

(1996), firstly, pragmatics is the study of utterances as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a hearer. Secondly, pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning. It requires a consideration of how a speaker organizes what he or she wants to say. Thirdly, pragmatics is the study of how the hearer gets the implicit meaning of the speaker's utterances. The last, pragmatics is the study of the expression of a relative distance. It is assumed as the study of the relationship between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. From all the definition above, discourse and pragmatics are combined to see the relationship between language and context.

Furthermore, according to Yule (1996) in his book *Pragmatics*, it covers several scopes; they are deixis, cooperative principles, implicature, presupposition and speech acts. From the areas of pragmatics field, the co-operative principle becomes a main theory of this research.

2.1.1 The Co-operative Principle by Grice (1989)

H.P. Grice invents a theory of conversation like Thomas (1995) says that it “attempts explaining how a hearer gets from what is said to what is meant” (p. 56). In the way we are doing conversation, some principles should apply to make a good contribution of conversation as Grice's (1989) states “make our conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the exchange in which we are engaged” (p. 26). He suggests that all participants should give a contribution to each other in conversation by providing required information, speak the truth, be relevant and be clear. This principle will engage between

2.1.4 Context

Context is the central understanding in interpreting the meaning. According to Cutting (2002), he divides it into three kinds aspect of context. They are situational context, background knowledge context and co-textual context.

Cutting (2002) explains the term situational context as “what speakers know about what they can see around them” (p. 3). In the way of conversation, the speaker and hearer engage themselves to use the things around them to support their speaking. Like Cutting (2002) says that it is an immediate physical co-presence, the situation where the interaction is taking place at the moment of speaking.

Background knowledge context is people say what they know about each other and the world. It includes cultural knowledge and interpersonal knowledge. Paltridge (2006) explains that cultural knowledge tends to say “what they know about the world, what they know about various areas of life, what they know about each other and what they know about the norms and expectation of particular discourse community in which the communication is taking place” (p. 54). Interpersonal knowledge engages between speaker and hearer has relationship before. As Cutting (2002) sates “share interpersonal language is knowledge acquired through previous verbal interaction or joint activities and experiences, and it includes privilege personal knowledge about their interlocutor (p. 6)”. So that they can share everything that both people

the maxim as should be. So, the function is still not obeying cooperative principle.

Flouting is the type of failing maxim in order the speaker wishes the hearer to get a certain meaning as Thomas (1995) said “the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning” (p. 65). The second type is violating maxim. This maxim is different from flouting. If flouting asks the hearer looks for the other meaning, this failing maxim discourages the hearer for seeking for implicature. Grice draws ‘violating maxim as the unostentatious non observance of a maxim. Grice (1989, p. 30) states directly “a speaker who violates a maxim will be liable to mislead”. The third type is infringing of maxim. Grice said infringing is failing the maxim because of imperfect linguistics performance such a young child or a foreign learner or in the way the speaker’s nervousness, drunkenness, excitement. Opting out maxim is the way the speaker fail maxim to indicate unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim require. It is the kind of legal or ethical reason (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 74). The last is suspending of maxim. The speaker might use this failing maxim in under certain circumstance as part of certain events there is no expectation on the part of any participants that one or several maxims should be observed (cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 74).

As the research focuses on flouting conversational maxim, the following will emphasize its discussion more on flouting in each maxim.

2.2.1 The study of Aguslani (2012)

Aguslani (2012), from Petra Christian University, conducted an analysis of flouting conversational maxim entitled “Flouting of Maxims Which Provokes Humor in The Big Bang Theory and Office Boy Shift 2 Movie Series”. This thesis used Gricean maxims to look for the humor which was created in Big Bang Theory and Office Boy Shift 2 Movie Series. In this study, he compared two movies for looking the frequently appearance of flouting maxim in both movies. He also gave a detailed explanation how the characters create humor through the flouting maxims.

As a result, the study found that the characters in two movies flouted all maxims in the way to make humor appears in the movies. In The Big Bang Theory and Office Boy Shift 2 Movie, the maxim of relation was the maxim that often flouted with ratio of 18:10. The second most flouted was maxim of quantity with ratio 12:4. Maxim of quality was put on the third place maxim flouted with ratio 5:4. And the last was maxim of manner with ration 5:2.

Different with this study, the researcher’s study do not focus on the humor. Provokes humor through flouting maxim has been conducted by many people. There were many studies of co-operative principles in focusing on flouting maxims to look for humor. Humor became a favourite one in doing research of flouting maxims. In the researcher’s study, the character that is elected is not the kind of humorist person. He is a typical of serious person. Since looking for the flouting maxim in the humorist person has been

