

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Related theories

In conducting his study, the writer needs some related theories such as conversational maxims and the flouting of it in order to answer how humor may be created in a comedy serial, before discussing those theories the writer decided to define a humor itself based on the linguist' work related to it.

2.1.1. Humor

Humor is identical with laughter; the funny stimuli inside its nuances can make people laugh. The stimuli here can appear into many forms, for example, joke (verbal or written), caricature, silent movie, cartoon, or even at some happening such as monkey dancing or people falling down from stairs. People feel those funny things because they have already understood the situation and they have realized from the family, groups, or culture that those stimuli are worth laughing. Humor is something we think about that make us laugh, nothing is itself funny, so it must involve our thought. Humor then can be related to background knowledge or cognitive aspect; it depends on the funny stimuli, the audience, the situation, and the cultural context.

For some linguistic, the phenomenon of humor makes them interested to find the truth. Raskin (1985), for example, define humor as non-bona-fide communication (NBC), which purpose is not to bring any information contain in

the text but rather to create particular effect, such as funniness or humor. This kind of communication often flouts the cooperative principle to get its aim. It is different with bona-fide communication; Raskin argued that if the communication supplies information, serious and convey mode of verbal communication it is called bona-fide communication (BC). When the conversational maxims are obeyed strictly by non-humor expression, it is flouted deliberately or naturally for humor purposes. Raskin then made some modification from Grice's maxims formulas for humor occasion:

1. Maxim quantity: Give information as much as the Humor needs
2. Maxim of quality: Tells only information suitable for humor purpose
3. Maxim of relevance: Tells only information relevant to humor
4. Maxim of manner: Make efficient humor

As an addition, through pragmatics humor also substantively as a deviation of two kinds of implicatures, there are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. The first is associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings, but the second is based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. The writer will analyze the humor in comedy serial through the deviation of cooperative principle in the next chapter.

2.1.2. Grice's co-operative principle and conversational maxims

Cooperative principle is the principle that helps the speaker to make the contribution of the conversation clearer (Grice, 1975 as cited in Yule, 1996, p.37). This principle in conversation is elaborated in four sub-principles that we called it maxims. According to this principle, we interpret language on the assumption that

its sender must obey the maxims. Co-operative principle (CP) is divided into four categories of specific maxims; there are Maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner.

2.1.2.1. Maxim of quantity

The rule of maxim quantity demands the participants of a conversation to give contribution as is required. In other word, the speaker should not give too little or too much information. It can be explained as follow:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required.

(Do not say too little)

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

(Do not say too much)

We usually assume that people are telling us everything we need to know. If they do not say something, then we assume they simply do not know.

2.1.2.2. Maxim of quality

In order to fulfill the maxim of quality the speaker should make true contribution, it means that he/she should not say what he/she believes to be false and should not say something which lack of evidence. For example, somebody have to say the capital city of Indonesia is Jakarta not another city, unless he knows it before.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.

(Do not lie)

2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

(Do not say things that you cannot back up)

2.1.2.3. Maxim of relation

This maxim aims the participants of a conversation give a relevance contribution with the topic at that time. The participants give comments that are only related to the subject and each of them recognizes it.

1. be relevant.

(Do not say things that out of the context)

2.1.2.4. Maxim of manner

The last is maxim of manner, which says the people should be brief and orderly. Moreover, a person who follows this maxim should avoid obscurity and ambiguity.

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief.
4. Be orderly.

These maxims relate to the form of speech you use. You should not use words you know your listeners will not understand or say things that you know could be taken multiple ways. You should also not state something in a long, drawn-out way if you could say it in a much simpler manner.

2.1.3. The fulfillment of the maxims

The first is maxim of quantity. The speaker can be said to fulfill the maxim of quantity when they present their contribution as informative as it required, and they should not make their contribution more informative than is

required, in this case, the speaker should give suitable information that is needed by the hearer in a conversation. For example:

A: *Where did you go?*

B: *I went to my uncle's house*

For the example above, B fulfills the maxim of quantity because B gives information that is really needed by A.

The second is maxim of quality. The maxim of quality requires that the statement uses in the conversation have factual basis. The speaker should give contribution that they believe to be true and they should not say something if there is no adequate evidence. The example below is fulfilled the maxim of quality (A is asking about the weather to B, B lives in London and it's snowing at that time)

A: *What is the weather like?*

B: *It is snowing*

B is fulfilling the maxim of quality because B gives an answer that is based on the fact.

The third is maxim of relation. When the speaker gives relevant information, they have fulfilled the maxim of relation. In this case, they have to give answer or information that is relevant to the topic of the conversation, For example:

A: *B, here is call for you*

B: *I am in the bathroom, Mom*

The maxim of relation is crucial for evaluating the appropriateness of responses to the question: " B here is call for you" because we assume that the

conversational contribution of other are relevant to the topic we can response: “I am in the bathroom, Mom” that the speaker is unable to answer the phone. Moreover, from B’s answer we can say that it is relevant because B gives an answer about the reason, something which is needed by A to know.

The last is maxim of manner. The speakers are considered to fulfill the maxim of manner when their utterances are clear and perspicuous. They do not have to say unnecessary things, so our partner can easily understand our meaning. For example:

A: let’s get the kids something

B: Ok, but no ice cream. The kids get a cough

B gives a clear answer to A by mentioning reason why they have not to buy ice cream. That is why that B is fulfilling the maxing of manner.

2.1.4. The flouting of the maxims

According to Grice (1975, cited in Thomas, 1995, p.64) there are many occasions when people fail to observe the maxim such as violating a maxim, infringing a maxim, opting out of the maxim, suspending the maxim and flouting the maxim. In this research however, the writer only focused on analyzing the flouting or violating of the maxims that cause humorous effect. A speaker should be considered as flouting maxims when they want the hearers to understand what they mention exactly, there must be an implicit meaning for the hearer. As violating maxim occurs when speakers do not want them to understand or want to finish the conversation at that time.

Here are some examples of flouting of each maxim:

1. Maxim of quantity

A: *well how do I look?*

B: *your shoes are nice* (B gives too little information; B does not say that the sweatshirt and jeans do not look nice. However, B knows that A will understand that he actually want to say that A does not look nice)

2. Maxim of quality

A: *May I go along with you?*

B: *Sure, I must be late* (the fact is B objected to invite A)

3. Maxim of relation

A: *How is your girlfriend?*

B: *it's has been raining a lot of lately, hasn't it?* (B signals to another person that he wants to move away from the topic of the conversation has been raised)

4. Maxim of manner

A: *let's get the kids something*

B: *Ok, but not I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M* (spelling it out) (the fact is her kids get cough, she does not tell her husband directly)

Beside those examples above, the flouting can produce humor also; moreover violating the maxims deliberately is required when we want to make humorous speech or jokes, for example:

A: *do you have a very cheap room here?*

B: *oh sure, and it is completed with a ghost inside.* (Wijana, 2004, p.18)

As shown in the example above, it will achieve effects of conversation implicitly because of violation one or some maxims of cooperative principle, especially in humorous conversation.

2.2. Review of related studies

The writer presents some studies here considering their similarity to his study. There are the studies of Milah (2003), Paramita (2007) and Rizky (2008). Milah studied the flouting of conversational maxim in *Tintin* comic series. In her study, the writer tried to find out the maxims of conversation that can be flouted for creating humor. Her data was taken from written text. After analyzing the data, the writer found that the maxims that often flouted in *Tintin* comic book is maxim of quality.

Paramita (2007) studied the cooperative principle in interview on liputan 6 SCTV, she wanted to seek how the speaker's utterances might be interpreted from the writer point of view as an analyst since the speaker utterances sometimes did not match to the cooperative principle and the four maxims. After she analyzed her data, she found that those four maxim were all flouted by the speaker in liputan 6 SCTV and the most flouted one was maxim of quality the same with Milah's study.

The last is the study that was conducted by Rizky (2008). She tried to analyze the flouting of cooperative principle in utterances especially in jokes. Her data was taken from spoken language that was the conversation between trainer and trainees in a training activity. It was a training conducted by KPI (Konsorsium Pendidikan Islam) Surabaya. After analyzing the data the writer found that there

are only three maxims that were flouted during the training. There were maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. She concluded that the flouting of those maxims could cause humorous effect in a training activity.

The writer study has similarity with three of related study above which is to conduct an analysis by using the Grice's theory of cooperative principle, but the writer's study is more focused to the humor. Both of the studies of Milah and Rizky have tried to prove that humor is caused by flouting of maxims, but they did not use pure humor materials. Therefore, it was lack of variation that humor is formed by flouting of maxims. The writer's analysis in a comedy serial hopefully will gain another variation in creating humor by flouting the maxims. The writer intends to do a further study about humor, because of that the writer uses "Tawa Sutra" comedy serial to analyze the utterances. From Milah and Rizky's studies, the writer also focused on the theory of conversational maxims to analyze the data. In addition, the writer focus is in order to get a specific finding of humor that resulted in the flouting even violating of the theory of the conversational maxims.

In addition, by Paramita's study, she has a different point of view in analyzing the data. Paramita's study is only analyzing the number of the flouting utterances that appear on the interview without discussing further how the effects of the flouts. Due to the reason that the writer source of data is spoken language just same with Rizky and Paramita, the writer get some contribution from their studies. The writer saw how they collected, classified, and formed the data into the appendixes.