

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher presents the review of related literature and related previous study. The review of related literature consists of some relevant theories used to analyze the data and to answer the research questions. In the review of related study, he cites briefly an earlier related study by Fanny (2004) and Faisal (2013).

A. The Cooperative Principles

The main points of the Cooperative principle were formulated by Grice in the lectures at Harvard in 1967 and published in his essay “Logic and Conversation” (1989). Levinson (1983:102) summarizes the CP as the specifications of “what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, co-operative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly, while providing sufficient information.”

In an attempt to describe how the CP works, Grice formulated guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation. These guidelines are known as the maxims of conversation. It should be underlined that Grice (1989) introduces Quality, Quantity, Relation and Manner as *categories* (not maxims as they tend to be called in literature), each of which comprises supermaxim and maxim(s).

Table 2.2. Conversational Maxims (Grice, 1989:26-27)

Category	Supermaxims	Maxims
Quantity		<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. make your contribution as informative as is required2. do not make your contribution more informative than is required
Quality	be true	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. do not say what you believe is false2. do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
Relation	be relevant	
Manner	be perspicuous	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. avoid obscurity of expression2. avoid ambiguity3. be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)4. be orderly

In the followings, the maxims are presented as subordinate to the CP and should not be (although they often are in literature) analyzed in isolation from the CP.

1. Quantity

The category of quantity relates to the quantity of information to be provided. The first maxim under this category requires one to “be informative”. This maxim means that the speaker has to include all the information that the hearer requires to understand. If the speaker leaves out a crucial piece of information, the hearer will not understand what the speaker is trying to say.

On the other hand, providing too much information during the course of a conversation can be perceived as superfluous and insignificant to the other person. According to the second maxim, which requires one to “be

brief”, the speaker should avoid including unnecessary, redundant information in his contribution. If the speaker keeps rambling without saying anything new or informative, the hearer will lose interest in the exchange very quickly and stop paying attention.

2. Quality

Under the category of quality, the maxim of truthfulness falls. This maxim refers to the importance of making only statements one believes to be true as Grice (1989) expects that the “contributions to be genuine and not spurious”. In short, the speaker is expected to be sincere and tell the truth. The reason is that if s/he gets caught making false statements, s/he will lose one of the most important social assets a person can have, credibility. Obviously, in real life, this maxim is occasionally disobeyed in order to deceive the hearer. In less serious contexts, it can be broken in an obvious manner when the speaker tries to be humorous or tease the hearer.

3. Relation

Obviously, relevance is a significant principle in linguistics since some books have been written entirely under the topic of relevance in language. In the context of Grice’s Cooperative Principle, the demand for relevance simply means that the speaker should only include information in the communication that is relevant to the topic being discussed. It is interesting to notice, however, that the perception of what is relevant and what is irrelevant diverges among people. This shows that

relevance is a matter of degree, and cannot be measured in absolute terms (Sperber and Wilson, 2002).

4. Manner

Under this category, the general idea is what is said should be expressed in a direct, clear, brief and orderly way to make the contribution such that it can be understood. The speakers not only need to avoid ambiguity and wordiness, but also have to take the characteristics of their audience into account (Schwarz, 1996:8).

B. Non-observance of the Maxims of Cooperative Principles

In everyday language, however, people fail to observe or fulfill the maxims on many occasions because, for example, they are incapable of speaking clearly (they are nervous, frightened, have a stammer, etc.) or because they deliberately choose to lie. In his first paper (1989:30) Grice distinguished three ways of failing to observe a maxim: **flouting** a maxim, **violating** a maxim and **opting out** a maxim.

1. Flouting a Maxim

There is a qualitative difference between flouting and the rest of the cases: flouting does not reduce the quality of the communication. However, the others cases of non-observance of the maxims impoverish communication. Jokes or flirting, for instance, are cases of flouting or exploitation of any maxim to achieve a certain communicative purpose.

2. Violating a Maxim

By the violation of the maxims, Grice (according to Thomas 1995:72) means the unostentatious non-observance of a maxim. If a speaker violates a maxim s/he will be “liable to mislead” (Grice, 1989:30). Violation differs from flouting in that generally you do not find out that you have been misled by violating a maxim, whereas flouting of maxims are meant to be noticed.

3. Opting out a Maxim

When a speaker opts out of observing a maxim, s/he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires (Grice, 1989:30). The speaker is fully aware that s/he is not cooperating, however, according to Thomas (1995:74), s/he wishes to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative. This might be the case in such situations, where the speaker cannot say anything because of ethical or legal dealing with confidential information. Another reason frequently given for ‘opting out’ is that giving the requested information might hurt a third party or put the speaker in danger.

C. Review of Related Study

In a study carried out by Fanny (2004) from Petra Christian University, verbal humor and its relation to maxim flouts was investigated. Employing Grice’s CP as the underlying theory, her study is focused on the humor produced by Srimulat’s comedians and found that maxim flouts could generate humorous effects. Among her fifty-three findings that she claimed to

flout the maxims of conversation, however, her study surprisingly enough did not account for the conversational implicature stemmed from the flouts in that she mistook maxim flouts/exploitations for maxim violations. Hence, the result of her study unfortunately did not uncover the additional layer of meaning which is optionally used by comedians as conveyance of informative content. In the case of quality flout, for instance, such a misguided assumption led Fanny into wrongly perceiving the comedians' intention to be telling lies to generate humor. Additionally, in her analysis, no attempt was made to investigate how humor is generated and to explain the mechanism behind.

In 2013, Faisal from STAIN Tulungagung also conducted the same inquiry with extra covering on layer of meaning which was not completed by the previous study. These additional elements, though, brought upon an additional problem to the misleading of distinguishing between flout and or violation. The data presented on the study showing are either flouts or violates though the focus of the study is to find the flouts only. However, the study had done a great amount of significant advancement of the knowledge of either to the Gricean maxims and the study of the implicature in a literal work.

In the present study, the researcher employed the same theory of CP as used by the previous studies above and took different object of research that is the conversation produced by characters on Spongebob Squarepants Series Movie. What makes the present study different from the previous one was

most attention paid to violating not flouting or exploiting a maxim for the purpose of implicating information (implicature), and later using it for the explanation and analysis of the implicature effect. Since implicature is context-dependent, text and context are brought together, in order to find out the “speaker meaning”. This is also essential to understand the core meaning why the characters deliver these violations, which is understandable only with the aid of a great deal of world knowledge.