

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Research

In daily life context, we frequently encounter casual conversation situations where people disregard statements to implicitly express meanings. For example, someone asks a friend, 'Did you enjoy the party last night?' and he responds with, 'Well, the food was good.' Here, the speaker deliberately avoids giving a direct answer, causing the listener to think that the party was likely not enjoyable. For that reason, this phenomenon of flouting the maxims exists when speakers knowingly break rules during conversations in order to generate particular implied meanings. In order to violate a maxim, the speaker needs to disregard one of Grice's maxims: Quantity, Quality Relevance or Manner (Grice, 1975). If a speaker is currently disobeying one of these maxims, they have to count on the ability of the listener to read between the lines as well as comprehend what was indicated. As a result of this, such passive communication must be coated in some form of politeness or clever subtlety, often hiding within humour. For instance, in the example above, the speaker avoids being direct and clear about the party's real experience, which lacks enjoyment, instead highlighting a positive aspect (the food) to sugarcoat it. This technique is visible in various social contexts, including everyday conversations, literature, and media, where individuals convey more than what is stated in an explicit way (Levinson, 1983; Cutting, 2002). This nuanced communication is important in maintaining social harmony and allowing more expression of thoughts.

Understanding flouting maxims is important to interpret underlying meanings in any conversations. When speakers do flout maxims, they deliberately disregard one of Grice's principles, such as providing the right amount of information (quantity), providing truthful information (quality), being relevant to the topic discussed (relevance), and being clear and not ambiguous (manner) (Grice, 1975). For instance, let's have sarcasm to take part. It often involves flouting the maxim of quality, where the speaker says something false to imply the opposite, as in below (sarcastic_us):

My two work modes:

1. I have done 30 mins of work in 8 hours.
2. I have done 8 hours of work in 30 mins.

Let's take a look at the example above, the speaker is being sarcastic by highlighting inefficiency and overachievement in a humorous manner. Sarcasm, as a form of flouting the maxim of quality, relies on the listener's reading ability in detecting and understanding the implied meaning and its underlying criticism and humour. For that, it is indicated that sarcasm can enhance social interactions by creating a mutual sense of understanding among those who recognise the implicit meaning (Dynel, 2014).

Subsequently, as these seasons provide a contemporary sample of the show's value and content, they may not fully represent the evolution of flouting maxims usage development across the series' entire existence. Seasons from earlier may exhibit

different dialogue and humour patterns, which could lead to a less holistic perspective of how flouting maxims operates throughout the series. This study leaks the characters' dialogue in these instances to reveal how it employs flouting maxims for comedic effects, character development and sociocultural commentary. It is valuable to analyse flouting maxims in *Family Guy* because it not only demonstrates the linguistic innovation of this show, but also reflects a broader phenomenon of language use across media. The goal of this study is to offer an insight into how the animated series as a viral part alongside, use some clever conversational techniques while trying to entertain and engage its audiences (Brock, 2015; Bednarek, 2018).

1.2 Limitations of the Problems

This research on flouting maxims in the animated series *Family Guy* is dealing with several limitations. First, the analysis is limited to the main characters: Peter Griffin, Lois Griffin, Meg Griffin, Chris Griffin, Stewie Griffin, Brian the dog, Glenn Quagmire, Joe Swanson and his wife Bonnie, Cleveland Brown and his wife Loretta, Mort Goldman, Herbert, Tom Tucker, Dr Hartman, and Mayor West.

Secondly, the theoretical framework for this research is mainly based on H.P. Grice's theory of conversational maxims: maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. Also, Levinson's theory is utilized to examine the implicature for each maxim.

Lastly, the scope of this research is limited to episodes from seasons 19 to 20 of *Family Guy*, as one of the requirements for conducting a thesis is analysing sources of data not below 2019.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What flouting maxims are found in the animated series *Family Guy*?
2. What are the implicatures in the animated series *Family Guy*?

1.4 Objectives of the Research

1. To identify and categorise instances of flouting maxims in selected episodes of *Family Guy*.
2. To assess the implicatures found in the *Family Guy* series