#### **CHAPTER II**

# **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

In this chapter, the writer describes the discussion about the supporting theories and previous study to show the differences and similarities between this research and another research. It involves about Pragmatics, Context of Situation, Cooperative Principle, Non-Observance the Maxims, Flouting Maxims, and Previous Study.

# 2.1 Pragmatics

Kreidler (2002: 18) said that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that is concerned with meaning and people's ability to use language meaningfully. The chief of pragmatics is person's ability to derive meanings from specific kinds of speech situations to recognize what the speaker is referring to, to relate new information and to interpret what is said. Paltridge (2008: 53) said that 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. It also includes background knowledge context that is what people know about each other and about the world.

## 2.2 Context of Situation

Since the beginning of the 1970, linguists have become increasingly aware of the importance of context in the interpretation of sentences, Brown and Yule (1983: 35). In addition, Paltridge (2008: 53) said that an understanding of how language functions in context is central to an understanding of the relationship between what is said and what is understood in spoken and written discourses. The context of situation of what someone says is, therefore crucial to understanding and interpreting the meaning of what is being said. Cutting (2002: 3) said that situational context is what speakers know about what they can see around them.

## 2.3 Cooperative Principle

Paltridge (2008: 61) wrote the Grice (1975) argues that in order for a person to interpret what someone else says, some kind of cooperative principle must be assumed to be in operation. The cooperative principle says we should aim to make our conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage. In addition to the Cooperative Principle, Grice based his cooperative principle, four conversational maxims: *maxim of quality, quantity, relation,* and *manner* to show how we communicate effectively in the light of certain rules on four sub-principles or maxims.

2.3.1 Maxims of Quality

*Maxim of Quality* is concern that people should only say what they believe to be true and what they have evidence for. Coulthard (1985: 31) have described sub maxim of quality: Don't say what you believe to be false and don't say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Example:

A: what month is this month?

## B: this month is November.

#### 2.3.2 Maxims of Quantity

*Maxim of Quantity* is concern that we says should make our contribution as informative as is required for the particular purpose and not make it more informative than is required. Coulthard (1985: 31) have described sub maxim of quantity: Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange) and don't make your contribution more informative than is required.

Example:

A: what is the color of Indonesian flag?

B: the color of Indonesian flag is red and white.

2.3.3 Maxims of Relation

*Maxim of Relation* says we should make our contribution relevant to the interaction, or we should indicate in what way it is not. Coulthard (1985: 31) have described sub maxim of relation "Be relevant".

Example:

A: have you done your dinner boy?

B: yes mom, I have done.

2.3.4 Maxims of Manner

*Maxim of Manner* says we should be clear in what we say, we should avoid ambiguity or obscurity and we should be brief and orderly in our contribution to the interaction. Brown (1983: 32) said that maxim of manner must be perspicuous. Coulthard (1985: 31) have described sub maxim of manner: Avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief and be orderly.

Example:

A: how old are you?

*B*: *I'm twenty one years old.* 

There is an example to approve the four of conversational maxim.

Husband: where are the car keys?

*Wife* : they're on the table in the hall

In the example above, wife can answer the husband's question using the four maxims as describe above. The wife answer relevant with the husband's question (relation), the wife answer what she believe (quality), the wife answer with make contribution as informative as is required (quantity), and be brief (manner)

### 2.4 Non-Observance the Maxims

People don't always mean from what they say literally when they build a conversation or just giving some utterance. Coulthard (1985:31) gives the important thing to realize the maxim that do not represent a descriptive statement of how conversational contributions. According to Thomas (1995) in Hanifah (2013: 138) when speaker implied something to suggest or to deliver some meaning by means of language, so intentionally the speaker generates an implicature. There are five ways people fail to observe a maxim: *Flouting a* 

Maxims, Violating a Maxims, Opting out a Maxim, Infringing a Maxims, and Suspending a Maxims.

*Flouting a Maxims* takes place when a speaker blatantly failed to observe a maxim without any intention to misleading a hearer. *Violating a Maxims* is the speaker may lie. The speaker will be able to misleading the hearer intentionally. The speaker says the truth but implies what is untrue. *Opting out a Maxim* is the speaker cannot reply in normal way that is expected, may be the speaker get trouble in pronunciation. *Infringing a Maxims* is the speaker cannot speak clearly or to the point because of informatively impaired. The last is *Suspending a Maxims*, it occurs when there are cultures–specific or particular event that force the speaker not to say something directly, for instance, taboo words.

### 2.5 Flouting Maxim

Flouting maxim is to say blatantly fails to fulfill it. The speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim without any intention to misleading a hearer. Paltridge (2008: 64) explores that on some occasions speakers flout the cooperative principle and intend their hearer to understand this, which is they purposely do not observe the maxim, and intend their hearer to be aware of this. There are four maxims which flout. So, there are four of flouting maxims: Flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of relation, and flouting maxim of manner.

#### 2.5.1 Flouting maxim of quality

Flouting maxim of quality happen when the speaker gave utterance but not appropriate with sub maxim of quality. Therefore, if there is an utterance from the speaker to be false and lack adequate evidence without any intention to misleading the hearer, thus the utterance is flouting maxim of quality.

Example:

A: what month is this month?

B: this month may be December.

Cutting (2002: 37) gives addition that the speaker flouting the maxims of quality may do it in several ways:

2.5.1.1 Hyperbole

The speakers may flout the maxims by exaggerating as in the *hyperbole*. For example; "*I could eat a horse*". It means that he or she said that when they felt hungry, with flouting maxims by exaggerating.

2.5.1.2 Metaphor

The speaker can flout the maxim of quality by using a *metaphor*, as in "*my house is a refrigerator in January*". It means that hearers would understand that the house was very cold indeed.

2.5.1.3 Irony and Banter

Two main ways of flouting maxims of quality are *irony* and *banter*. As Leech (1983: 144) says in Cutting (2002: 38) "while *irony* is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness), the type of verbal behavior known as *banter* is an offensive way of being friendly (mock impoliteness)".

In the case of Irony, the speaker expresses a positive sentiment and implies a negative one. If a student comes down to breakfast one morning and says "*if only you knew how much I love being woken up at 4 am by a fire alarm*" she is being ironic and expecting her friends to know that she means the opposite.

Banter, on the contrary, expresses a negative sentiment and implies a positive one. For example, *you're nasty, mean and stingy. How can you only give me one kiss?* It is intended to be an expression of friendship or intimacy. Banter can sometimes be a tease, and sometimes a flirtatious comment.

2.5.1.4 Sarcasm

There is *sarcasm* also as the way of flouting maxims. Sarcasm is a form of irony that is not friendly; in fact it is usually intended to hurt.

### 2.5.2 Flouting maxim of quantity

Flouting maxim of quantity happened when the speaker gave utterance but not appropriate with sub maxim of quantity. Thus, if there is an utterance from the speaker more informative than is required without any intention to misleading the hearer, thus the utterance is flouting maxim of quantity. Cutting (2002: 37) said that the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. Therefore, the way of flouting maxims is the speaker gives too little or too much information, the example like below:

Example:

A: what is the color of Indonesian flag?

*B: the color of Indonesian flag is red and white, actually it made by Fatmawati, the wife of first President Soekarno.* 

B not only say about the color of Indonesian flag, but also he gives much information because he know that A will understand although he just asking about the color but B just giving much information because he want to gives additional information. We see that B flouts the maxim of quantity when B said: *the color of Indonesian flag is red and white, actually it made by Fatmawati, the wife of first President Soekarno.* B gives much information without any intention to mislead the hearer, but he has purpose behind his much information, he just to give additional information about the flag.

# 2.5.3 Flouting maxim of relation

Coulthard (1985: 31) have described sub maxim of relation "Be relevant". If there is an utterance from the speaker not relevant in communication without any intention to misleading the hearer, thus the utterance is flouting maxim of relation.

Cutting (2002: 37) said that the way of flouting maxims of relation is expecting that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance didn't say, and making the connection between their utterances and preceding one, thus in: Example:

A: have you done your dinner boy?

B: my book is lost mom

B doesn't say that he done or not for the dinner, although actually he has not done the dinner because his book is lost but by not mentioning it, he apparently saying something irrelevant, he implies it. Similarly, in the next, Noel Coward is said to have had this exchange, after his play *Sirocco* (1927) was booed:

Heckler	: we expected a better play
Coward	: I expected better manners

(Sherrin 1995: 29)

Using a Grice analysis, we can say that the second comment seems irrelevant to the first: the heckler in the audience is talking about the play, and coward's comment is about manners. However, Coward intends the heckler to infer that he expected better manners that booing and shouting about his play. The heckler will have understood that Coward found him as well as the others not just bad-manner but rude and offensive.

Grice thought that flouting the maxim of relation was possible, but many people have disagreed. Whether we observe or flout maxims, our utterance will always be taken as relevant to the preceding co-text.

# 2.5.4 Flouting maxim of manner

Flouting maxim of manner is when speaker blatantly failed to observe a maxim of manner without any intention to misleading a hearer. Flouting maxim of manner happened when the speaker gave utterance but not appropriate with sub maxim of manner. Therefore, if there is an utterance from the speaker is

17

ambiguity and not brief without any intention to misleading the hearer, thus the utterance is flouting maxim of manner. Usually it found on tautology and figure of speech. Cutting (2002: 39) said that those who flouts the maxim of manner, the way is appearing to be obscure, like the example below:

Example:

A: how old are you?

*B*: *I*'m twenty one years old with the young face like a rose in the flowerbed.

B speaks in an ambiguous way, saying *like a rose in the flowerbed*, because he is avoiding saying the old face.

### 2.6 Previous Study

Previous Study is to show the difference and similarity between this research and another research. Several researchers have been analyzed pragmatic case study start from the research of cooperative principle, non-observance, and flouting maxims. Several researchers also have been analyzing with comedy as their subject, but there are similarities and differences from several researchers with my research. The writer takes six previous studies from 1990, 2011, 2013 and 2015.

Studies of pragmatics that focus on one Non-Observance of maxims have been done by Attardo (1990) with the title of thesis *The Violation of Grice's Maxims in Jokes* concluded that cooperative aspects of humor as a non-bona-fide mode of communication have been stressed. It has also been shown that jokes and other kinds of humorous texts can yield information. Whether humor as a nonbona-fide mode or as jokes, they are on the principled construction of texts which violate the maxims to exploit the deception of the hearer's expectations. The similarity between this research with my research is both of them use one of the Non-Observance as the theory and comedy or jokes as the subject. The difference is this research used Violating maxims but the writer take flouting maxims as my theory.

Analyzing non-observance of maxim has been done to analyze nonobservance of maxim like Alvaro (2011) with the title of thesis *The Role of Conversational Maxims, Implicature and Presupposition in the Creation of Humour: An Analysis of Woody Allen's Anything Else* showed that this research has intention to contribute or compensate the form of humor using implicature and non-observance of maxims. This research only used the non-observance of maxims as approach in simulating the intrinsic interest of movie. The research described the role of conversational maxims, implicature and presupposition in the creation of humor using the non-observance of maxim. The similarity between this research with my research is both of them use Non-Observance of maxims and also use humour or comedy as the subject but the difference is this research use humour in movie and my research use humour in Flappers Comedy Club.

There are three previous study from 2013; Hanifah (2013), Triyatun (2013) and Andresen (2013). In investigating about the role of conversational maxims, Hanifah, (2013) is not only the research but also Journal of Linguistic Major with the title *Non-Observance of Maxims in Facebook Conversation (A Case Study in English Education Department).* She explained that beside the

Grice's conversational maxims, there is non-observance of maxims also that correlate in conversational maxim. She investigated types of maxims which not observed by male and female social media. The finding of Hanifah (2013), male in social media flouting maxim was just to make a joke when they flout a maxim in public interaction, indicate that they show no interest to the topic being discussed when they give irrelevant contribution and fail to observe the maxim of relation in conversation. Besides that, female in social media indicated that they want to stay close with friends when giving more information that is required and fail to observe the maxim of quantity in interaction. The similarity between this research with my research is both of them use Non-Observance that is just flouting maxims as the theory. The difference is the writer doesn't take social media as subject but the writer takes flouting maxims in Flappers Comedy Club.

Triyatun (2013) with the title Non-Observance of Grice's Maxims Found in the Death of Salesman Drama Script by Arthur Miller: a Pragmatic Study also investigated about non-observance of Grice's maxims. She found that the types of non-observance in the death of salesman drama script used by the character whom flouting of maxims, violating of maxims, and suspending of maxims. The speaker's intentions of non-observance maxims were requesting, suggesting, alerting, warning, refusing, and disagreeing of utterance. Both findings showed the type of non-observance of Grice's maxim in counting of non-observance in four maxims and the speaker intention. The similarity between this research with my research is both of them use Non-Observance as the theory, but the difference this research use flouting of maxims, violating of maxims, and suspending of maxims and my research just use flouting maxims.

Andresen (2013) with the title *"Flouting the Maxims in Comedy: an Analysis of flouting in the comedy series community"*, explored on how flouting of the Grice a maxim is used to create comedy in television series community. Besides that, the use of flouts happened in different situations and explored the different each character in comedy movie. He argue that the flouting of maxim reflect the personalities of the character. This research is close with my research but there is a difference in the subject, both of them use comedy but this research used comedy series community and my research is Flappers Comedy Club.

The research has been done in pragmatics analysis of the cooperative principle like Purwaningsih (2015). Her title thesis is *The Pragmatics Analysis of the Cooperative Principle in a Comedy Movie Entitled "Meet the Parents"*. The researcher analyzed the types of maxims based on cooperative principle and the meaning of each utterance contains the Grice Maxim, and some socio cultural background of American Society used in a comedy movie entitled "Meet the Parents". The researcher found conclusion about the type of maxim from the four maxims and non-observance of maxims. The similarity between this research with my research is both of them use comedy as the subject. The difference is the writer only takes one of Non-Observance the maxim that is flouting maxims.

From the all previous researches, it is to know my research position or to know the different between my research from another researches, and to know the new one from my research. There were many researches that analyzed in the area of comedy concerning on investigating non-observance and flouting maxim. However, related to this research, the writer takes the same theory about flouting maxims but different subject and finding.

