

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter discusses the theories related to this study. Those are focusing on the basic notion of Pragmatics, Flouting Maxims, and Preview Studies.

#### **2.1 Pragmatics**

According to Yule (1996, p. 3) Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. It reveals the invisible meaning of the speaker in conveying the intended meaning to the hearer. It also involves the relation of context and as meaning as a particular way for its interpretation.

Pragmatics revealed the language structure between addresser and addressee. The element that needs to be considered is how the interconnections between sign and its interpretation properly used. Sign as the aspects of meaning of the language usage always depends on how the addresser delivers the context to the addressee. Pragmatics is a study which describes the language sense, and its relation toward human behavior and human language sign. It means it takes human attention, attitude, background and understanding of their knowledge about how language can be used to inform, interpret, and deliver the sign as a tool of communication.

Yule isolated four pragmatic concerns, those being speaker meaning, contextual meaning, how gets more communicated than is said and the expression of relative distance. First, Yule explains pragmatics as a study of speaker meaning. In this sense it is a study not of the words or phrases that a speaker uses but the meaning of the speaker's utterances.

Second, it is a study of contextual meaning, where the speaker concern with the questions of who, what, when, where and other conditions come into play. Third, it is about the study how utterances get more communicated than it is said. It deals with how the addressee or listener investigates the intended meaning by the speaker because of what is unsaid or stated indirectly. The last, pragmatics as the study of the expression of relative distance. By this he means that 'distance' whether it is physical, status or conceptual can influence the expression about what is said by the speaker.

Yule (1996, p. 4) claimed that the advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals and the kinds of actions (for example, request) that they are performing when they speak.

In short, pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies about the implicit meaning of utterance. Thus, this study needs a pragmatics investigation to reveal how people use and understand language in their daily life. Pragmatics is a level to figure out the language and its users. When using language in verbal communication, people need to be cooperative to maintain their relationship in having conversation. Therefore, in investigating how participants establish their communication in WIB, pragmatics is needed to be the main approach to analyze the data.

## **1.2 Cooperative Principle**

Everyone wants to communicate well in his/her life. In order to create a good communication, Grice (1975,p. 45) states human talk exchanges in a speech event represent cooperative efforts. The indicator of being cooperative is that the talk exchanges consist of a succession of connected remarks through which maximally efficient communication can be

reached. It means that participants in a speech event constantly produce relevant utterances. If, for example, participant A produces an utterance, participant B will relevantly respond to it. In other words, Grice is sure that people having a conversation tend to be cooperative, even if it is not evident from what is literally said.

Grice then proposed a general principle guiding people in using language. This principle is called *cooperative principle*. The principle says make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchanges in which you are engaged. This principle is then broken down into four maxims that guide us how to communicate: maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, each of which covers submaxims.

#### A. The Maxim of Quantity

This maxim deals with the quantity of information we need to share with others. We are required to be able to measure how much information is needed. Too much or too little information will not result in maximally efficient communication. This maxim has two submaxims:

- a. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchanges;
- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

In order to make it more understandable, Grice gives us an analogy: If you are assisting me to mend a car, I expect your contribution to be neither more nor less than is required; if, for example, at a particular stage I need four screws, I expect you to hand me four, rather than two or six.

#### B. The Maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true. This maxim is broken down into two submaxims:

- a. Do not say what you believe to be false;
- b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

This maxim suggests that being honest and sincere is obligatory in human communication. The analogy of this maxim given by Grice is the following case: I expect your contributions to be genuine and not spurious. If I need sugar as an ingredient in the cake you are assisting me to make, I do not expect you to hand me salt; if I need a spoon, I do not expect a trick spoon made of rubber.

#### C. The Maxim of Relation

This maxim suggests that we need to be relevant with current exchanges. Grice proposed an analogy of this maxim as follows: I expect a partner's contribution to be appropriate to immediate needs at each stage of the transaction; if I am mixing ingredients for a cake, I do not expect to be handed a good book.

#### D. The Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous. It is related with how we express our ideas in a speech event. This maxim is broken down into four submaxims:

- a. Avoid obscurity of expressions;
- b. Avoid ambiguity;
- c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity);
- d. Be orderly.

The analogy of this maxim is as follows: I expect a partner to make it clear what contribution he is making, and to execute his performance with reasonable dispatch.

From the explanation of Gricean cooperative principle above, it can give an understanding that when we are obeying the principle of cooperative principle in our communication, surely the good conversation can runs well and effectively.

### **1.3 The Flouting of Maxims**

When speaker appear not to follow the maxims but expect hearers to appreciate the meaning implied. Just as with an indirect speech act, the speaker implies a function different from the literal meaning of form: when flouting a maxim, the speaker assumes that the hearer knows that their words should not be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning.

(Cutting 2002: 37)

#### **1. Flouting the Maxim of Quantity**

The speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information.

**A** Well, how do I look?

**B** Your shoes are nice ...

B does not say that the sweatshirt and jeans do not look nice, but he knows that A will understand that implication, because A asks about his whole appearance and only gets told about part of it. If we look again at the old lady in the sheltered home, in the example that started this unit, we see that she flouts the maxim of quantity when she says, 'Oh yes, you will get other opinions, but that's my opinion.' The interviewer knows that she is not giving all the information that he needs in order to fully appreciate what is being said. This will be why he later asks 'What would the other people say?' The old lady knew that the interviewer would know that she had more

information, but maybe she wanted to be pressured for it. It is similar to ‘I had an amazing time last night’, which invites ‘Go on – tell me what happened then!’

## **2. Flouting the Maxim of Quality**

The speaker flouting the maxim of quality may do it in several ways. First, they may quite simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think. Speakers may flout the maxim by exaggerating as in the hyperbole ‘I could eat a horse’, or

Lynn : Yes I’m starving too.

Martin : Hurry up girl.

Lynn : Oh dear, stop eating rubbish. You won’t eat any dinner.

In which ‘I’m starving’ is a well-established exaggerating expression. No speaker would expect their hearer to say, ‘What, you could eat a whole horse?’ or ‘I don’t think you are dying of hunger – you don’t even look thin.’ Hearers would be expected to know that the speaker simply meant that they were very hungry. Hyperbole is often at the basis of humour. Take this example from *Social Studies*:

Remember that as a teenager you are at the last stage in your life when you will be happy to hear that the phone is for you.

(Lebowitz 1985: 368)

## **3. Flouting the Maxim of Relation**

If speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make the connection between their utterance and the preceding one(s). Thus, in

**A** So what do you think of Mark?

**B** His flatmate’s a wonderful cook.

B does not say that she was not very impressed with Mark, but by not mentioning him in the reply and apparently saying something irrelevant, she implies it. Similarly, in the next, Noel Coward is said to have had this exchange, after his play *Sirocco* (1927) was booed:

**Heckler**        We expected a better play.

**Coward**        I expected better manners.

(Sherrin 1995: 29)

Using a Gricean analysis, we can say that the second comment seems irrelevant to the first: the heckler in the audience is talking about the play, and Coward's comment is about manners. However, Coward intends the heckler to infer that he expected better manners than booing and shouting about his play. The heckler will have understood that Coward found him as well as the others not just bad-mannered, but rude and offensive.

Grice thought that flouting the maxim of relation was possible, but many people disagreed since (see the section below on relevance theory). Whether we observe or flout maxims, our utterances will always be taken as relevant to the preceding co-text.

#### **4     Flouting the Maxim of Manner**

Those who flout the maxim of manner, appearing to be obscure, are often trying to exclude a third party, as in this sort of exchange between husband and wife:

**A**    Where are you off to?

**B**    I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.

**A**    OK, but don't be long – dinner's nearly ready.

B speaks in an ambiguous way, saying 'that funny white stuff' and 'somebody', because he is avoiding saying 'ice-cream' and 'Michelle', so that his little daughter does not become excited and ask for the ice-cream before her meal. Sometimes writers play with words to heighten the ambiguity, in order to make a point, as in Katherine Whitehorn's comments in *Sunday Best* on 'Decoding the West':

(Whitehorn 1976)

Thereby implying that she agreed with the first point of view, even though she had just said that she did not agree with it.

#### **1.4 Humor and Laughter**

Humor is a creation of jokes involves participants. It is not easy to define humor although we always realize it when we meet it. Innumerable definitions of humor have been advanced. McGhee (1979, cited in Zhan 2015, p. 2) believes that humor does not exist in the real world but only exist in one's mind and it is only measureable in terms of one's assessment. He defines humor as "a form of intellectual play" (McGhee, 1979 as cited in Zhan 2015, p. 2). Some people identify humor with joking. It takes that addresser and addressee's attention in every single humorous effect of utterance. Especially in a situation comedy, humor is always followed by the laughter of the audience. Thus, there must be an actor in conveying the humor sense to audiences mind. In this case, the idea is that we laugh at things that surprise us because they seem out of place. The incongruity theory suggests that humor arises when things that do not normally go together replace logic and familiarity. For example, a joke becomes funny when we predict an outcome and another happens. When we receive jokes from others, our minds and bodies are already anticipating what is going to happen and how it is going to end.

According to Raskin (1985, p. 14), laughter is, of course, an important factor of humor. So that between laughter and humor is inseparable in many ways. As Raskin (1985, p. 1) claims a person which is stimulated by audial or funny visual stimulation is defined as humor. So when we find people laughing at something, meaning that we find humour.



However, in investigating the creation of humour is not as easy as it seems. Especially in verbal humor that always involves hearer's attention, sometimes speaker tends to force funny stimulation in making his/her interlocutor laugh at his/her humorous utterance.

## **1.5 Previous Studies**

The researcher uses two previous studies. The first previous study is by Rifka Ayu Muqtadir (2016) entitled "Analyzing Coherence in the Flouted Maxims Produced by Mulan Jameela in a Deep Conversation with Deddy Corbuzier". She uses a qualitative method to conduct her research. She uses qualitative method because the data are in form of utterances. In conducting her research, she uses theory from Yule (2010) to analyze the data. She focuses on the dialogue between Corbuzier and Jameela without any audience involved, Mulan Jameela releases and expresses her feeling out freely. It obviously makes a speaker to flout maxim.

The second previous study is by Muhamad Lukman Khakim (2015) entitled "implied Meaning of Flouting of Maxims in Mata Najwa Talk-Show Program Penebar Inspirasi Episode". He used a qualitative method to conduct his research and the reason he used a qualitative method is the data are in the form of utterances. He used the theory from Grice in analyzing flouting maxims and determining implied meanings in the program. He focused on the kind of maxims flouted in the program and the real meaning of the conversation.

The two previous studies are relevant to this study. The two previous study has similarity and differences to this study. The similarities between the previous studies and this study is that all of them investigate about flouting a maxim and use qualitative method as the research method. The differences between the previous studies and this study from the theory used. Rifka Ayu Muqtadir (2016) uses the theory from Yule (2010), Muhamad Lukman Khakim (2015) use theory from Grice (1975) and this study use the theory from

Grundy (2000). From the object of study, the first study from Rifka Ayu Muqtadir (2016) use a deep conversation of Deddy Corbuzier and Mulan Jamella. The second study from Muhamad Lukman Khakim (2015) uses Mata Najwa Talk Show episode ‘ Penebar Inspirasi’. Meanwhile, this study use A comedy program *Waktu Indonesia Bercanda* as the object of the study.