

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There are some theories and related studies that the researcher will use in her analysis and reviews in this chapter. This review is very necessary for the researcher because it is used as the key of the analysis of the study in Chapter Four.

2.1 Theoretical Frameworks

Because this study is focused on the flouting of the conversational maxims which cause humour, the main theory used by the researcher as the basis of her analysis is Grice's Cooperative Principles Theory (1975). This study also has supporting theories about humour from Raskin (1985) and Norrick (1986).

2.1.1 Grice's Cooperative Principles Theory

Grice (cited in Simons, 2000, p. 3) says that to account for the phenomenon of conversational implicature, there are certain norms of conversational behaviour. These norms are mutually known and typically adhered to by conversational participants. "A succession of disconnected remarks," and, at each stage in conversation, render certain possible conversational contributions "unsuitable" are the norms which prevent the conversation. Then, Cooperative Principle is the effects of these norms as a single overarching principle.

The following example shows how the hearer makes a ‘disconnected remark’:

A: Would you come to my party tonight?

B: I’ve to study for my examination.

A is likely to conclude that B means to inform A that will not come to the party. How so? First, A presumes that B is speaking appropriately with the cooperative principle. Among other things, this means that A presumes that B intends B answer to be relevant. B’s utterance is not an answer to the question A has asked: it says nothing about the agreement. But because of A presumption, A presumes that what B says is relevant in some way to A question. It immediately occurs to A that B will take an examination tomorrow; and that B is likely to tell A that B will not come to the party tonight, because B has to study. If A attributes this belief to B, and assumes that B intends, via his utterance, to communicate this belief to A, then A has successfully interpreted B utterance in a way which renders B behavior consistent with A presumption of B cooperativity. As B can, moreover, plausibly assume that A will gives a reason in this way, he implicates that will not coming to the party.

Based on the example, the disconnected remark which indicates a set of purposes is recognized as the Conversational Implicature. As Simons (2000) says that in identifying what the speaker intends, the interpreter will rely on three things: first, his or her observation about what the speaker said (i.e. the truth conditional content expressed) and the form in which it was expressed; second, the presumption of cooperativity; and third, any world knowledge that might be relevant.

Cooperative Principle is the principle of a person to interact with others. This explains the basic of an individual in an interaction with another individual. In a conversation or discussion, the speaker assumes that the listener can work together so that they can interact to achieve the desired target in a conversation or meeting. For this reason, the speaker assumes that the listener has a basis equal term with the speaker.

But sometimes there is a mistake in communicating or interacting due to several factors, such as differences in cultural and linguistic experiences between the speaker and listener and it leads to a false assumption. Therefore, it takes the basis of interacting or communicating, called Conversational Maxim.

2.1.1.1 The Fulfilling of Maxims

According to Grice (cited in Simons, 2000, p. 4), the basis of communicating is divided into four conversational maxims, namely: Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Relation and Maxim of Manner.

The first maxim is the Maxim of Quality. The speakers should give information that they believe to be true. In a conversation they should not say what they believe to be false and should not make statements if there is no adequate evidence.

The Maxim of Quality is fulfilled in this conversation:

A: How old are you?

B: I'm 30 years old.

B is fulfilling the Maxim of Quality because she gives an answer that she believes to be true. Although some people, especially women are sometimes

embarrassed to tell other people about their age, B gives the true condition about her age to A.

The second maxim is Maxim of Quantity. The speakers are considered to fulfill the Maxim of Quantity when they present their contribution as informative as is required and they should not make their contribution neither too little nor too much.

For example, the following conversation shows how the Maxim of Quantity is fulfilled:

Boy: Where is Mom?
Girl: She goes to the market to buy some fruits.

In this case, B fulfills the Maxim of Quantity because she gives information that is really needed by A. B presents an indication that A cannot find his mother in the house because his mother goes to the market to buy some fruits.

When the speakers give relevant contributions, they have fulfilled the Maxim of Relation. In this case, the given contribution should relate clearly to the purpose of the conversation. The relevance of the speakers' and the hearers' utterance is shown in this conversation:

A: Do you like this shoes?
B: Yes, it's cute.

B fulfills the maxim of Relation because she gives a relevant answer about the shoes. It means that she does not talk about anything else that has no relevance to their topic of conversation, which is about the shoes. Moreover, B gives an answer about her opinion which is needed by A to know.

The last maxim is the Maxim of Manner, which requires that the speakers should be perspicuous with their utterance. It means that they should be clear, orderly and brief. On the other hand, they should avoid obscurity of expression, ambiguity and unnecessary prolixity. The following conversation shows how the speakers follow the direction of the Maxim of Manner:

A: Who is that old woman?

B: She is Surya's grandmother.

B gives a clear answer to A by mentioning the status of the old woman which is asked by A. That is why, B is fulfilling the Maxim of Manner.

If the speaker and the hearer fulfill those four maxims, they are considered to be cooperative. By being cooperative, the conversation between the speaker and the hearer will become smooth and they can achieve a successful communication.

Fulfilling those four maxims indicates that there is the willingness to cooperate between the speaker and the hearer, and then it will influence the relationship among them.

2.1.1.2 The Flouting of Maxims

Grice (cited in Davies, 2010, p. 26) believes that speakers obeying the cooperative principle should be truthful, informative, relevant, and clear. But he does not claim that speakers are always cooperative; nor does he claim that speakers always follow the maxims. Speakers may deliberately or accidentally violate one of the maxims for a number of effects, including lying. Green (cited in Davies, 2010, p. 27) also says that speakers may also flout a maxim when they are unable to conform to all of the maxims at once. So, the hearer must conclude that

the violation was purposeful. This is called “flouting” a maxim, which is, disobeying a maxim deliberately with the intention that the hearer recognizes that the maxim is being disobeyed.

A speaker can disobey or flout the Maxim of Quality by saying things which he or she believes to be false to the hearer. The flouting Maxim of Quality is seen in the following statement which is made when the teacher was getting a difficulty to read and correct his student’s paper test:

“What a beautiful handwriting!”

Beautiful means pleasing to the sense or to the mind, but the example above gives a description that is far from the reality or the truth about his student’s handwriting. Therefore, it flouts the Maxim of Quality. That example also gives a rhetorical device called irony, and a person who flouts this maxim in this way would be immediately said as a “sarcastic” person.

The second example can be seen in the following conversation when someone goes back home after coming to the music concert:

A: Well, how about the concert?

B: Yeah, the singer is so handsome tonight.

That is the example of flouting the Maxim of Quantity. In the example, A needs a review about the concert, but B gives a command with one sentence only.

It cannot represent the whole concert. A cannot get a picture of how the concert is, because B gives less information than is actually needed by A.

The following example can be seen in the following indirect command to turn down the volume of the radio:

“Are you a deaf?”

It is the example of flouting Maxim of Relation because it has no relevance to a usual command to turn down the volume of the radio. A hearer would soon recognize that the speaker intends something else from his question.

The last example is the example of flouting Maxim of Manner:

“I buy a small white mouse”

This is the case of flouting Maxim of Manner because that sentence is vague or ambiguous. That sentence may have more than one meaning, one of which would be concluded by the hearer that the speaker buys a small animal that is covered in fur and has a long thin tail. Another meaning may be related with computing, that is, a small device that is moved by hand across a surface to control the movement of the cursor on a computer screen.

2.1.2 Humour and Laughter

As Raskin (cited in Wamsler, 2007, p. 14) says that humour and laughter are widely seen as roughly co-extensive, but to distinguish humour from laughter is very difficult. One man’s humour may be another man’s laughter.

Based on Raskin (cited in Wamsler, 2007, p. 8), humour means that a person finds the audial or visual stimulus funny. So, the funny stimulation is needed in a humour to make people laugh. Humour can be done through written or spoken humour. Written humour can be found in cartoon, comics and magazines. Then, spoken humour can be found in television, radio, lives comedy, etc., which is can play with sounds, meanings or ambiguities.

People can laugh at those funny things or other kinds of funny stimulation because they have already had the knowledge from their surroundings, family,

groups and culture. It probably makes the people from different culture have different assumption about the humour. Although there are differences about the funniness in different culture, it does not mean that a person who comes from one culture cannot understand what is considered to be funny in another culture. As Norrick (1986, cited in Tan, 1999, p. 19) says that, in different times, a funny thing may cause different response from different people, even people of the same group or culture. Raskin (cited in Wamsler, 2007, p. 9) gives the addition that seven factors supply the humour act, there are: hearer, speaker, stimulus, experience, psychologies, situation and sociology.

Moreover, Wamsler (2007) says that, the incongruity theory sees humour as a response to an incongruent situation, which includes ambiguity, logical impossibility, irrelevance or inappropriateness. Incongruity means that people enjoy contrasted or unexpected situations but in order to realize whether an action or comment is incongruent. An incongruent situation causes laughter when people realize the incongruity and are able to simply enjoy it.

Based on Raskin (cited in Wamsler, 2007, p. 14), laughter is a physiological process as well as a psychological. When we laugh, we unconsciously make gestures and sounds on the same time. In addition, when we laugh, our facial muscle contracts, we breathe irregularly, we gasp for breath or maybe our tears roll down our face. At the moment, endorphins are set free which makes us happy.

Laughing is an innate capacity of humans and already starts when human are born. Laughing is a usual emotional reflex reaction when something which is regarded to be funny happens to our soul. However, laughter is not the main

reaction to humour. If we do not get the joke, the puzzlement or confusion may become the responds. Moreover, personal taste, mood and time are the essential for humour.

2.1.3 Humour and the Cooperative Principle

Humour deals with laughter or non-serious language, while the Cooperative Principle is a principle to achieve a successful communication and has more serious sense. So, it is a normal thing if some people think that there is no relation at all between humour and Cooperative Principle. But, some linguists are attracted to analyze it and many studies have been done to find the relation.

Raskin (cited in Zienkowski et al, 2011, p. 138), one of some linguists attracted with humour, gives a definition of humour as a non-bona-fide (NBF) mode of communication, which does not tolerate the Cooperative Principle, mode of communication he excluded the possibility of accounting for it straightforwardly within the realm of 'serious' non-humorous language. This is a new concept to the analysis of the pragmatics of humour. Non-bona-fide is the contrary of bona-fide mode of communication in which the participants obey or tolerate the Cooperative Principle.

Moreover, Raskin (cited in Zienkowski et al, 2011, p. 139), also gives a more general explanation that jokes, as the integrated part of humour are considered to include the non-bona-fide mode of communication, which breaks the Cooperative Principle. This indicates that communication in jokes may deal with the flouting of the Conversational Maxims. Raskin gives an example that humour, just as

lying, involves a different mode of communication which does not abide by the Cooperative Principle. Raskin also give a good illustrate about the difference between non-bona-fide modes such as humor and other modes governed by Grice's Cooperative Principle, provided a set of 'maxims for joke-telling' directly paraphrased from Grice: "Give as much information as is necessary for the joke".

However, some other linguists are opposed the theories about the relationship between humour and Cooperative Principle which is made by Raskin. The linguists who are in opposition claim if the Cooperative Principle is the way of how people convey information, how can jokes which violate the principle convey information? The answer is the function of jokes itself, that is to cause laughter.

The breaking of the Cooperative Principle in jokes or in humour is different with the breaking of the Cooperative Principle in a conversation. In jokes or humour, the breaking of the Cooperative Principle does not mean that it cannot convey information, but more or less it is meant to cause the audience to laugh or to create humour. As Raskin (cited in Zienkowski et al, 2011, p. 139), said that in the case of jokes, the perlocutionary goal of the speaker is not to convey information but rather to elicit a humorous reaction in the hearer. It can be overt or consist merely of the hearer's recognition of the speaker's intention.

Moreover, Norrick (cited in Tan, 1999, p. 13) gives explanations that the hearer or the audience can assume that jokes communicate or convey information based on three things. First, they can rely on their own belief that the text is purposed to have a humorous nature, the second is the underlying message of the text that it is funny or relating to humour and the third is their ignorance of the

flouting of the maxims, which means that they only focus on the inferences and implicatures of the disobeying of the Conversational Maxims.

2.2 Previous Studies

There are two studies that the researcher reviews here reflecting on their similarities to her study. They are the study of Nelly (2005) and Yuliana (2007).

The first previous study was Nelly's (2005) study which was about humour in Bajaj Bajuri drama comedy TV series, concerned in semantics field and focused in the condition of the text in two episodes of Bajaj Bajuri drama comedy TV series which were considered as having more humorous scenes to be analyzed.

In her analysis, she found out that there were 43 utterances from the total of two episodes seen in Bajaj Bajuri drama comedy TV series. After finishing her analysis by using humorous aspect from Raskin (1985), she found out that in those utterances there were 22 occurrences found in the fourth condition, when a speech act occur, 9 occurrences found in the second condition, when an implicature was produced by the speaker, 8 occurrences found in the third condition, when a possible world was evoked by the text and only 4 occurrences were found in the first condition when there was a presupposition shared by the speaker and hearer.

The second previous study was Yuliana's (2007) study which concerned in violation of Cooperative Principle. After analyzing the three episodes of Din Brodin JTV'S comedy, she found that the violations of maxim of quality and

maxim of manner of this comedy show had become one way to create humorous utterances resulting in audiences' laughter.

In the three episodes of *Din Brodin*, there were only four violations among the total occurrences. In episode 157 there was only one violation, while in episode 158 there were two violations and in episode 159 there was only one violation. The most violated maxim was Maxim of Manner. Maxim of Quantity became the second violated maxim in order to create humour in *Din Brodin* Comedy. Violation of Maxim of Quantity and Maxim of Relation could not be found.

Based on Yuliana's analysis, she concluded that the violation of the Cooperative Principles was not the only source for humour to occur in comedy. Some other aspects such as the characters' behaviour and action can also become the reason for the humorous effect. By looking out the physical appearance, people were able to get the context, especially those who came from high-context culture.

Different from those previous studies, this present study focuses on the Cooperative Principle Theory by Grice (1975) and supporting theories about humour from Raskin (1985) and Norrick (1986). Both Nelly and Yuliana discuss the humour effect in TV comedy by using different theory; Nelly focuses on semantics field and Yuliana concerns in the violation of the Cooperative Principles. After the researcher finds and reads the theory of humour from Raskin, Norrick and Attardo, she finds that there is a relationship between humour and Cooperative Principle. Breaking the Cooperative Principle by flouting the

Conversational Maxims can create the perlocutionary goal of joke, called humour.

Then, by using that finding the researcher wants to combine those theories in her analysis.

