

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter describes the theories that the writer used in analyzing the data. The writer divided it into seven parts. The first is the general theory which explains about pragmatics study, the second is about the theory of Co-operative principle, the third is about conversational implicature, the fourth is about flouting maxim, the fifth is about humour, and the last is about the related studies.

#### **2.1. Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is about the interaction of semantic knowledge with our knowledge of the world, taking into account context use (Griffiths, 2006, p.1). According to Paltridge (2005, p.53), pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to the context in which a person is speaking or writing. This includes social, situational and textual context. Therefore, pragmatics is also the study of contextual meaning (Yule 1996, p.3). This type of study necessarily involves interpretation of what people mean in particular context and how the context influences what is said. Pragmatics has opened our eyes to the fact that we need a rich description of the context in order to understand what is said (Archer 2012, p. 7). In pragmatics is not only for spoken but also written form. It can be seen from the Yule's statement which said that pragmatics can be analyzed by using written form. Yule (1996, p.3) explained that pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). In summary, pragmatics is a study of meaning which a person is

speaking or writing in the context. According to Yule (1996, p.4), the advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people's intended meaning, their assumptions, their purposes or goals.

## **2.2. Co-operative Principle**

Grice (as cited Brown and Yule 1983, p.31-32) stated that Co-operative Principle is a general principle of conversation plus a number of maxims which speaker will normally obey, called Co-operative principle which Grice (1975) presented in the following terms: 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. As the result, people usually use co-operative principles to avoid disconnected meaning or misunderstanding meaning.

Grice (as cited in Paltridge 2006, p.62-63) based the co-operative principle on four sub principles or maxims. These are the maxim of quality, quantity, relation and manner (Grice as cited Archer 2012, p.51). The four maxims will be explained below:

- 1). Maxim of Quantity : Be informative. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange). Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
- 2). Maxim of Quality : Be truthful. Do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
- 3). Maxim of Relation : Be relevant

- 4). Maxim of Manner : Be perspicuous, Avoid obscurity of expression, Avoid ambiguity, Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), Be orderly.

According to Paltridge (2006,p. 70), a maxim can be followed in a straightforward way and the hearer implicates what the speaker intends. The following example, where a customer order a beer, illustrates this :

A : What'd you like?

B : A beer thanks.

B has followed the maxim of quality by saying what he wants, the maxim of manner by answering clearly, the maxim of quantity by saying enough and no more, and the maxim of relation by providing an answer that is clearly relevant to the question.

Sometimes people do not obey the co-operative principle when they communicate with each others. According to Grice (as cited Archer 2012, p.52), the breaking of Cooperative Principle has some possibilities which include flouting maxim, violating maxim, opt out maxim and infringement maxim.

- 1). Flouting maxim : A speaker is flouting maxim if they do not observe a maxim but has no intention of deceiving or misleading the other person (Thomas (1995) and Cutting (2002) (as cited in Paltridge 2006, p.65)). For the example of flouting maxim :

A : Do you want some coffee?

B : Coffee would keep me awake.

B deliberately fails to observe a maxim as a means of prompting others to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning. B flouts maxim of relevance since B changes the topic of discussion (Archer 2012, p.52).

- 2). Violating maxim: a person is violating maxim if there is a likelihood that they are liable to mislead the other person (Paltridge 2006, p.65).

Following example from Cutting (as cited in Archer 2012, p. 52) demonstrates : 'Mummy's gone on a little holiday because she needs a rest'. This violation of the second part of the quality maxim, 'Do not say what to be false'. According to Cutting, for mummy had actually gone away to decide whether she should divorce her husband.

- 3). Opt out maxim: a speaker may also decide to opt out of a maxim such as where a speaker may, for ethical or legal reasons, refuse to say something that breaches a confidentially agreement they have with someone, or is likely to incriminate them in some way (Thomas 1995, Cutting 2002, as cited in Paltridge 2006, p.65).

An example of opting out occur frequently in public life, when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reasons, reply in the way normally expected (Thomas, 1995, p.74)

- 4). Infringe maxim: a speaker may also infringe maxim when they fail to observe a maxim with no intention to deceive, such as

where a speaker does not have the linguistic capacity to answer question (Paltridge 2006, p.65).

In this study, the writer focuses on flouting maxim. In the data analysis, teenager and *Tante Pinky* deliberately fails to observe the maxim but they have no intention to deceiving or misleading the other person. As the result it is appropriate to conduct the data using flouting maxim.

### **2.3. Flouting Maxim**

According to Thomas (1995, p.65), the situations which chiefly interested Grice were those in which a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning. He called this additional meaning ‘conversational implicature’ and termed the process by which it is generated as ‘flouting maxim’. In summary, flouting maxim means that the speaker does not obey the Cooperative principle.

Still according to Thomas (1995), these are the examples of the flouting of each maxim.

- The flouting of the maxim of quality occurs when the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue or for which he or she lacks adequate evidence. For example:
  - (i) The ambulanceman has expressed pleasure as having someone vomit over him

- (ii) There is no example in recorded history of people being delighted at having someone vomits over them.
- (iii) I have no reason to believe that the ambulanceman is trying to deceive us in any way.
- (iv) Unless the ambulanceman's utterance is entirely pointless. He must be trying to put across some other proposition.
- (v) This must be some obviously related proposition.
- (vi) The most obviously related proposition is the exact opposite of the one he has expressed.
- (vii) The ambulanceman is extremely annoyed at having the drunk vomit over him.

In the word 'ambulanceman' is an implicature which is generated by the speaker's saying something which is patently false. Since the speaker does not appear to be trying to deceive the listener in any way, the listener was forced to look for another plausible interpretation.

- The flouting of the maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires. For example:

A : How are we getting there?

B : Well we're getting there in Dave's car

B blatantly gives less information than A needs, thereby generating the implicature that, while she and her friends have a lift arranged, A will not be travelling with them.

- The flouting of the maxim of relation can be exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic.

For example:

“I finished working on my face. I grabbed my bag and a coat. I told mother I was going out..... She asked me where I was going. I repeated myself “out”.”

In the example the speaker, the speaker makes a response which is truthful, clear, etc but does answer her mother’s question. In here, the speaker does not address her mother’s goal in asking the question: her mother can see the speaker is going out; what she wants to know is where she is going. The example also can be analyzed as a flout maxim of quantity, in which the speaker has given less information that the situation requires.

- The flouting of the maxim of manner can be done by making a response which is ambiguous and not perspicuous. For example;

Interviewer :“Did the United States Government play any part in Duvalier’s departure? Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?”

Official : “I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion.

The official could simple have replied “yes”. Her actual response is extremely long winded and convoluted and it is obviously no accident, nor through any inability to speak clearly, that she has failed to observe the maxim of manner.

In addition, flouting maxim characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature; and when a conversational is generated in this way. It means that a maxim is being exploited (Grice 1989, p.49). The types of conversational implicature are also used in this study to complete flouting maxim which discussed in the following explanation.

#### **2.4. Conversational Implicatures**

Mey (1993, p.46) said that conversational implicature concerns the way we understand an utterance in conversation in accordance with what we expect to hear. Still according to Mey, one example of conversational implicature is “What time is it?”. It makes perfectly good sense to answer ‘The bus just went by’ in particular context of conversation. This context should include the fact that there is only one bus a day that passes by their house, which is at 7:45 a.m. each morning.

Paltridge (2006, p.70) stated that conversational implicature refers to the inference a hearer makes about speaker’s intended meaning that arises from their use of literal meaning of what speaker said. Conversational implicature arises only in a particular context of utterance (Thomas 1995, p.58). Conversational implicature is derived from a general principle of conversation plus a number of



maxims. In fact, the speaker often breaks the rules, especially by flouting the maxims.

Grice (as cited Paltridge 2006,p. 71) described two kinds of conversational implicature: Generalized Conversational Implicatures (GCI) and Particularized Conversational Implicatures (PCI). Generalized conversational implicatures occur when no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning (Yule 1996, p.40-41). For example :

A : Did you invite Bella and Cathy?

B : I invited Bella.

In the example, B assumes that A is saying no more that A needs to (following maxim of quantity) and B does not intend to be ambiguous or obscure (following the maxim of manner). So, A infers that B did not invite Cathy.

On the other hand, the particularized conversational implicatures are derived from a particular context, rather than from the use of the words alone. These result from the maxim of relation. That is when the speaker assumes the hearer will search for the relevance of what they are saying and derive the intended meaning. For example :

A: You're out of coffee

B: Don't worry. There's shop on the corner

A can derive from B's answer that they will be able to buy coffee from the shop on the corner. Most implicatures, in fact, are particularized conversational implicatures.

## 2.5. Humor

Ross (1998, p.14) stated that humour is something that makes a person laugh or smile. While Raskin (1985, p.1) said that humour occurs when somebody hears or sees something and laughs. Therefore, laughter is, of course, an important accompanying factor of humor (Raskin 1985, p. 14). Humour has various effects, whether these are intentional or not. It is simplistic to say that it is just for laugh. It is possible to laugh and admit that, in a sense, it is not funny (Ross 1998, p. 2). Still according to Ross, if someone signals their intention to say something humorous, the listeners are immediately ready to laugh. People often laugh when given this sort of cue, regardless of whether they even got the joke.

The reason why people laugh, according to Shatz (2005, p. 33), is because they are out of surprise, feel superior, out of instinct, or are at incongruity, ambivalence, and regress. While according to Ross (1998, p. 8), humour often have the following elements :

- There is a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs in the joke.
- The conflict is caused by an ambiguity at some level of language.
- The punch line is surprising, as it is not the expected interpretation but it resolves the conflict.

Raskin (as cited Ruch 2007, p. 99) said that in humour, cooperative principle can be discovered. It is rather similar to Grice's principle except that the commitment to the truth is replaced by the speaker's commitment to humour, and the quantity, quality, relation and manner are all subordinated to the speaker's goal of making efficient joke.

## **2.6.Review of Related Studies**

The writer used four previous studies that are related to her study of conversational implicature. The first study was conducted by Gilang Primajaya (2012) entitled "The Study of Implicature in Cartoon Books 'Dari Presiden ke Presiden'". The second study was conducted by Anisoara Pop (2010) entitled "Implicature derived from maxim flouting in print advertising: A contrastive empirical approach". The third study was conducted by Pravita Puspita Sari (2012) entitled "The Study of Flouting Maxim of Grice's Cooperative principle on Cak Cuk Surabaya T-shirt".

In *The Study of Implicature in Cartoon Books 'Dari Presiden ke Presiden'*, Primajaya (2012) analyzed the flouting maxim that occurs in Cartoon Book dari Presiden ke Presiden. He analyzed the utterances of cartoon character which contain of flouting maxim of Cooperative principle. As the result he found that the most flouted maxim is the maxim of quality. He also used metaphor and irony to get the implied meaning. The similarity between Gilang Primajaya's and the writer's study is the use of theory of cooperative principles by Grice.

However, the objects of both studies are different. The writer used magazine which focus on article of *Tante Pinky's* forum while Gilang used a Cartoon Book.

In *Implicature derived from maxim flouting in print advertising: A contrastive empirical approach*, Pop (2010) focused on the flouting maxim in the devices employed in English and Romanian print advertising. She found flouting maxim in metaphoric expression (Quality), Quantity flouting and idiomatic expression (Manner) in her study. The similarity between Pop's and the writer's study is the use of theory of Cooperative principles by Grice. The difference lies in the objects of the study. The writer used magazine while Pop used advertisement. The writer also used the theory of humor to analyze the implied meaning of implicature while Anisoara did not.

In *The Study of Flouting Maxim of Grice's Cooperative principle on Cak Cuk Surabaya T-shirt*, Sari (2012) focused on the expressions on the design of *Cak Cuk Surabaya T-Shirts*. She found that the flouting maxim most frequently used in *Cak Cuk Surabaya T-Shirt* is the maxim of quality. This maxim is mostly flouted when the expression on the design of *Cak Cuk Surabaya T-Shirt* create the humour. As the result she also used the theory of humor to support her theory of cooperative principle. The similarity between Pravita's and the writer's study is the use of theory of Cooperative principle by Grice. The differences lies in the object of the study. The writer's object was magazine while Pravita's was T-Shirt.