

A PRAGMATIC APPROACH FOR ANALYZING A DOCUMENTARY NOVEL “NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH” BY AVI

Hanny Fariany Fauziah*

Abstract

The background of the study is a daily problem representing the events at school. There are rules implemented by school officers which must be obeyed by all school staffs, including students. However, there is a student who still disobeyed the rules. The reason why he does it, is he may not be getting enough attention from his parents and also teachers. This may be due to his parents are preoccupied with their jobs. Therefore, the student tries to seek attention from external factors, for example, from his school as his second home. Apparently, it generates a conflict between a student and their school, especially teachers. The characters involved in the conflict, are teachers, student, reporters, broadcasters, and the members of the school board. But, it will be limited, related to the theme, such as teachers, students, and some outsiders. The aims of this research are to find what the presumptions of the conflict is represented in the documentary novel Nothing But the Truth and to indicate the implications of the student who breaks the conflict by using a pragmatic approach. By using this approach, there are two ways in analyzing the data, presumptions and conversational implicatures. The findings shows us that the presumptions of the conflict happened in the novel indicate that there are feeling of bore and loneliness of the student because he gets less attention from his parents. It may happen since his parents are busy with their jobs. So, the student tries to get attention from school. While, the implications of the story of the novel are the school gets bad image from public and the student gets pay more attention from his parents by transferring him to another school which has an appropriate rule with his willing.

Keywords : *rules, conversational implicature, conflict, presumption, and documentary novel.*

*Penerjemah Ahli Pertama pada Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Teknologi Mineral dan Batubara, Kementerian Energi dan Sumber Daya Mineral, hanny.fauziah@yahoo.co.id., Jl. Jend. Sudirman No. 623 Bandung 40211.

Abstrak

Latar belakang penelitian ini fokus pada masalah sehari-hari yang terjadi di sekolah. Beberapa aturan yang diberlakukan di sekolah wajib ditaati dan dipatuhi oleh seluruh warga sekolah termasuk guru, karyawan/ pegawai sekolah, dan para siswa. Tentu saja, tidak semua warga menaati aturan-aturan yang berlaku di sekolah, pasti ada satu atau dua orang siswa yang melanggar aturan sekolah. Alasan mereka melanggar aturan biasanya mencari perhatian dari guru, kepala sekolah, juga teman-temannya karena mereka tidak mendapatkan perhatian dari pihak keluarga, terutama orang tuanya yang sibuk dengan pekerjaannya. Oleh karena itu, siswa yang suka melanggar aturan sekolah, kemungkinan mereka mencoba mencari perhatian dari sekolah sebagai rumah kedua bagi mereka, padahal yang dibutuhkan perhatian dari keluarganya di rumah. Namun demikian, kasus siswa yang melanggar aturan sekolah seringkali melahirkan konflik antara siswa tersebut dengan pihak sekolahnya, terutama gurunya. Tujuan dari penelitian ini untuk mengetahui dugaan konflik yang akan terjadi dari kisah siswa yang melanggar aturan sekolah sebagaimana diceritakan dalam novel *Nothing But the Truth* yang merupakan jenis novel dokumenter. Adapun tokoh yang terlibat konflik antara lain guru, siswa, reporter, pembaca berita, dan anggota komite sekolah. Namun, dalam penelitian ini, penulis mencoba membatasi konflik yang terjadi hanya antara guru, siswa, dan beberapa pihak di luar sekolah. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan pragmatik, ada dua cara dalam menganalisa data, dugaan, dan implikasi percakapan. Hasil yang diperoleh menunjukkan bahwa diduga konflik terjadi karena adanya perasaan bosan dan sendiri dalam diri siswa tersebut disebabkan kurangnya perhatian yang dia butuhkan dari orang tuanya karena kesibukan orang tuanya sehingga dia mencari perhatian dengan cara melanggar aturan sekolah. Namun demikian, konflik yang terjadi akibat pelanggaran yang dilakukan oleh salah satu atau dua orang siswa, mengakibatkan penilaian buruk terhadap sekolah tersebut dari pihak luar. Adapun niat dan keinginan siswa yang berkonflik tersebut untuk mendapatkan perhatian orang tuanya, dia peroleh dengan cara meminta orang tuanya memindahkan dia ke sekolah lain, dalam kasus ini sekolah yang membolehkan siswanya menyanyikan lagu kebangsaannya.

Kata kunci: aturan, implikasi percakapan, konflik, dugaan, dan novel dokumenter.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

When we make conversation with other people, we usually use language as media of communication. Language is one of the effective media to send a message from speakers to hearers so that the message can be understood. The message can be: information; expression of feeling, such as annoyance, admiration, or respect. Bach and Harnish (1979) stated that linguistic communication is successful when the hearer, upon hearing an expression, recognizes the speaker's communicative intention. In other words, Liu said that it relates to how people comprehend and produce communicative acts or speech acts in a concrete speech situation which are usually a conversation (hence*conversation analysis). It distinguishes two intents or meaning in each utterance or communicative verbal communication. The abilities to comprehend and produce a communicative act are referred to as pragmatic competences (Kasper, 1997) which often include one's knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers who involved the cultural knowledge such as politeness, and the linguistic knowledge explicit and implicit. Related to this research, the writer purposely adopts a hot issue in terms of linguistics about conflict that occurs when conversation is made. The conversation made here is, in a classroom between teacher and student` it is described in novel "Nothing but the Truth" by Avi. Certainly, to analyse the data which is a conversation data, the writer will use an appropriate tool of analysing it. In this case, CA (Conversation Analysis) is the right way. CA is one of studies that will is going to applied to one form of the realization of real conversation, such as in a classroom-between teacher and student, court-between judge and defendant, market-seller and buyer, or in hospital-between doctor and patient, etc.

However, the issue that the writer means is conflicting the rule between teachers and student in which it daily happens. Of course, every utterance u sed by teacher and student implicates some meanings

and interpretations. In the perspective of pragmatics, the analysis of data will use implication method. As stated by Liu, implication is referring to an indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance derives from context this is not presented from its conventional use.

Based on the writer's observation, there are some utterances expressed by teachers which more focus on angry expressions. As represented in that novel, the expressions will give bad effect on the student behaviour. It is showed by Philip- the student - the writer meant. He got bad treatment from his school because of his fault to break the rule. It is undeniable that angry expressions contained power of ideology. Actually, we know that the fault is naturally done by the student, in the age of 7 to 13 years. It is emphasized by Papalia's statement (1975), in the age of which, children want to see their selves are mature. They will break the rules to enjoy whatever they done. However, teachers and parents have power to prevent what the children do to the rules. They-the children-feel, what they have done is right? Of course not. It occurs because they have power too; even it is less power.

Along with Schaefer's statement in his book *How to Influence Children* (2003) that angry expressions when disciplining students indicated by giving punishment to them, usually stating a mock, humiliet, tease, flaw, and yell will engender less confidence and fear for students, Instead, they may tend to be rebellious.

2. RESEARCH PROBLEMS

To conduct this research, the writer will focus more on some expressions using two questions. Those questions are:

1. What presumptions of the conflict in the novel *Nothing But the Truth* cause the main character-student who breaks the rule?
2. What are the implications of the student's reaction to the rule?

2.1 Limitation of the Study

This research investigates some events that performed conflicting of the rule among student, parents, and teachers; then, identifies some expressions representing conflicting the rule between teachers and student, as represented in *Nothing But the Truth*.

2.2 Clarification of the Key Terms

Here I encompass some explanations of terms used in this research. The explanations will be based on expert opinions. The explanations are as follows:

1. **Conversation Analysis** is, a technique developed relatively recently for examining and exploring spoken language. It used in verbal interaction such as doctor-patient consultation, legal hearings, interactions in courtroom and classroom etc.
2. **Conflict** is “an expressed struggle, at least between two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce [resource], and interference from the other party in achieving their goals” (Hocker & Wilmot, 1985, p 23).
3. **Documentary Novel** is the model of the “living newspaper”—a style of theater developed during the 1930s to dramatize social issues in an unconventional way, via speeches, readings, and dialogue.

3. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

3.1 Conflict

The section consists of five subsections, namely, definition of conflict, conflict climates, the relation between power and conflict, and conflict from pragmatic perspective.

3.1.1 Definition of Conflict

Conflict is “an expressed struggle, between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce

[resources], and interference from the other party in achieving their goals" (Hocker & Wilmot, 1985, P.23). The conflict occurs when we have two people, one who is upset, and the other who is not. It also happens while an individual's private interest differs from his or her professional obligation to the School, University, and institutions.

3.1.2 Conflict Outcomes

In the earlier discussion, conflict was suggested that it might sometimes be a good thing. In this sections, it will be boldly argued that conflict can be good because when handled properly it can produce positive results. As we all know, it can also produce negative results. So, we will look at both sides.

One benefit of conflict is that it often serves as an impetus for change. If a situation is favorable, we roll along and do not disturb them. When the situation is unfavorable though, we often feel forced to confront to others. The "others" might be our employers, friends, or our spouse. It is through conflict that we change the situation. This conflict can take the form of discussions or arguments, or might be as complex as an arbitrary, a strike or even a war when countries are involved. These changes are not always good. A war can result is fascism or communism as easily as democracy or more freedom. Often the more equal the parties, the harder they must work to find a suitable solution for all, and the better that solution will be.

A related benefit of conflict is creativity in solutions. Conflict often forces us to look for new and unconsidered ways of getting what we want rather than battle about your way or mine,. For an example, imagine when a husband and his wife argue over dinner plans. She suggests them to eat out (because she is too tired cook). Meanwhile, he responds that they should eat in (because he wants to save money). They can argue out or in until one of them gives up. Then, one of them get a winner or a mad person. This is not good. They can argue until

them both stubbornly quit, and finally neither of them has dinner. This is not good either. They can get beyond the in or out question to why each of them feel as they do.

If they look for options where she cannot have to cook and they don't spend much money they open up new possibilities. He can cook, they can visit their mother who are usually glad to feed them, they can look for coupons or bargain meals (e.g. value menu at Wendy's or dollar days at DQ), or check the freezer for TV dinners. We are sure with time and discussion they can come up with even more options. When people at work find themselves in this type of conflict, it often results in new inventions or improved procedures. This creativity is directly sparked by conflict, handled constructively.

If you use the dinner argument, you can illustrate a third benefit of conflict, interpersonal growth. When we survive conflict with others, and improve our situation and understand of how the other person thinks, we have grown interpersonally. With this person, we are now a little better in our communication because of this growth. This is why we often view a relationship's first fight as a milestone.

You may have noticed that discussion of growth and benefits from conflict often follow a phrase like "when handled affectively." We now move discussion of tools to help you understand and respond to conflict in an affective and productive manner. These tools include conflict climates and power.

3.1.3 Conflict Climates

When we consider whether we look at the specific conditions, or current weather, and the more general, long-term conditions, or climate. In conflict, this same concept exists. While, we may have an emotional response or a logical attack at any given time, we usually have a guiding way of interacting with certain people. This set of personal habits and expectations are part of the climate of the conflict. Jack Gibb divided our actions into two main climate patterns, supportive and defensive.

He listed six pairs of communication behaviors that supported one or the other climate, as follows:

1) Supportive orientation which contains

Equality : It occurs we treat the others as if they were our equals.

Example : "If you don't like this idea very much, then let's look for other ideas.

Description: It explains conditions in details and specifics

Example: Let me explain why I think your implementation step is too expensive.

Problem Orientation: It shows, "let's look at my idea and your ideas. Then see if that generates so me others, and pick the best of the bunch."

Spontaneity: It shows, "let's look at my ideas, and your ideas. Then see if that generates so me others, and pick the best of the bunch."

Example: "Let's look at some reasons I think we should do it this way."

Empathy: He or she is trying to understand the situations from the other person's perspective, or sharing their emotions.

Example: " I am sorry that your sick leave is up, how are you feeling now? Have you checked to see if the company has a leave bank?"

Provisionalism: being more reluctant or tentative in making the final decisions, which leaves you open to other ideas.

Example: "In my opinion, this is the right answer."

2) Defensive behaviors contain

Superiority: When we express the feeling that we have more power, money, intelligence.....than the other person.

Example: "If you think you're so hot, let's see you come up with a better idea."

Evaluation: Skips explanation of why or how, and jumps to assigning value or utility.

Example: "That won't work." Or "That is smart."

Control: The desire to have our ideas done only our way.

Example: "it is my way or the high way."

Strategy: It attempts to use hidden tactics to manipulate the other person, such as guilt, pride ago, shame, fear.

Example: "Let's just do it my way, then you can go home and spend time with your wife, who you have been neglecting."

Neutrality: "Being unmoved by personal situations, and sticking to the rules and facts.

Certainty: "Being sure of the response, and not open the other options. Sometimes it called dogmatic"

Example: "This is the correct answer, while the rest are incorrect."

Given the application, there are times when the supportive behaviors can be viewed with suspicion. For example, provisionalism might be seen as wishy-wishy, or unable to make a decision. Spontaneity might make you look like the guy who never plans.

3.1.4 Reward and Punishment

A central element in understanding conflict, and how people respond to conflict, are to understand their power viewpoint. The viewpoint of power includes that individual's sources of power (includes

their actual sources, perceived sources and current cumulative level), and their ability to access and apply that power to a given situation. Several ideas are important in this idea. *First* is that power is perceptual. If we have the power to have you do something for me because of our positions at work, then it will be unlikely that we will get a benefit from the power. If we don't have that power or authority, but you think that we do, then you will probably comply anyway. *Second*, cumulative level of power is mentioned because we may have several sources of power that we add to or lose. This is because power is always changing, or is dynamic, depending on factors in our situation.

Our power also changes from person to person and as our situation changes. At work we may be a supervisor to one friend, and at the same level with another. After work we may be equals, or power may even reverse. If we are playing basket ball and the person we supervise is our team captain, then he may now take a stronger leadership role. Much of this will become clearer as we discuss the sources of power that are available to us at different times. First, let's make sure we all understand what is meant by power.

Many people think that power produce intimidation. But power has a broader application. Power is the ability to influence others. When there is a new baby in the house, that infant who doesn't understand power, has a great ability to make others do things for her. In the middle of the night, we will leave my warm bed and feed this child, change her diaper or just comfort her. It indicates why the seemingly powerless would get compliance, and the powerful would not we need to understand the sources of our power and their relationship to the situation. If my four years old son would ask me to write a proposal for a new speech class, we probably would not, but we would do this for our supervisor or ministry or president (maybe not in the middle of the night thought).

3.1.5 Conflict from Pragmatic Perspective

Conflict may occur because it serves the interaction of groups, particularly the interaction of group power holders. In the context of pragmatics, when speaker utters some statements to hearer, the statements may be ambiguity and give misinterpretation. Finally, it may generate conflict between speaker and hearer. The conflict will happen because each person has different perspective, or point of view, or interpretation about something. Eventually, it produces different implication. For example, in one side speaker implicating something is A, while another hearer implicating it is B.

Somehow, it should be a good solution when doing interaction with other people to avoid conflict, such as, saying a sentence clearly, directly, and denotatively as well to avoid ambiguity and misinterpretation.

According to the settings of my research-in school, Clabaugh and Rozycki (1990) stated that in many school systems, board members promote antagonisms among school administrators, teachers, and students.

3.2 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of the relation between the structure a semiotic system (notably language) and its usage in context, and along with semantics (see Semantics). With inference and the unsaid, and the way in which language structure trades on this backgrounds of the presumed and the inferred. Pragmatics is a part of general linguistic theory. It has substantial intrinsic subject matter. Partly, it explains other linguistic phenomena.

The use of the term 'pragmatics' in modern semiotics derives from the philosophical work of C.S Peirce and R Carnap, reflected in C. Morris's (1938) three divisions of semiotics, the study of sign system: *syntax*, which investigates the relation of signs to sign, *semantics*,

which investigates the relation of signs to the things referred to, and pragmatics, which studies the relation of signs to users of them. Since then, the usage of the term has bifurcated into a broad use, which subsumes sociolinguistics (See sociolinguistics) and discourse analysis (see conversation analysis, sociological, and discourse, anthropology of), and a narrower use (associated especially with philosophy of language and approaches to the study of meaning which derive from it) in which pragmatics deals with those aspects of meaning that are systematically context-dependent.

Contemporary linguistic pragmatic focuses on a number of special relations between linguistic meaning and context. On the narrower scope for pragmatics, concerned with context-dependent meaning, the following topics have to come to be central deixis, presupposition, speech acts, implicature, and conversational inference-the inferential model which includes some kinds of presumptions. The two last of central will be discussed briefly in turn.

3.2.1 Presumptions

Basically, the connection between speaker's communicative intention (message) and a sentence is not one of conventional coding of the message into the sentence via its meaning, but it is inferential. Based on the theory of communication to be presented here (see Bach and Harnish 1979), linguistic communication is successful when the hearer, upon hearing an expression, recognizes the speaker's communicative intention Linguistic communication works because the speaker and the hearer share a system of inferential strategies leading from the utterances of an expression to the hearer's recognition of the speaker's communicative intent. It is a kind of cooperative problem solving. The speaker faces the problem of getting the hearer to recognize the speaker's communicative intention, so the speaker must choose and expression that will facilitate such recognition, given the context of utterance.

While, the Inferential Model of communication proposes that in the course of learning to speak our language we also learn how to communicate in that language, and learn this involves acquiring a variety of shared beliefs or presumptions, as well as a system of inferential strategies. The presumptions allow us to presume certain helpful things about potential hearers (or speaker), and the interference from what someone utters to what that person might be trying to communicate. Taken together, the presumptions and strategies provide the basis for and account of successful linguistic communication.

3.2.2 Conversational Implicatures

In pragmatics, **conversational implicature** is an indirect or implicit speech act: what is meant by a speaker's utterance that is not part of what is explicitly said. The term is also known simply as **implicature**; it is the antonym (opposite) of explicature, which is an explicitly communicated assumption.

Implication is the relationship between two statements where the truth of one suggest the truth of the other, but-distinguishing implication from entailment—does not require it. For example, the sentence *Mary had a baby and got married* strongly suggest that Mary had the baby before wedding, but the sentence would still be strictly true even if Mary had her baby after she got married. Further, if we add the qualification – not necessarily in that order to the original sentence, then the implication is cancelled even though the meaning of the original sentence is not allowed.

The main concept in pragmatics as one branch of linguistics is **Conversational Implicatures**. It is also the key notion in the cooperative principle in which it is necessary in using language effectively and efficiently. However, to make the language useful, there are some maxims of conversation as general principles underlie to that cooperative principle. According to Grice (1975), people assume that there are some kind of rules for interaction that direct us to a particular

interpretation of what a person is saying, unless we receive some indication to the contrary. He describes the cooperative principle thus:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Grice 1975-45).

Conversational implicature refers to the inference a hearer makes about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from their interpretation of the literal meaning of what is said, the conversational principle and its maxims.

4. RESEARCH PROCEDURE

This chapter explains the problems of the study and the methodology which are used to solve is be clear, there are three sections are research method, data collection technique, and data analysis. The last section will be divided into two subsections, namely, conversation analysis and steps of analysis.

4.1 Research Method

The methodology applied in this research is Qualitative Method. It can not only obtain highly descriptive data, but also compel information related to the usual evaluation questions, such as what, how, many effects, and outcomes. However, the qualitative information can also help her understand perceptions and interpretation of circumstances and events. The writer will use conversation data as the qualitative information.

The character of the data is descriptive. So, it does not relate to numerical information. In other word, Nasir(1999) said that, it merely investigates a group of people, an object, condition, event, and some social contexts by describing them in picture, textual evidences, or just word expressions. Thus, it will be more focus on the facts, description of among characters, and relationship of research elements systematically, factually, accurately.

Whay, Trott, and Bloomer(1998) also believe that qualitative method produse judgments, perceptions, and insights, are most appropriate to the data that writer collected.

4.2 Data Collection Technique and Data Analysis

The data will be collected by taking important notes focusing on the events that represent conflicting of the rule between teachers and student. The analysis of the novel then will be use Conversation Analysis(CA) and will be combined with Pragmatic Approach.

4.2.1 Coverstation Analysis

Conversational Analysis in one of study that will be applied to refer to one form of the realization of real conversation that is in the classroom, on the plane of language, as represented in the novel *Nothing But The Truth*. It is used to analyze some utterances that occur in interactions between speaker and hearer. Whatever we do in interaction, we do so as to be understood to mean something. That in plenty to be going on with, both in doing social life and in analyzing it.

The approach to the analysis of spoken interaction know as conversation analysis (CA) developed from work carried out by Harvey sacks, Gail Jefferson, and Emanuel Schegloff in the early 1960s at the University of California. CA arose in the field of sociology and started with the examination of the telephone calls made to the Los Angeles Suicide Privention Center.

The writer considers that CA is an appropriate way to analyze that novel.The novel. Wihich is formed a documentary novel, has a unique format of the novel because the outhor follower the model of the “Living newspaper”-a style of theatre evolved during the 1930, to dramatize social issues in an unconventional way, via speeches, readings, and dialogue.

The discourse structure of conversations is generally less easy to redict than in many other genres. Form example, conversations tend to be more open-ende and involve more shifts in topic than is the case

with some other genres. There generally are, however, a number of aspects of conversation which typically occur. Conversations are generally divided up into three main stages. Burns and Joyce (1997), as cited in Brian's book, argue that the three stages are:

Opening stages: -*Greeting* Example: Hi(sec.3), Hey(sec.14) Hello

-*Initiating exchange*

Example: How you doing? (sec.3), How're things?

Middle stages: Developing a range of topics using conversational strategies, such as: turn-taking. Turn allocation, keeping a turn, adjacency pairs, preferred and dis-preferred responses, ways of giving feedback, etc.

Closing stages: - Pre-closing

Example: Now! Thank you (sec.1). Get along with your day. Make it a good one(sec.5), Okay, peg. Sorry to bother you (sec.8), thank you for coming in. Philip, I hope you think about it(sec.9), I'm glad. You're telling the truth can only help her(sec.16), Anyway, well, thanks for calling(falling intonation).

-Closing → Bye, see you, chaw.

The categories of conversational data that has been collected, it will be classified by using the middle stage that focuses on adjacency pairs and preferred and dis-preferred responses. Chimombo and Rose Berry (1998: 40) explain by combining with common adjacency pairs, as follows:

Adjscency	Preferred	Dispreferred
Request	acceptance	Refusal

Offer/invite	acceptance	Refusal
Assessment	Agreement	Disagreement
Question	Expected answer	Unexpected answer
		Or non-answer
Compliment	acceptance	rejection

The example of which:

Miss Narwin : Is that someone humming? question

Is that humming

Philip : Just humming expected answer

Miss Narwin : Please stop it. request

Philip : Mr.Lunser doesn't mind, I just- refusal (by

unexpected

answer)

A question or request may be followed by an expected answer (preferred) or unexpected answer (dis-preferred).

4.2.2 Steps of Analysis

There are some steps the writer will be done to analyze the data as the following:

1. Read the novel thoroughly for preliminary in-depth analysis, nothing down how the presumptions and the implications of the story in that novel are showed in each situation of the story.
2. Using a critical reading method for taking expressions on the conflict events uttered by each character that focusing on the breaking the rules.

3. Read the relevant references on conversation analysis and pragmatics.
4. Read the relevant books and articles regarding conflict, in the context of school/classroom interaction as the main focus on this research.
5. Comprehend the Conversation Analysis as based theory for collection data
6. Identify the presumption and implication that showed in the conflict as the answer of the first and second research question.
7. Present the data of point 5 and 6 in the form of tables, as the textual evidences to make easy doing analysis.

5. DATA ANALYSIS, FINDINGS, AND DISSCUSIONS

5.1 Data Analysis

In this sections, the research will focus on how the data analyzed by using the concepts of pragmatics. To be more specific, the concepts will be limited into two, they are *Presumptions and Conversational Implicatures*. They will be explain below.

5.1.1 Presumptions

There are some kinds of presumptions as the ***Inferential Model of Communication***. And, it also will be added by some examples and their analysis.

5.1.1.1 Linguistic Presumptions (LP)

The hearer is presumed to be capable of determining the meaning and the referents of the expressions in the context of utterance or it is called as metaphorical expression.

Example 1)

Miss Narwin : oh, **stupid business** (sec 1 page 42-43)

I presume that the speaker feel upset.

Mr. Lunser : A **decent** kid (sec 3, page 50)

The speaker is pride of his student.

Philip : It's a **dumb** rule (sec 9, page (83-84)

The speaker thinks that the rule is bad.

5.1.1.2 Communicative Presumptions (CP)

The speaker is assumed to be speaking with some identifiable communicative intent.

Example 2)

Miss Narwin : Is that someone humming?

I don't know who that is, but you heard Dr. Doane request silence. **Is that you, Philip?**

Philip Malloy : Just humming (sec.1)

The speaker intent has been identifiable by guessing the person who does it.

Mr. Benison :**Something the matter.** Peg?

Miss Narwin : **Oh, stupid business.** I suppose it's this changing homeroom classes.

The announcements and so on. And when the national anthem comes on, the students *are* supposed to stand in silence.

Mr. Benison : "Respect, silence, and attention," I think the rules read (sec. 2)

The speaker tries to identify what is going on hearer.

Miss Narwin : **Phillip Malloy**

Mr. Benison : **Oh, sure, Phil. Nice kid. Bright-when he gets around to doing some work. Which isn't exactly every day. He's got being fast on his brain. Humming loudly? What was he doing that for?** (sec. 3)

Miss Narwin : **One of my new** homeroom students, Philip Malloy, informed me that you always allowed singing

Mr. Lunser : **Oh, Philip...Right. He was in my homeroom. He'd do better if he thought himself a little less clever and got his brain into something besides running. But I like him. A decent kid.** You get him? (sec.3)

The second speaker recognizes what the student is like.

Miss Narwin : Is that someone humming? (What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming? Whose broad stripes and bright stars...

Philip, is that you again? (...thro' the perilous fight, o'er the ramparts we watched were so gallantly streaming?)

Philip, I spoke to you yesterday about this. (And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air...)

Philip, stop this insolence! (Oh, say does that Star – Spangled Banner yet wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?)

Philip, leave this room instantly. Report to Dr. Palleni's office. Now! (sec.4)

The speaker tries to identify who is singing the national anthem when it is playing.

5.1.1.3 Presumptions of Literalness (PL)

The speaker is assumed to be speaking literally. It means that the expression tends to utter denotatively, directly, and clearly. Almost the expression that uttered in whole conversation in the novel *Nothing But the Truth* is literal. The writer will give some examples of which from some sections.

Example 3)

Section 1 :

Miss Narwin : **Is that someone humming?**

I don't know who that is, but you heard Dr. Doane request silence. Is that you, Philip?

Philip : **Just humming**

Miss Narwin : **Please stop it.**

Philip : Mr. Lunser doesn't mind. I just
Here, the conflict is begun.

Section 3 :

Mr. Benison : Something the matter, Peg?

Miss Narwin : Oh, stupid business. I suppose it's this changing
homeroom classes. The announcements, and so on.
**And when the national anthem comes on, the
students are supposed to stand in silence**

Mr. Benison : "Respect, silence, and attention," I think the rule
reads.

Miss Narwin : Exactly. **I had a student who started to him
loudly. Very loudly**

The second speaker feels upset because there is a student who
disobeys the rule.

Section 4 :

Miss Narwin : **Is that someone humming?**

Philip, is that you again?

I spoke to you yesterday about this.

This is a time for listening. **Now, please, stop
singing.**

Philip, stop this insolence

Philip, leave this room instantly. Report to
Dr. Palleni's office. Now!

The speaker guess there is someone who sings the song and
makes sure that the person is the same like before.

It has similar condition to section 6 because Philip-the student- makes
the same mistake.

Section 6 :

Miss Narwin : Philip, is that you singing again? Philip! I am talking
to you.

Philip : I have the right to do it.

- Miss Narwin : The what?
- Philip : The right.
- Miss Narwin : I want you to stop it immediately. Your actions are thoroughly disrespectful
- Philip : It's you who's being disrespectful
- Miss Narwin : Philip!
- Philip : I was being patriotic. That's all. It's a free country.
You have no right to stop me.
I was just singing to myself.

The second speaker makes the same mistake and he tries to keep his argument. However, it makes the first speaker-his teachers-be angry.

Section 7 :

- Dr. Palleni : What's going on?
- Philip Malloy : **Miss Narwin She won't let me sing "The Star-Spangled Banner."**
- Dr. Palleni : Isn't this what we were talking about the last time?
- Philip Malloy : **She's against me being patriotic**
- Dr. Palleni : **I thought we agreed that when we have rules in schools, we stick with them.**
- Philip Malloy : **I was just singing...**
- Dr. Palleni : **Did you hear me?**
- Philip Malloy : **It's a free country**
- Dr. Palleni : **Nothing is free.**

The second speaker tries to keep his right-being a patriotic by singing the national anthem-even though the rule says no.

Section 8 :

- Dr. Palleni : **Look, it's about this Phil Malloy**
- Miss Narwin : Something is certainly bothering that boy.

- Dr. Palleni : Singing when you asked him not to.
- Miss Narwin : Quite provocative . Trying to create an incident.
- Dr. Palleni : **I offered to get him out of this business by coming back and apologizing , but he won't. Two day suspension.**
- Miss Narwin : **Maybe it would be better to switch him into another homeroom.**

Both speakers try to find out the better solution for the problem that happens to one of their students in recent.

Section 9:

- Dr. Palleni : Look, Mrs. Malloy, I don't want to get into that.
Philip admits he broke a rule.
- Mrs. Malloy : What rule?
- Dr. Palleni : Disturbing a class.
- Philip : **Singing a national anthem.**
- Mrs. Malloy : Is that the rule?
- Dr. Palleni : **Yes, disturbing the class.**
- Mrs. Malloy : I just can't believe that-
- Dr. Palleni : Excuse me. Philip, did you break the rule?
- Philip : **It's a dumb rule.**
- Dr. Palleni : See? He's admitting it. Mrs. Malloy, it is my job-one of my jobs-to make sure the school-the kids, the staff, the teachers-works together in harmony.
I'm sure we agree that we can't have kids deciding which rules to follow and which rules not to follow. I really don't wish to discuss it. Two-day suspension. For the rest of today. And Monday. Be back on Tuesday.
- Mrs. Mollay : I just want to say I don't think it is right. I mean,

singing the-

Dr. Palleni : Excuse me. Are you saying **that kids should only follow the rules they want to?**

Mrs. Malloy : Not, but-

The first speaker still supposes that the third speaker has broken the rule. However, the second speaker does not believe if the third speaker-her son-has disturbed the class by singing the national anthem. Actually, she believes to the rule. So, the second speaker tries to find the clarification of which and its solution.

Section 10 :

Miss Narwin : Did you have to suspend him?

Dr. Palleni : The rule. **Two infractions I one week. Anyway, I put a memo in your box. Also, switch him back to Bernie for homeroom. What about his English class?**

Miss Narwin : **I don't want to give up on him yet.**

Dr. Palleni : Whatever you say.

The first speaker sincerely feels worry about her student who has made a mistake. So, she actually does not want to give up on teaching English to that student.

Section 11 :

Dr. Seymour : Well, look at section D. Community news. Page two. School news. Did you find it?

Dr. Doane : Yes, and I.... Oh my!
This is ridiculous!

Dr. Seymour : **What is this business? I had a call from a reporter yesterday, but....**
Is any of this true?

Dr. Doane : Al, **the boy was not suspended because of singing**

the national anthem. Of course not.

He was suspended because he was creating a disturbance.

That's according to Joe

Dr. Seymour : **A disturbance by singing? Singing 'The Star-Spangled Banner'?**

Let's hope so. I mean....

Dr. Doane : **Al, no one could take this seriously.**

Dr. Seymour : I hope not. I hope not. **With the budget vote soon ... and the school board-**

The second speaker feels surprised with the news. She tries to clarify the problems to the first speaker though the real problem it does not like that. The first speaker is a little bit upset because of the news. He does not only feel afraid that his school will get bad image from the public, but he worries about the vote soon .

In the section 12, there is similar condition with the section before

Section 12 :

Dr. Seymour : Look, I got a call from **Gloria Harland about this boy who was suspended for singing.**

Dr. Doane : **Al, I told you,** that's not why the boy was suspended

Dr. Seymour : That's not what's at stake here. I've got this budget...Now listen. She was at a meeting last night at which this guy, **Ted Griffen**

Dr. Doane : He's running for the school board.

Dr. Seymour : Exactly. And wouldn't you know, he's making speeches about the **incident, claiming its school policy to keep kids from singing-**

- Dr. Doane : **Al, that's absolutely untrue**
- Dr. Seymor : It doesn't matter if it's true or not true. **It's what people are saying that's important.**

The first speaker feels worry this problem will give bad image to the school because it has been blown up to the public. It also has become a hot issue for one of the school board candidates - Ted Griffen - when he campaigns himself in front of many people.

Section 13 :

- Dr. Doane : Peg, just tell me what happened.
- Miss Narwin : **I've told you twice now I know you're upset, Peg. But I have to get it down clearly.** Anyway, we all need to tell the same story.
- Dr. Palleni : **Gert's trying to be helpful, Peg.**
It's terribly upsetting.
- Miss Narwin : very well... **Philip** Malloy-from the first day **he entered my homeroom-last week**-during the time are asked **to stand in silence during the playing** of the national anthem, he sang. **Loudly. With no respect. Very loudly.** To make a commotion.
Obviously. The first time he did it, I asked him to stop, and he did. After a bit. **The second two times, he didn't.** refused. That's when I sent him **to Joe. Both times**
- Dr. Palleni : The boy admitted it, Gert. No bones about that
- Miss Narwin : Deliberately provocative
- Dr. Doane : Do we know why? Peg?
- Miss Narwin : I haven't the slightest idea.

- Dr. Doane : Maybe I should talk to some students
- Miss Narwin : I don't know. I will say this, Gert he's always been restless in English class. Sort of a wise guy. I'd have to call him, try to cover up laziness with smart talk. I don't know why. Sometimes that just happens. The chemistry. In his last exam for me how wrote a very foolish, really provocative, answer. Mocking me.
- Dr. Doane : You?
- Miss Narwin : Oh, yes. Absolutely. Mocking
- Dr. Doane : Do you still have it?
- Miss Narwin : I always return exams to student.
- Dr. Doane : Too bad. But there must be some reason-
- Miss Narwin : I agree
- Dr. Palleni : Home, Gert. Home. Ninety-nine point nine times out of a hundred you get a think like this, a kid acting out. Believe me, it is home.
- Dr. Doane : But we don't know that

The first speaker tries to find out the truth by asking the second and third speakers. But, here, there is an odd statement from the second speaker. She stated that the student- Philip- has mocked her in his paper during the exams. So, it seems the problem does not to focus on the rule again. While, the third speaker tries to identify the reason of that student do the mistake. He assumes that the reason is come from the student's home.

5.1.1.4 Conversational Presumptions (ConPs)

- Relevance : The speaker's remarks are relevant to the conversation
- Example 4)
- Miss Narwin : Is that someone humming
- Philip : Just humming

- Mr. Benison : Something matter, Peg? (sec. 3; page 42-43)
- Miss Narwin : Oh, stupid business. I suppose it's this changing homeroom classes. The announcements and so on. And when the national anthem comes on, the students are supposed to stand in silence.
- Mr. Benison : Respect, silence, and attention, "I think the rules reads.
- Miss Narwin : Exactly. I had a student who started to him loudly, very loudly

The first speaker felt wondered because she thought that the rule is clear not to sing when the song of national anthem is playing. Nevertheless, there is a student who does hum it.

While in later section, the writer presumes that the first speaker, Mr. Bension (MB) asks the condition of the second speaker, Miss Narwin (MN). For the first time, MN's answer is less relevant to the MB's questions. But, when the conversation is running. They can do that smoothly.

Sincerity : The speaker is being sincere.

Example 5)

- Miss Narwin : Phillip Malloy
- Mr. Benison : Oh. Sure, Phil. Nice kid. Bright. When he gets aroundto doing some work which isn't exactly every day.
- He's got being fast on his brain Humming loudly?
What was he doing that for (sec.2)?
- Mr. lunser : Oh. Philip... right. He was in my homeroom. He'd do better if he thought himself a little less clever and got his brain into something besides running. But I like him. A decent kid (sec.3)

Miss Narwin : I don't want to give up on him yet

He's really a nice boy (sec.10)

The speaker-Mr. Benison, Mr. Lunser, and Miss Narwin sincerely agree to say that Philip is a good boy, nice kid and

Philip Malloy : She wouldn't let me sing "The Star- Spangled
Banner"

Two former speakers try to say the truth that rule says that we or all members of that school must keep quiet when the national anthem is being played. While the last speaker says that his teacher does not allow him to sing.

5.1.2 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature refers to the inference a hearer makes about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from their interpretation of the literal meaning of what is said, the conversational principle and its maxims. Grices (cited in Brian's book) argues that this principle is based on four conversational maxims, these are :

The maxim of quality ----- be true

The maxim of quantity ----- be brief

The maxim of relation ----- relevant

The maxim of manner ----- clear

Explanations :

1. The maxim of quantity that speakers are expected to give as much information as necessary for their interlocutors to understand their utterances but to give no more information than it. For example, Dr. Doane announced the rules that administration, faculty, and students must rise and stand at respectful, silent attention for playing of our national anthem (sec 6; page 71-73), it is the maxim of quantity that permits you to assume that no body allows to hum even

to sing the song. The conversational implication of such a reply is 'no one person who may sing the national anthem when it is played, including hum it'.

2. The maxim of quality that speakers and writers are expected to say only what they believe to be true and to have evidence for what they say. Be truthful. The maxim of quality applies principally to an assertion and certain other 'representative' speech acts. Expressive and directives can hardly be judge true or false in the same sense. However, there are two points of view which, first this maxim constrains interlocutors to tell the truth and to have evidence for their statements. Second, this maxim will also make lying possible. For example in the section 1. Philip said that Mr. Lunser doesn't mind that he hummed the national anthem when it is played While, in section 3, when the Mr. Lunser is asked by Philip's English teacher, Miss Narwin, he-Mr. Lunser- stated that the rule says keep quiet and he supposed that "do I look like a guy who goes around breaking the rules?" the conversational implications of both statements are the first speaker is assumed that he- Philip- said the truth. But in another sections his statements is made bias by Mr. Lunser- the second speaker. So based on the maxim of quality the statements might be true and also it might be lie
3. The maxim of relevance that it directs speakers to organize their utterance in such a way that they are relevant to ongoing context. Be relevant at the time of the utterance.

Example 7

- Mr. Benison : Something the matter, peg? (sec.3 ; page 42-43)
- Miss Narwin : Oh stupid business suppose it's this changing homeroom classes. The announcements, and so on. And when the national anthem comes on, students are supposed to stand in silence

Mr. Benison : “respect, silence and attention.” I think the rules
read

Miss Narwin : Exactly. I had a student who started to him loudly.
Very loudly

Based on the explanation above, sure, it is related to each other even, the data are included in one of the maxims of conversation that is the maxim of relation it is called the maxim of relation because the data will be affected to the meaning or presumption of utterances and, it becomes the core of implication and also becomes a main factor in interpreting of utterance/ sentence

4. The maxim of manner that this maxim dictates that speakers and writers avoid ambiguity and obscurity, and be orderly in their utterances.

According to blakeore’s book of understanding utterances (1992), there are some examples. When someone says “ is that someone humming? Please stop it” and another person after hearing the question, says ‘ just humming, Mr. Lunser doesn’t mind I just-‘ . clearly, the second speaker does not mean ‘ I am only humming at all’. But rather the first speaker will assume this and ‘implicate’ the second speaker’s meaning for the complete it will be presented, below

Example 8

In the event on march 28th.

Miss Narwin : is that someone humming?
I don’t know, who that is , but you heard Dr. Doane
requested silence. Is that you, Philip?

Philip Malloy : Just humming

Miss Narwin : Pleae stop it.

Philip : Mr. Lunser doesn’t mind I just-

Miss Narwin : stop it now

Philip : But-

Miss Narwin : Now! Thank you

From the dialogue above, the first speaker. Miss Narwin, asks the student, Philip to stop his humming when the national anthem is playing. The first speaker hopes that the second speaker obeys the rule, by saying "..... But you heard Dr. Doane request silence." The rule is clear and has been determined by the school. It also has been already announced by the principle of Harrison high School. Dr. Gertrude Doane. In contrast, the second speaker, Philip, gives a less relevant answer. He answers that he just humming, whereas Miss Narwin wants he stop to hum. Even, he argues that another teacher, Mr. Lunser, doesn't mind he hums it.

That description implies that Philip, the second speaker, does not obey the rule even he conflicts the rule because of his other teacher support.

5.2 Findings and Discussions

From all explanations above, the writer tries to conclude some descriptions or the presumptions and the implications of the novel. Beside that, it shows how is the implications seen from the social status of the language users.

5.2.1 The Representations of the Presumptions of the Novel

According to the explanation about presumptions before, it is found the answer of the first question in research problems. The question is, "What the presumptions of the conversation in that Novel cause the main character-a student- breaks the rule"? The presumptions of the novel based on the description, is dominantly categorized to the Presumptions of Literalness, as well as Conversational Presumptions. It can be seen from the analysis of the data. The conclusion of which is, what the representation and how it is seen from the relation among teacher, student, and parent. The writer

concludes that the conflict generates from the main character-a student, who has name Philip. He makes the same mistake- breaks the rule, singing the national anthem when it is playing. I presume that he does it because he feels bored live in home and there is no pay attention from his parents. The rule itself is not absolutely obligatory in that country, except for that school. Why I say that? Because in the last story, it is talked about how is the student removed to another school which allows him to sing the song. It can be said that the rule is optional. The country where they live does not allow any no body sing the national anthem when it is playing. As stated by Jake Barlow, in his talk show, there is a statement that he quoted from American Affiliated Press Wire Service. "A tenth grader was suspended from his local school he sang 'The Star-Spangled Banner' during the school's morning exercises. **The boy, Philip Malloy, who wished to sing in the spirit of patriotism, was then forced to remain home alone, since both his parents work.** English teacher Margaret Narwin who brought about the suspension, maintains the boy was making a nuisance of himself."

Referring to the review of the novel in chapter I, there are **strong indications that he was acting out some personal animosity toward the teacher in question for reasons unknown.** His school performance has been inferior. It has been suggested that there may be problems in the home arena because he feels no more pay attention from his parents. Therefore, the relationship between Philip and his parents is actually disharmony. So, it gives a bad impact to the relation between him and his teacher.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusion

This section presents the conclusion of the present study in accordance with the research problem previously discussed in chapter III.

Related to the first research problem, for example, the presumptions of the conversation in the novel cause the main character- a student- breaks the rule, the present study identifies four categories of presumptions: Linguistic Presumptions (LP), Presumptions of Literatures (PL), Communicative Presumptions (CP), and conversational Presumptions (ConPs) while, for the last category – Conversational Presumptions- has some subcategories: relevance, sincerity, and truthfulness. The presumptions of the story can be taken literally because they almost existed dominantly in the story, as well as Conversational Presumptions. The story is presumed about the main character- a student conflicts the rule (humming the national anthem when it is played), but the peripheral character- his teachers- suppose that the student has disturbed the class by doing it. Even though he is a smart student, the school still gave him a suspension as punishment.

Related to the second research problem that focuses on the implication of the student's reaction to the rule it is found that the student reacts students reacts to make the Conflicts/problems in to public, so that the issue could be hot news in some newspaper. Starting from a small problem, but in the next, it becomes a big problem because the main character is supported by others to publish the conflict the issue (to the public) through a newspaper. The implication can be obtained by using four conversation maxims, namely, the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner. Each dialog, especially each expression has similar maxim and they are maxim of relation.

6.2 Recommendations

Referring to the conclusions above, there are some recommendation for further research. This research is concerned with the presumption and the implication of a novel, especially the conflict that happened in the story. I think it will be better for further research that the study focuses more on what the presupposition of the story is

about and what conflict management is presented. The tool of analysis for further research would be more elaborative if it uses psychological analysis or linguistic approach to see the representation from other perspective.

Besides that, it should be considered how to read a literary work. There are some approaches how to read a novel or text, for example, by using authorship, readership, inter textual study, and inter contextual study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, Keith. 1994. *Meaning and Speech Acts*. Monash University.
Available:
<http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/definition.html>
- Bach, Kent. 1994. *The Semantics-Pragmatics Distinction: What It Is and Why It Matters*. Available:
<http://userwww.sfsu.edu/~kbach/semprag.html>
- Levinson, S C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Available:
<http://www.ling.ed.ac.uk/~andrew/researc/andrew-dm-smith-thesis-chapter-10.pdf>
- Blaxter, Loraine et al. 1996. *How To Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Blakemore, *Understanding Utterances: An Introduction to Pragmatics*, by Dianne
- Chimombo, M. P. F., & Roseberry, R. L. (1998). *The power of discourse: An introduction to discourse analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Clabaug, Gary K., Edward G. Rozycki. 1990. *Understanding schools: the foundations of education*. Authors, Publisher, Harper & Row, 1990

- Hocker, Joyce L. t. and William W. Wilmo . Interpersonal Conflict. 1985. Dubuque, Iowa : Wm. C. Brown
- Holmes, Janet. 1998. An Introduction To Sociolinguistics 2nd edition). Sydney: Longman
- Liu, Shaozhong. 2010. Negative Pragmatic Transfer: Types, distributions, and communicative effects. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing
- Pierce and R. Carnap,C.S. Accounts of meaning usually throw a handful of putty ... work of reflected in C. Morris's (1938)
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321834405_Grice's_Conversational_Implicature_A_Pragmatics_Analysis_of_Selected_Poems_of_Audre_Lorde
- Nababan, P. W. I, 1987. Ilmu Pragmatika (Teori dan Penerapannya). Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan
- Papalia, Diane, 1975. A Child's World: Infacy Through Adolescence. McGraw-Hill: USA
- Paltridge, Brian. 2000. Making Sense of Discourse Analysis. Australia: Antipodean Educational Enterprise (AEE):
- Scheinfeld, Amram. 1944. Women and Men. Brace and Company, Inc:Harcout.
- Schaefer, Charles, Ph.D. 2003. How To Influence Children (translation edition). Semarang : Dahara Prize
- Yunita, Nicke. 2004. Power relation in Characters' Conflicting Interest in the novel The Chocolate War by Robert Cormier within framework of a postcolonial Perspective. UPI: Unpublished paper