#### **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter consisted of many important aspects in analysis the data. The researcher divided this chapter into two parts, theoretical framework and previous studies.

#### **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

# **2.1.1 Pragmatics**

People make communication with other in daily life. Good communication happens when speakers understand each other correctly, that is, in accordance with what the speaker means and the listener understands the speaker to mean (Mey, 2009: 786). Pragmatics helps people to understand about what the speaker means. Pragmatics concerns with the studies of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpret by a listener (or reader) (Yule, 1996:3). The speaker and listener can interpret the utterance each other because pragmatics is thought of as the relation of signs to those who interpret the signs, the users of language (Morris, 1938: 6).

When such an understanding does not occur, the communicative situation becomes one of misunderstanding rather than of understanding (Mey, 2009, 786). This is the situation when hearers fail to interpret the intention of speaker. It is the task of pragmatics to clarify for us what it means to see and not to see an object of which the same words are being used, yet are understood in different, even deeply diverging ways (Mey, 2009: 787).

#### 2.1.2 Cooperative Principle

In conversation, speaker and hearer are supposed to respond to each other in their turn and exchange with the needed information that benefits both of them (Crowley & Mitchell, 1994, p.140). Therefore, the speaker and hearer must obey the cooperative principle in their communication. Grice proposed that participant in a conversational obey general cooperative principles (CP), which expected to be in force whenever a conversation unfolds: "Make your conversation contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose of direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Mey, 2009: 365)." The cooperative principle function makes ideal communication between speaker and hearer. The ideal communication means a speaker and hearer give contribution that necessary them.

There are three characteristics of cooperative principle (Mey, 2009: 152). Those are:

- 1. The participants have some common immediate aim.
- 2. The contributions of the participants are dovetailed, mutually dependent.
- 3. There is some sort of understanding (often tacit) that, other thing being equal, the transactions should continue in appropriate style unless both parties are agreeable that it should terminate.

Grice (as cited in Yule, 1996: 35) divided cooperative principles into four types: Maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, maxim of manner.

1. Maxim of quantity contains of quantity of your information.

Sub - maxims: - Make your contribution as informative as require.

- Do not make your contribution more informative than required.

The speakers do not give excessive information and statement to the hearers.

2. Maxim of quality contains of truth in your utterance.

Sub – maxims: - Do not say what you believe to be false.

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

The speakers do not give wrong information and statement to the hearers.

3. Maxim of relation contains of correlation between speakers and hearers utterance.

Sub - maxim: - Make your contribution relevant.

The people give relation information and statement to the hearer.

- 4. Maxim of manner
  - Avoid obscurity
  - Be perspicuous
  - Be orderly.
  - Avoid ambiguity

8

- Be brief

Those maxims are important use to communication. It will help you to make utterance easy to understand by the hearers.

## 2.1.3 Violation of Maxims

In an interaction, a participant may not fulfill a maxim. The participant possible to disobey one of maxim and violate other maxim or they violate all of maxim. Grice stated that there are various ways of participant does not fulfill maxim (Grice, 2004: 49):

- 1. He may quietly and unostentatiously violate of maxim; if so, in some cases he will be liable to mislead.
- 2. He may opt out from the operation both of the maxim and of the CP; he may say indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires.
- 3. He may be face by a clash: he may be unable.
- 4. He may flout a maxim

Grice (as cited in Cutting, 2002, p. 40) says that when the speaker does not fulfill or obey the maxims, the speaker is said to "violate" them. Violation, according to Grice (1975), takes place when speakers intentionally refrain to apply certain maxims in their conversation to cause misunderstanding on their participants' part or to achieve some other purposes [IPEDR vol.26 (2011)]. There are two points of Grice's spoken above: First, the purpose of maxim violation makes misunderstand the participants. Second, the speaker may be has other reason to violate of maxim.

Parvaneh Khosravi zadehand Nikan Sadehvandi [IPEDR vol.26 (2011)] gave some example of maxim violation:

1. Violation of the Quality Maxim

Mother

: Did you study all day long?

Son who playing all times : Yes, I study till now

In this exchange, the boy is not truthful and violates the maxim of quality. He lies to avoid unpleasant consequences such as; punishment or to be forced to study for the rest of the day.

2. Violation of the Quantity Maxim:

John: Where have you been? I searched everywhere for you during the past three months!

Mike: I wasn't around. So, what's the big deal?

John poses a question, which he needs to be answered by Mike. What Mike says in return does not lack the truth, however is still insufficient. This can be due to the fact that Mike prefers to refrain from providing John with the answer. John's sentence implies that Mike has not been around otherwise he did not have to search everywhere. John does not say as much as it is necessary to make his contribution cooperative. Hence, he leaves his listener unsatisfied. 3. Violation of the Relation Maxim

Teacher: Why didn't you do your homework?

Student: May I go and get some water? I'm so thirsty.

In the above exchange, the student's answer is by no means relevant to the teacher's question. One reason for this answer can be the fact that the student is trying to evade the interrogation posed by the teacher.

4. Violation of the Manner Maxim

Sarah: Did you enjoy the party last night?

Anna: There was plenty of oriental food on the table, lots of flowers all over the place, people hanging around chatting with each other.

Sara asked a very simple question, however what she receives from Anna is a protracted description of what was going on in the party. Two interpretations can be made from Anna's description: 1. Anna had sucha good time in the party that she is obviously too excited and has no idea where to begin.2.Anna had such aterrible time and she does not know how to complain about it.

## 2.1.4 Context

Context as a situation that gives rise to a discourse and it is within the discourse (Cited in Nunan, 1993: 6). In context, we require a consideration of

how speaker organize what they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstance (Yule, 1996: 3). The comprehension of the context is important to know by every people to make good communication. People are difficult to understand their speech when they do not know the context.

In this case, context is very necessary in cooperative principle to communicate. You will get the benefit when you comprehend four sub maxims in your communication. Gricean approaches to conversation focus on inference andbelief ascription under the assumption that speech is a cooperative engagement, subject to the maxims of quality, quantity, relation, and manner (Mey, 2009: 119).

### 2.1.5 Christoffersen's Classification

In the real life situation, many people tend to tell lie and break the rules of Grice's Cooperative Principle when they communicate (Tupan, 2008: volume 10 page 67). According to Christoffersen (2005), people believe that a lie is the natural tool to survive and to avoid them from anything that my put them in an inappropriate condition (Tupan, 2008: volume 10 page 64). The condition has violated of maxims which the people lie and disobeyed cooperative principle. They do not tell the truth condition to avoid some reason.

Christoffersen (as cited in Tupan, 2008: volume 10 page 64) said that people tend to tell lies for different reasons in real life. The following reasons will be used in the analysis to interpret the data: 1. Hide the truth

Example: (John covers his real age to his sister's friend whom he met at the party by telling her that they have the same age)

A: I am twenty years old, and how old are you?

B: Exactly the same.

2. Save face

Example: (Ann covers herself for being shoplifter in front of people)

A: What is in your bag? I think our bracelet is in it

B: I – I do not know what you are talking about. I do not have any bracelet. That alarm must be wrong.

3. Feel jealous about something

Example: (*Cindy lies to Jane that she doesn't know Jim, the new* 

student. Cindy actually likes him.)

A: I know you talked to Jim, this morning. He is awesome. What do

you think about him?

B: I don't know what you are talking about.

4. Satisfying the hearer

Example: (A conversation between a mother and her son)

A: Mom, how was I born?

B: Uhm... because God loves you so He sends you to me as a gift

5. Cheer the hearer

Example: (a wife asks her husband whether she looks OK with the purple blouse or not. Her husband who hates purple, cheers his wife by giving an answer that is expected by his wife)

A: Honey, does this color nice?

B: Of course sweetheart, you look gorgeous.

6. Avoiding to hurt the hearer

Example: (a mother of three years old boy wants to protect his son by telling that his father has gone overseas rather than saying that he died) A: Mummy, where is Daddy?

B: Daddy has gone overseas because he wants to buy some toys for you

7. Building one's belief

Example: (Joan asks her boyfriend whether he still remembers his exgirlfriend or not. Her boyfriend lies to her and makes her believe 100%)

A: I wonder if you are still in love with your ex.

B: Of course not darling, you know you are the one in my heart.

(Fact: he is still in love with his ex)

A: But how come you still keep her photo in your wallet?

B: That is not her; she is my cousin who looks like her.

(Fact: that's his ex's photo)

8. Convincing the hearer

Example: (a part time clerk asks his friend to take his shift, but his friend refuses by creating a good reason)

A: Can you take my shift tonight?

B: I wish I could, but I have to take my daughter to the dentist.

#### 2.1.6 Humor

There are many spoken and written varieties of humor, from puns to novels, but characteristic techniques recur in all forms of verbal humor, namely production of incongruity based on linguistic constructions or on the events described (Mey, 2009: 335). The incongruity focuses on the element of surprise. It states that humour is created out of a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs in the joke. This accounts for the most obvious feature of much humour: an ambiguity, or double meaning, which deliberately misleads the audience (Ross, 1998: 7).

We sometimes use humor to make Joke. This type of humour is often a one off joke or a gag occurring in extended texts (Ross, 1998: 8). Conversational joking can be spontaneous or formulaic. Recurrent conversational situations call for formulaic witticisms like "Born barn?'' who in а to someone leaves door а open, and typical joking strategies like hyperbole (Mey, 2009 :335). Humor has elements to make a joke (Ross, 1998: 8):

- a. There is a conflict between what is expected and what actually occur in the joke.
- b. The conflict is caused by an ambiguity at some level of language.
- c. The punch line is surprising, as it is not the expected interpretation, but it resolves the conflict: 'Have you got a light, Mac?' 'No, but I've got a dark brown overcoat.

# **2.2 Previous Studies**

Violation of maxims has been analyzed by many researchers in different fields and objects. The researcher has taken some researcher as his references. Those references are Satria (2008), Rizky (2008) and Fitria (2013).

The first study was written by Satria Andy Kirana (2008). The thesis title is "Humor Resulting From The Flouting of Conversational Maxim In Piled Higher And Deeper (PhD) Comic Strips. The researcher used theory of cooperative principle to analyze the conversation in PhD Comic Strips. The researcher also used descriptive-qualitative approach to analyze the conversation. The researcher analyzed flout of maxim rather than violation of maxim. However, the meaning is same. Satria analyzed types of flout of maxims in PhD comic strips and most flout of maxims that create humor in PhD comic strip. After analyzed the data, Satria concluded that the characters violated all of maxim in their conversation. The study showed that violation of manner maxim was the most dominated of violated in PhD comic strip. Maxim of manner was usually used frequently in order to make fun of others, to hide fact and to establish solidarity of humor.

The second study was "An Analysis Of The Flouting Of The Maxims To Cause Humorous Effects In Training Activity (A Study Of Jokes In One Day Ouantum Parenting Training Conducted By Konsorsium Pendidikan Islam Surabaya)" written by Rizki Karunianti (2008). The researcher used theory of cooperative principle to analyze the conversation in Konsorsium Pendidikan Islam (KPI). The researcher also used descriptive-qualitative to analyze the conversation. The researcher analyzed types of flout of maxim that caused humor effect in KPI training activity and the manner of flout of maxim to cause humor effect in KPI training activity. As the result of this study, the researcher found that three maxims flouted in KPI training activity, quality, relevance and manner maxim. Flout of quality maxim caused humor effect when the trainer gave wrong information of the discussion. Flout of relevance maxim made the trainer laugh when the trainer said irrelevant explanation which was not related to the topic of discussion. Flout of manner maxim caused laughter to the trainees when the trainer delivered much additional information which was not important to the discussion. The researcher also found that flouts of maxim were used to maintain the conversation effective, attractive and interesting.

The third research entitled "An Analysis of the Violation of Maxim in Malam Minggu Miko Situation Comedy" written by Fitri Hidayati and published in 2013. The researcher used theory of cooperative principle to analyze the conversation in Malam Minggu Miko film series. The researcher also used qualitative-approach to analyze the data. By this object of the study, the problems of this study were to analyze types of violation of maxim in Malam Minggu Miko and the most frequent violation of maxim in that comedy situation. By this problem, the researcher concluded that all maxims have been violated there and the most frequent violation of maxim is maxim of relation.

The researcher chooses those three studies as his references because their studies talk about violation of maxim. However, there are some differences between this study and the previews research. The first is object of analysis in this study. The researcher's object is *Vampires Suck* movie whereas the object of previews study is community of KPI, PhD comic strips and *Malam Minggu Miko* film series. The second is problems of number two in the researcher's study. The researcher's problem of number two is to analyze the reason of violation of maxim whereas the number two's problem of those previous studies is to analyze most violation of maxim.