

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BASES

In this chapter, the researcher discusses Grice's theory of conversational maxims. Then, the writer also gives explanation of the ways the flouting of maxims. Also, previous studies are intended to make the comparison between this research and the others. In this part of the thesis, the researcher will explain the framework of the analysis which will help the researcher to answer the research problems.

2.1 Pragmatics

There are some linguists' interpretations about pragmatics but basically they have same idea that pragmatics is the study of language used in communication and the associated usage principles. According to Grundy (2000), pragmatics is about explaining how we produce and understand the language which is used in communication everyday but apparently rather peculiar uses of language (p. 3).

The researcher uses this theory of pragmatics in order to know the way of communication. Leech (1983) considers pragmatics as a study of discussing the speaker meaning linking with discourse situation. He also adds that pragmatics is a study of linguistic communication according to conversational principles (p. 187). As stated above, the researcher begins to put Leech's theory of pragmatics because it has relation with conversational principle.

2.2 “*Implicature*”

The concept of “*implicature*” is firstly introduced by Grice. Grice was an English philosopher who was best known for his contributions to the theory of meaning and communication. Grice made a distinction between what is said by speaker of a verbal utterance and what is implicated. Based on Grice, “*implicature*” is an inferred meaning, typically with a different logical form from the original utterance. “*Implicature*” is something implied and meant from what is said (Grundy, 2000, p. 273).

This also has a relation, the term “*implicature*” is used by Grice to account for what speaker can imply, suggest, or meant as distinct from the speaker literally say. Here, Grice states that there are two kinds of “*implicature*”:

1. Conventional “*implicature*” which is determined the conventional meaning of the words used.
2. Conversational “*implicature*” which is derived from a general principle of conversational plus a number of maxims which speakers will normally obey.

Hence, the general principle is also known as the cooperative principle which Grice presents in the following term: “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (1975, p. 45).

2.3 Grice’s Cooperative Principle

Grice (1989) advises cooperative principle which makes the conversational contribution is in the right size and agrees with the accepted purpose of the

conversation a speaker is connected to. Grice states that cooperative principle “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (p. 26). It means that a speaker needs to be as informative as it requires based on the context of the conversation so that the communication will be successful.

To make the principle acceptable, Grice (1989) generates the principles into four conversational categories or maxims that will result in accordance with cooperative principle (p. 26). The categories are:

2.3.1 Maxim of Quantity

- a. Make your contribution as informative as it is required
- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than it is required

Those mean that maxim of quantity suggests speakers to be brief. It proposes a speaker to contribute as informative as a required and not to contribute too much or too little information than is required. Black (2006) added that “this maxim requires that we offer the appropriate amount information” (p. 29).

Example:

Jack: where is the nearest mosque?

John: it is in front of the post office.

Jack asks John the nearest mosque. John understands that the nearest mosque from the place they are talking is in front of the post office. It fulfills

the maxim of quantity. It is because John's answer is informative and explicit that the mosque is near with the place where the conversation is taken.

2.3.2 Maxim of Quality

- a. Do not say what you believe to be false
- b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

Those mean maxim of quality suggests speakers to be true. It proposes a speaker to say what he believes to be true and not to say something with less evidence. Black (2006) adds that "this maxim has to do with the truth of falsity of an utterance" (p. 30).

Example:

Tommy puts his jacket on the sofa then, he goes to the bathroom. Rio outs from his room and looking for the jacket because he wants to go out. Rio found the jacket on the sofa and takes it. After Rio went home, Tommy asks him.

Tommy: where is my jacket?

Rio: I take it.

Rio really takes the jacket, so it completes the maxim of quality because Rio does and he tells the truth.

2.3.3 Maxim of relevance

- a. Be relevant

Maxim of relevance proposes speakers to be relevant. A speaker has to say something related to the topic.

Example:

Jane: how was the scenery?

Rose: it was amazing.

The conversation above is clear enough, between the answer and the question is relevant, and it fulfills the maxim of relevance.

2.3.4 Maxim of Manner

- a. Avoid obscurity of expression
- b. Avoid ambiguity
- c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
- d. Be orderly

Maxim of manner suggests speakers to be clear. It means that a speaker needs to say briefly, orderly, and avoid obscurity and ambiguity. Black (2006) stated that “this maxim refers not to what is said, but to how it is expressed” (p. 30).

Example:

Marry: what the day is today?

Robby: it is Wednesday.

Marry: what the date is today?

Robby: it is 25th.

The conversation is clear without the appearance of misunderstanding. It was perfectly brief and well ordered.

Those all how maxims work in cooperative principle, after understanding it all, the researcher lets to know the connection between the cooperative principle and maxims, and also conversational *implicature*. According to Grice (1989; p.30):

“A participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfill a maxim in various ways, which include the following:

1. He may quietly and unostentatiously *violate* a 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 cooperative principle; he may say indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim require.
3. He may face by *a clash*, he may be unable, for example: to fulfill the maxim of quantity without the second maxim of quality.
4. He may *flout* a maxim; that is, he may blatantly fail to fulfill it.”

Those all are about the relation to each other. The last number will be explained in the next point and it will also become the main focus to make this research runs well.

2.4 Flouting Maxim

A flout occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because s/he wants the hearer to look for the meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning. It takes place when individuals deliberately cease to apply the maxims to persuade their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind the utterances; that is, the speakers employ “*implicature*” (S. C. Levinson, 1983, p. 104).

Grundy (2000) states in his book that flouting is a particularly silent way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an “*implicature*”.(p. 78). It is also said by Cutting (2002) that flouting the maxims is when the speakers appear not to follow the maxims but expect hearers to appreciate the meaning implied (p. 37). Cutting (2002) determined flouting of maxims as follows:

2.4.1 Flouting quantity

Cutting (2002) stated that “the speaker who flouts the maxim quantity sees to give too little or too much information (p. 37). It means that the speaker may give information not as it requires. Here, Cutting gives his example:

A: well, how do I look?

B: your shoes are nice....

B’s answer is not giving all the information that A needs in order to fully appreciate what is being said. B does not say that the sweet-shirt and jeans do not look nice, but B knows A will understand that implication, because A asks about his whole appearance and only gets told about part of it.

The example above is clear enough show that the conversation flouts the maxim of quality because the information that needs is too little, B’s answer is not complete yet, but A can catch the meaning implied.

Another example gave by Grice (1983), he says that a flouting of the maxim of quantity are provided by utterances of patent tautologies like:

Women are women.

War is war.

Grice's opinions about these examples are totally non-informative, and so, at that level, cannot but infringe the maxim of quantity in any conversational context. *“An infringement of the first maxim of quantity, “Do not give more information than is required”, on the assumption that the existence of such a maxim should be admitted.”* (p. 34).

2.4.2 Flouting quality

Cutting (2002) defines the speaker who flouts the maxim of quality may do it several ways:

1. They may quite simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think.
2. The speaker may flout the maxim by using the hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and banter.

Cutting gives an example of it on his book that speaker may flout maxim by exaggerating as in the hyperbole “I could eat a horse”. That sentence has another meaning that may the speakers are dying of hunger. (p. 37)

Another example gave by Grice (1983) in metaphor “you are cream in my coffee” means that it is intending the hearer to reach the metaphor interpreted “you are my pride and joy”. Those examples above clearly explain that those are break the maxim of quality by interprets the utterances spoken. (p. 34)

2.4.3 Flouting relation

Cutting (2002) If the speaker flouts the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make connection between their utterance and preceding one (s) (p. 39). Here the example on his book:

Heckler : We expected a better play

Coward : I expected better manners.

(Sherrin, 1995;29)

Cutting uses Gricean analysis as he says that the second 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 manner than booing a shouting about his play. The Heckler will have understood.

2.4.4 Flouting manner

According to Cutting (2002), those who flout the maxim of manner may appear to be obscure. (p. 39). Here, the example:

A: where are you off to?

B: I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody

A: ok, but don't be log-dinner's nearly ready

Cutting (2002) analyzes that B speaks in an ambiguous way, saying "that funny white stuff" and "somebody" because he is avoiding saying "ice-cream" and

'Michelle' so that his little daughter does not become excited and ask for the ice cream before her meal. Sometimes writers play with words to heighten the ambiguity. (p.39).

2.5 Presupposition

Brown and Yule (1983) states in their book that:

“Stalnaker (1978: 321) stated that presupposition are what is taken by the speaker to be the common ground of participants in the conversation.”

Here, Brown and Yule notice from that quotation that the indicated source of presupposition is the speaker (p. 29).

In Seed (1995), Sperber and Wilson argue that presupposition is not an independent phenomenon but one of a series of effects produced when the speaker employs syntactic structure and intonation to show the hearer how the current sentence fits to the previous background (p. 109).

Lyons (1977) states that, “most of the definitions of presupposition to be found in the recent literature take the presupposition of an utterance to be a set of propositions. An alternative view is that they are the conditions that must be satisfied before the utterance can be used felicitously to perform its function as a statement, a question, a promise, a request, etc. (cf. Fillmore, 1971b)” (p. 604). It is also strengthened with Cooper’s (1974) opinion, he states that “the condition that counts as presuppositions are all ontological, in fact they have to do, not necessarily with existence, but with whatever kind of ontological satisfaction is appropriate to the entity, state-of-affairs, event, process, in question” (p. 605).

2.6 Context

People cannot judge what they say without knowing the condition when they are doing the communication. It might appear different meaning between what is spoken and the utterance itself. People can also know if it has relation with the context when they are doing the communication. Nunan (1993, p. 6) defines context as a situation that gives rise to a discourse and it is within the discourse. So, different occasion means different context.

There are two types of context based on Nunan's perspective. Those are linguistics context and non-linguistics context. Linguistics context is "the language that surrounds or accompanies the piece of discourse under analysis" (Nunan, 1993, p. 8). Non-linguistics context is several aspects involved in the conversation; the type of communicative event, the topic, the purpose of the event, the setting (location, time of day, season of year and physical situation), the participants, the relation between them, the background knowledge and the assumptions in the conversation.

2.7 Previous Studies

On this study, there are several researchers have done in the same area with the researcher of this paper. However, the focus of this research is different. The same studies are such as a research has done by Kirana (2008) with comic strips analysis and Prastyaning (2011) with talk show as the object.

2.7.1 The study of Kirana (2008)

Kirana's study used the Grice's cooperative principle theory to analyze her research entitled "Humor Resulting from the Flouting of Conversational Maxims in Piled Higher and Deeper (PHD) Comic Strips". Comic strips as a part of comic development have been a great part of the history of modern literature. The researcher wants from this study is to reveal how the flouting of maxims produced by the utterances in PHD comic strips. Her research also wants to reveal how the flouting of the maxims can create the humorous effect in PHD strips.

In this research Kirana conducted the study by using descriptive-qualitative approach to describe discourse used in comic strips. And it deals with the utterances spoken by the characters in PHD comic strips that create humorous effect.

In her research, she had two statements of the problems. First, what maxims were flouted in PHD comic strips. In her result, she stated that the flouting of one or more of the four maxims carries a variety of pragmatic meanings. The quantity maxim can be flouted as to create prolixity, to mark a sense of occasion or respect, or to be rude. The quality maxim can be violated to mark the use of figure of speech in one's utterances. The flouting of the maxim of relevance can be used to signal embarrassment or to show a desire to change the subject. The violation of the maxim of manner can be used to establish solidarity or humor (Cook, 1989:31).

Second, which maxim is flouted the most to create humor according to the order of occurrence in PHD comic strips. The result of this statement of the problem is the violation of the maxim of manners. She said that maxim of manner dominates the total flouting. It is usually used frequently by the character in order to make fun of others, to hide fact, and to establish solidarity or humor.

2.7.2 The study of Prastyaning (2011)

On the other hand, it is different in Prastyaning's study. She is also applying Grice's cooperative principle theory on her research entitle "The Study of Flouting Maxim of Grice's Cooperative principle in *Online* Talk Show (Broadcasted on January 20th and February 23rd, 2010)". Talk show is one of the television programs which are categorized as soft news, discussing about particular problem but it does not always deliver immediately. Soft news is the interesting and important information which is delivered in-depth by the host (Morrison, 2008:28).

Her thesis also used descriptive-qualitative approach as like as Kirana's did. Here, she has two statements of the problems. First, what maxim is frequently flouted by the conversant in their talk exchanges in *On-line* talk show broadcasted on January 20th and February 23rd, 2010. And her result is that the most frequently maxim flouted is maxim of relation with the amount of 47% or twenty five times from the whole maxims.

Second, the statement is why the maxim frequently is flouted by the conversant in their talk exchanges in *On-line* talk show broadcasted on January

20th and February 23rd, 2010. Her result stated that maxim of relation relates how we said something. She said that it means we have to stay on the topic that we are talking about. Based on her analysis, flouting maxim of relation is not only produced by the guests but also the host. As we know that the host is someone very dominant in the program. The guests and the host flout the maxim of relation because they do not want to respond to the questions. Also, they want to create a humorous situation, give further information, and make a testing.