \) (= hearer) knows that by regulation (law) B.1. He should also have a ticket, a knowledge which is a condition for actually buying the ticket, and for feeling the obligation to show it to an inspector, when requested (as by B.2).

2. As a second example we take a speech act from an informal/private context:

“Let me carry your suitcase!”

Performed in a situation in which the speaker \( x \) takes the hearer \( y \) from the train, thereby making an offer to carry the hearer's luggage. Clearly, such an offer would be appropriate in many kinds of contexts, because there are no institutional restrictions on the interaction as in the first example:

Social context type: Physical context

*Frame*: Meet somebody (at arrival)

A. Frame structure

b. **Functions:**

\[ F(x): \text{host} \]

\[ G(y): \text{guest} \]

c. **Properties:**

\[ x \text{ is strong enough to carry suitcase} \]

\[ y \text{ may be tired and/or} \]

\[ y \text{ has difficulties wearing suitcase, and/or} \]

\[ y \text{ is a woman or old person} \]

d. **Relations:**

\[ x \text{ knows } y \text{ (and } y \text{ knows } x) \]

\[ (y \text{ knows that) } x \text{ is there to meet } y \]

e. **Position:**

\[ x \text{ is helper of } y \]

**B. Frame Conventions**

1. If \( x \) meets \( y \) at arrival, \( x \) should be friendly to \( y \);

2. If \( y \) has difficulty (or may have difficulty) in accomplishing a task, \( x \) should help \( y \) (or offer to help \( y \));

3. Heavy luggage is a sufficient reason for offering help;

4. Guests, and especially women, tired, ill or old persons should be offered help.

**Contextual course of action:**

**Macro-action:** Arrival of \( y \). \( Y \) being met by \( x \).

**Previous acts:**

- \( y \) prepared for arrival

- \( y \) got out of train

- \( y \) looked for \( x \)

- \( y \) walked to \( x \)
This categorized list, then, is assumed to represent the major components of a schema necessary in the comprehension (and acceptance) of as a request. Note that since we specify the knowledge which must be available for the adequate comprehension of speech acts, the acts are described, as in the previous example, from the point of view of the hearer. In case the major features of this context should not be satisfied, the request may become inappropriate, or it may become notcomplied with. Thus, if I do not wait for somebody, does not know him/her, etc., I may not usually offer for help, according to the frame conventions. Similarly, a strong man will usually protest against the offer if this is made by a child or a weak person in general.

The categories used above are not definitive, and require further definition. Especially the difference between the function and the position categories are not always clearcut. By a function we understand a more or less fixed, often institutionalized, set of properties/relations, e.g. professions, e.g. judge, ticket-inspector, etc. but also host, guest, etc. Positions on the other hand more specifically define the kind of relation operating in the frame, between the participants, i.e. they define their actual role in interaction: I may help, advise, prohibit, etc.