

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Communication is a process that is addressed to the hearers in order to give a message. Giving a message to the hearer can be done verbally and non-verbally. Verbal communication is delivered directly by the speaker to the hearer, while non-verbal one is conveyed indirectly through body gestures, letters, emails, and other intermediaries. The speaker expects that the hearer will be able to understand the message clearly. However, the communication made by a speaker is not always successfully received by the hearer.

“In communication, a speaker sends a fixed meaning to a hearer via the linguistic expression associated with that meaning. On this account it is possible to objectively say what you mean, and communication failures are matters of subjective errors: since the meanings are objectively right there in the words, either you did not use the right words to say what you meant or you were misunderstood.” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.206)

There is also possibility that the hearer receives a different message from the actual one. It means that there is possibility of a misunderstanding or lack of clarity about the information from the speaker to the hearer. Those happened because the speaker conveys a message to the hearer implicitly. A speaker conveys message more than what is said via an implicature (Yule, 1996, p.40). Implicature itself sometimes could result in humor and laugh to those who see or hear the incident.

Humor is anything that makes people laugh. According to Raskin (1985, p.1), humor is a phenomenon when somebody hear and see something and laughs. For some people, humor is important to reduce their level of stress since it could make them laugh. People, who especially live in urban cities like Surabaya, face some problems such as work and lifestyle. They should also face the urban city problems such as traffic jam. Actually, these problems could make them have high level of stress thus they highly need entertainment in order to make their mind relax. One type of the entertainment that can be enjoyed by people is talk show in certain television program.

Talk show is a program that discusses a topic through discussion, question and answer activity, and interaction with the related persons and audience. The topic discussed is a growing problem in society and it is considered as important and interesting for the audience. Talk show is presented by host (and co-hosts) that play a role in reviving the atmosphere with the comments, anecdotes, and even jokes. Thus, the audience is not only get the information but also something that is entertaining (Masduki, 2001, p.44).

Nowadays, there are many television stations which provide entertainment as talk show which discusses many topics and also delivers humor in their programs, such as *Show Imah* in Trans TV, *Tonight Show* in NET, *Demo Crazy* in Metro TV, and *Bukan Empat Mata* in Trans 7. *Bukan Empat Mata* is one of the talk shows in Trans 7 which is broadcasted every Monday to Friday at 10 pm. It is a talk show that discusses many topics; most of the topics are about our daily life. There is also T3 (Tanya Tamu Tukul), which is a segment in *Bukan Empat Mata*

that interviews one of the guest stars in more detail and it is guided by the co-host Marcela Lumowa.

Based on the phenomenon, the writer is interested in analyzing how the conversation in *Bukan Empat Mata* happens by using Cooperative Principle theory of Grice (1989) and then could create humor. Regarding this, there are several possibilities on communication in receiving messages that could trigger humor. The writer chooses *Bukan Empat Mata* because that is the winner of Panasonic Award in 2009 and 2010 as the best entertainment talk show according to the official website of Panasonic Gobel Award, www.panasonic-gobelawards.com. There are some characteristics in *Bukan Empat Mata* talk show. The host Tukul Riyanto or known as Tukul Arwana along with three co-hosts that are Pepi, Olla Ramlan, and Marcela Lumowa lead *Bukan Empat Mata* talk show. Tukul Arwana is a phenomenal presenter. He has a unique style while interacting with the audience. Frequently, he shows a self-deprecating joke and it could increase the atmosphere in the studio. He would say “*Puas? Puas?*” and when he wants to revert to the topic discussed, he precedes by saying “*Kembali ke laptop!*” Those appeals are the characteristic of Tukul Arwana in *Bukan Empat Mata* talk show.

Another characteristic is sometimes the host and co-hosts do not convey what they want to say directly. So that it may lead to those possibilities that create humor and causes laugh for the hearer. An example is one episode in *Bukan Empat Mata* with Soimah as the guest star.

Tukul : “Mirip Dewi Gita ya. Kaya istrinya Armand Mau Muntah itu lho.”

- Olla : “Cantik, mas. Coba lihat kanan, kiri.”
 Soimah : “Alhamdulillah yaaa (grinning).” (audience laugh)
 Olla : “Itu **kenapa** ya bu, ya?”
 Soimah : “*Gakpapa. Biasa, akting aja. Iya kaaan?*” (audience laugh)

In the conversation above, Tukul Arwana praises Soimah that she is similar to Dewi Gita, a wife of an Indonesian singer Armand Maulana who is twisted into Armand Mau Muntah. It makes the audience laugh. After that, the co-host Olla Ramlan says that Soimah is a beautiful woman. Hearing those statements, Soimah replies “Alhamdulillah ya” and “Iya kan” than grins.

In a conversation, the speaker assumes that the hearer will understand what the speaker intends to say and the hearer also assumes that what is conveyed by the speaker is true so that finally creates a good conversation. In this study, the writer uses Cooperative Principle by Grice (1989) to analyze the conversation in *Bukan Empat Mata*. According to him, “Cooperative principle is a basic assumption in conversation that each participant will attempt to contribute appropriately, at the required time, to the current exchange of talk.” (Yule, 1996, p.128) There are four sub-principles of the cooperative principle called maxims that are Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner. Those are the ‘rules’ of communication that should be performed or fulfilled when two or more persons have a conversation, so that a message intended by the speaker to the hearer can be conveyed well.

In the conversation in *Bukan Empat Mata* above, Olla asks to Soimah why she is grinning and Soimah answers that she is just acting. From that utterance, we

can see that the maxim is flouted. She flouts the quantity maxim since she provides the information less than it is required because the question is 'why' and it needs a longer answer about the reason why she is grinning. In this context, Soimah just intends to create a humorous situation by imitating the style of Syahrini. We can say that her utterances still cooperate since the audience laughs without the explanation of why she grins. It is because conversation is not only about fulfilling the 'rules', but also about whether the hearer understands what is intended by the speaker. Therefore, the background knowledge of the context in conversation is important.

Regarding this study, there are several studies that have been done before about flouting of conversational maxims. Two of the previous studies focus on television programs while the other one focuses on utterances that are printed on T-shirts. The first study was conducted by Fikri (2010) who analyzed flouting maxims and implicature in *Demo Crazy* talk show. *Demo crazy* is a talk show about politics news which is presented in the form of parody. He discovered how the speakers in *Demo Crazy* talk show attempted to express their meaning implicitly. The second study was conducted by Prastyaning M. H. (2011) about flouting maxims in *Online* talk show. Sinta used *Online* as the object for her study because she was interested with the hosts, Olga Syahputra and Nigta Gina or Jeng Kelin. She tried to examine the implicature conveyed by the hosts in their conversation. The last is about flouting maxims of the expressions on *Cak Cuk Surabaya T-shirts* by Sari (2012). The difference between this study and those

previous studies done by Fikri (2010), Prastyaning M. H. (2011), and Sari (2012) is the object of the study used that is *Bukan Empat Mata* talk show.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Based on the background of the study above, the writer proposes the research questions as follow:

1. What kinds of maxims are flouted in the conversation on *Bukan Empat Mata* talk show?
2. Why does the flouted maxim frequently occur in the conversation on *Bukan Empat Mata* talk show?

1.3 Objective of the Study

From the statement of the problems above, the objective of this study is to find out what kind of flouted maxims are evoked in conversation by the speakers on *Bukan Empat Mata* talk show. Furthermore, it intends to discover why the flouted maxims frequently occur and how implicature of the utterances could create humor.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The writer studies flouting of conversational maxims on *Bukan Empat Mata* talk show in Trans 7. For the theoretical significance, this study is expected to give a contribution for the study of Pragmatics especially in English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University. In addition, for the practical

significance, the writer hopes this study gives the readers a better understanding of how communication happens and how the implicature of communication can build a humor. The writer also hopes that this study provides some insights, inputs, and becomes a useful reference for students who are majoring in Linguistics.

1.5 Definition of Key Terms

Cooperative Principle : A basic assumption in conversation that each participant will attempt to contribute appropriately, at the required time, to the current exchange of talk (Yule, 1996, p.128).

Flouting Maxim : It is when the speakers do not say what their intended meaning is; instead, they hint it so that their hearers understand (Robinson, 2006, p.166).

Implicature : An additional unstated meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain the rules of communication (Yule, 1996, p.128).

Humor : Humor is anything that makes people laugh (Raskin, 1985, p.1).

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW