

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE
AND THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Review of Related Theories

This chapter includes some theories that support this research. I find related theories from various sources. Below are the main theories, flouting maxims and implicatures, supported by the theory of contexts and pragmatics.

2.1.1 Cooperative Principles

The cooperative principle is quite a significant theory in Pragmatics. As Grice (1975) explained, the cooperative principle takes the participants to contribute to a conversation. The direction of a talk exchange determines the requirements. Grice argues that conversation is a cooperative activity. Grice states that the 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). That means it happens when speakers and listeners can understand each other. Which, in turn, they can share what they think smoothly. Additionally, Herring (2015) explains that the cooperative principles, which is a traditional way of understanding effective communication in face-to-face interactions, can be applied to digital communication contexts.

2.1.2 Flouting Maxims

Although maxims are important, Grice realised that sometimes people break the cooperative principle laws, causing flouting maxims. With that being said, the violation of the cooperative principle might cause misunderstanding among the listeners or hearers, which is indicated by the hearers' responses that do not meet the supposed responses towards the addressors' intentions. There might be reasons for doing so, such as covering up something, being cynical, being competitive, saving time talking, avoiding offending people, etc. It might be understood if the hearers have the same knowledge or background as the speakers. The knowledge does not rely on the linguistic items only, though.

According to Grice (1975), there is something natural that causes people not to obey the cooperative principle. This, in turn, means when people flout a conversation, it does not mean that communication will not be successful. Additionally, the flouting of maxims can be many things possible, then there is no way of describing a particular violation detrimentally. Recent research has expanded on Grice's initial framework, it provides deeper insights into how and why maxims are flouted in conversations. For instance, Cutting (2015) discusses how the implicatures arise from flouting maxims, uncovering the subtleties of how speakers utilise implicatures to express implied meanings. Cutting's analysis explains that even though flouting maxims can be ambiguous, it often enhances the communicative process by allowing speakers to

provide nuanced meanings. In addition, Grice (1975) proposes four ways Following Grice's maxims, here are several criteria for flouting maxims as guidelines:

2.1.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

Similar to Grice, Cutting (2002) thinks that to obey the maxim of quantity, the speaker is obliged to provide the required information to the hearer. To achieve that, it should not be too much or too little than required. This, in turn, means that if you provide too little information, the hearer will be unsatisfied with the information provided. On the other hand, if it is too much information, it might cause boredom to the hearer. Thus, to avoid the maxim of quantity violation, the speaker has to be informative as required. To make it clear, do not say too much or too little to avoid the maxim of quantity violation.

2.1.2.2 Maxim of Quality

This happens when the speakers do not tell the truth. This maxim requires the speakers to be truthful because any false statement will cause misunderstanding. Thus, to avoid violating this maxim, the speaker is prohibited from saying any biased (heading to lies) or false statement. And then, the speakers cannot say a thing if they lack evidence.

2.1.2.3 Maxim of Relation

Staying relevant is required to avoid the flouting of the maxim of relation. Thus, to achieve that, it is quite an obligation for the speakers to be relevant to the intended topic or the topic discussed.

2.1.2.4 Maxim of Manner

It is required for the speaker to speak orderly and clearly to avoid ambiguity. If that happens, then the maxim of manner is violated. Then, to avoid violating the maxim of manner, here are the things: be brief, be clear, be articulate, and avoid ambiguity.

2.1.3 Implicatures

According to Levinson (1983:97), implicature occurs when the speakers' utterances conceal some implicit meanings behind what is literally said. The term 'implicature' holds to be what the speakers can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what is literally said. Implicature plays a part in the comprehension of the meaning of a conversation. To illustrate, below is one implicature example:

Table 2.1 Implicatures

Context	Utterance	Implicature
Can I call you for a while?	It's four in the morning. I'm about to sleep.	No, you should not call me.

From there, we know that there is an implied meaning behind the utterance. Obviously, there is a purpose for using it. It doesn't happen intentionally. To Flouting Maxims' accordance, implicature is related to them – playing an important part.

Moreover, Yule (2016) a detailed analysis of implicatures in 'The Study of Language,' dealing with both conversational and conventional implicatures. Yule differentiates between these two types: conversational implicatures are context-dependent, which often arise from the flouting of Grice's maxims; conventional implicatures are tied to the conventional meanings in certain expressions.

In the same way, Levinson (1983) proposes three conversational implicatures:

2.1.3.1 Particularised Conversational Implicature

These implicatures rely on specific contexts and specific situational factors. Furthermore, the particularised conversational implicature arises when the meaning of an utterance depends highly on the specific context and background knowledge. Thus, if it is not quite dependent on a specific context, it can't be defined as a particularised conversational implicature. For example, if someone says, "Can you give the sugar?" at a dinner table, the implicature is that they want it to be given, not just checking if you are able to do so.

2.1.3.2 Generalised Conversational Implicature

These implicatures are more flexibly applicable, broader, and do not rely heavily on specific contexts. The generalised conversational implicature arises from

general conversations and concluded conventionally in terms of expectations. For example, if someone says, "I saw Bella at school", the implicature might be that Bella was at school and the speaker saw her there.

2.1.3.3 Scalar Conversational Implicature

These implicatures deal with scales or gradations of meanings. It happens when a speaker uses a term that is part of a scale (e.g., "some", "all", "few", etc.) the implicature involves understanding that the term is used less than the maximum. For example, if someone says, "I ate all of the food," the implicature might be that they eat all the food. The term "all" suggest an overall quantity, meaning that there's no food left.

2.1.4 Pragmatics

Pragmatics deals with the study of language and context relations that are grammaticalised or encoded in the structural language (Levinson, 1983). It is a branch of linguistics that studies the ways contexts influence the interpretation of meaning. It goes beyond the study of grammar and sentence structure, focusing on how language is used in real-life situations to convey meaning effectively. In the context of the thesis, pragmatics would be the lens in analysing the use of language in the *Family Guy* series. In short, pragmatics provides a framework to analyse the use of language in real-world communication, and applying this framework to the analysis of selected episodes of *Family Guy* allows the author to dig into the pragmatic intricacies of humour and conversational implicature.

2.1.5 Context

2.1.5.1 Definition of Context

In a conversation, there must be a context in it. Cutting (2002) defined context as knowledge of time and place expressed through words, whether spoken or written, as well as the physical, social, and sociopsychological elements that affect communication. In short, context is something that precedes written or spoken statements or conversations. Based on Cutting's (2002:3) context categorisation, there are three types of contexts: background knowledge context, situational context, and contextual context.

2.1.5.2 Background Knowledge Context

Cutting (2002) states that background knowledge context takes place when the speakers and hearers know about their interlocutor and the information about the world they know. Moreover, background knowledge context is based on assumptions related to common things between the speakers and hearers. Cutting (2002) divides this segment of context into two: cultural (areas of life), or interpersonal (history of the speakers or hearers due to joint activities).

2.1.5.2 Situational Context

According to Cutting (2002), situational context is the speakers' knowledge about visible things around the place where the interaction occurs. In other words, situational context takes place when the speaker and the hearer have the same situation,

circumstances, or settings. It describes why something is happening and the appropriate behaviour and actions associated with the situation.

2.1.5.3 Co-Textual Context

Cutting (2002) defines co-textual context as the interlocutor's knowledge of the surroundings mentioned in the text or conversation that determine what the speakers mean. To illustrate, someone says, 'I want to go to the bank to deposit money'. On the other hand, another individual says, 'I go camping at the river bank.'. These sentences contain the word 'bank', but both have different meanings due to the context of the sentence. To explain, Co-textual context is what the speakers and the hearers know about something they have been talked about. In short, it is the text of the context itself.

2.2 Previous Studies

I intend to provide five titles to look up. First, it is titled "ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM IN HOTEL TRANSYLVANIA". Communication is crucial in daily life, enabling people to tell, inform, and ask questions. Conversations, involving at least two people using a familiar language, are a common form of communication. Movies often depict these interactions but sometimes violate the Cooperative Principle by providing too much or too little information, being ambiguous, lying, or bringing up irrelevant points. This research aims to identify and analyze the types and frequency of flouting maxims in the movie "Hotel Transylvania" using Grice's theory. The study

found 40 instances of flouted maxims: 5 of quantity, 12 of quality, 18 of relation, and 5 of manner. The most common was the flouting of relation, with 18 instances. This research focuses on searching for flouting maxims in the movie characters' utterances, complete with the reasoning. In addition, the techniques of data collection are documentation and observation. The similarities of this research to my research are. Then, the differences of this research to my research are: First, this research focuses on finding flouting maxim types in a film or movie, whilst mine is a study that focuses on finding flouting maxims and their implicatures in a series. Second, Second, this research only focuses on finding flouting maxim types, not their implicatures, whilst mine focuses on finding the maxims and implicatures.

Second, the title of the research is "FORMS OF HUMOURS CREATED THROUGH MAXIM FLOUTING IN CHURCHILL SHOW COMEDY PERFORMANCES". Verbal humor is complex due to its dissociative nature and tendency to defy language rules. This study examined humor in Kenya's Churchill Show, focusing on how comedians flout conversational maxims, analyzed using Grice's cooperative principle and Relevance theory. The research, based on qualitative analysis of performances from 2011 to 2019, found that comedians use techniques like hyperbole, satire, irony, stereotyping, and self-deprecation. Future research should explore the most flouted maxims and the most used rhetorical strategies in the show. The similarities of this research to my research are. Then, the differences of this research to my research are: This is quite the same as my study because it also analyses

the humour elements of an art form. One of the differences is that this study analyses something comedic from a stand-up show, whilst mine is from a series. The next one is that this study also focuses on finding or analysing its figures of speech, my research is not quite too involved in figures of speech, I am focusing on finding the types of flouting maxims and their implicatures.

Third, it is titled "AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING IN THE COMEDY SERIES COMMUNITY". This paper examines how flouting Gricean maxims creates comedy in the TV series Community. It aims to identify which maxims are most frequently flouted and by which characters. Based on transcriptions of eight episodes, the study finds that the maxim of quantity is flouted most often, with some characters flouting more than others. Then, the differences of this research to my research are: Similar to the author's, this research aims to analyse how the flouting of maxims is utilised to create comedy in a TV series show because the show *Family Guy* is also a comedy. Also, the research examines how different situations and different characters perform the flouting of maxims to create comedy. So, it depends on how contexts contribute to the flouting of maxims. Additionally, the author of that title explores what kind of maxim is shown the most and the least in the show and how the number affects the show's comedy. Thus, it is quite the same as my research.

Fourth, the research's title is " AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM PERFORMED BY POLITICIAN GUESTS IN MATA NAJWA TALK SHOW IN MATA NAJWA TALK SHOW IN THE EPISODE OF ADU LANTANG JELANG

PENENTUAN AND BABAK AKHIR PILPRES". In communication, speakers are expected to follow cooperative principles for effective messaging, but often they flout these maxims to create implicatures. This research studied the types and reasons for maxim flouting by politicians on two episodes of Mata Najwa Talk Show. Using a descriptive method, the study analyzed 55 utterances that flouted the cooperative principles. It found that the maxims of quantity and manner were flouted the most (53.96% and 36.50% respectively), while quality and relation were rarely flouted (4.76% each). The main reasons for flouting were to increase message impact and politeness. This suggests politicians flout maxims to gain support from the public. Then, the differences of this research to my research are: The main difference between this research and my research is the genre, this research analyses flouting maxims in a talk show of something serious, not likely a comedic one, whilst my research analyses a comedy series. Thus, the reasons for flouting maxims are different as well - Mata Najwa Talk Show flouts maxims to increase message impact and politeness, whilst *Family Guy* characters flout conversational maxims to create humour, satire, and social commentary. There's a similarity as well, though, which is that this research focuses on finding flouting maxims and the implicatures.

Fifth, the research's title is " FLOUTING MAXIM IN CREATING VERBAL HUMOR IN THE PRETTY SMART NETFLIX SERIES". Humor, a common aspect of social life and mass entertainment, remains underexplored in research. This study examines verbal humor in the Netflix series "Pretty Smart." The objectives are to

identify and describe the flouting maxims used by characters to create humor. Using a descriptive qualitative method, the study applied Grice's Cooperative Principle and Shaded's verbal humour theory. Analysing seven episodes, it found 20 instances of maxim flouting, most frequently the maxim of quality, followed by relation, quantity, and manner. These floutings generate humour types like jokes, irony, wit, and satire. This research aids in understanding Pragmatics, especially flouting maxims and verbal humor. The similarities of this research to my research are The similarities between this research and my research are the fact that this research analyses humorous elements of a series and counts the number of flouting maxims as well. Then, the differences of this research to my research are:

2.3 Theoretical Framework

This framework aims to investigate the use of flouting maxims and implicatures in the animated series *Family Guy*. By utilising Grice's theories of flouting maxims and implicatures, supported by the theories of contexts and pragmatics, this study addresses the research problems. Furthermore, the flouting maxim theory is utilised to analyse the flouting maxims found in the animated series *Family Guy*. Then, the theory of implicatures is used to find the implicatures found in the series. Also, to have deeper insights and analysis, combining all the theories definitely helps me. This study aims to provide comprehensive understanding of the humour and communication strategies used in the *Family Guy* series.