

THE ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM IN MATA NAJWA'S TALKSHOW 'GENGSI MEREBut KURSI'

DEVIAN TRY GUSTARY¹, MEIRINA DIKRAMDHANIE²

STBA Technocrat Tangerang¹
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia²
deviantry@gmail.com
meirina.dikramdhania89@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study is aimed at analysing the flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles and finding out the implicature of the flouting maxims. Descriptive qualitative method was employed. The data were analyzed by identifying the utterances based on Grice's Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975), classifying the flouting of maxims and finding the maxim that was mostly flouted in the video of Mata Najwa talk show. The findings show that the guest speaker of the show flouted all the maxims. The guest speaker flouted maxims through six manners that are giving more and lack information, saying something that lack of evidence, giving irrelevance responses, saying something ambiguous/unclear and giving unnecessary prolixity (verbosity). The study reveals that there are 1 occurrence of flouting the maxim of quality, 9 occurrences of flouting the maxim of quantity, 13 occurrences of flouting the maxim of manner, and 6 occurrences of flouting the maxim of quality. Maxim of manner is the most often flouted as it is indicated by obscure and unclear responses.

Keywords: Cooperative principle, flouting maxims, implicatures, *Mata Najwa* talkshow

A. INTRODUCTION

Conversation is the common form of communication in our day-to-day life. Conversation is defined as the familiar kind of talk in which two or more people freely alternate in speaking. From the definition, it is assumed that, at least two participants, the speaker and the hearer, carry out the conversation and the interchange the roles (Levinson, 1983, p. 284).

In order to communicate successfully, they are supposed to adhere to a certain mode of conversational rules develop by Grice (1975). Grice (1975, as cited in Levinson, 1983, p. 101 – 102; Thomas, 1995, p. 51; Grundy, 2008, p. 95 - 97) introduces the Cooperative Principle (CP). It consists of the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner.

In the certain circumstance, the speaker sometimes fails to fulfil the maxims due to his/her purpose(s) of interaction intentionally or unintentionally (Pham, 2010). When the speaker disobey the maxims, his/her utterances may

contain meaning(s) more than what he/she said. The meaning that is conveyed but not explicitly stated is called implicature (Yule, 1996, p. 35; Thomas, 1995, p. 66; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2007, p. 23; Grundy, 2008, p.92). This implicature can be found in many conversational contexts. However, many previous studies have been mostly conducted to analyze the flouting maxims of Grice' Cooperative Principle in debate and movie scripts (Rahayu, 2012, p. 34). Since the analysis of the flouting maxims of Grice' Cooperative Principle in other conversational contexts has been paid little attention, this study attempts to investigate it in the talk show program.

Thus, this study specifically analyzes the types of maxims flouted by the guest speaker, a legislative candidate from a political party, when she was interviewed in a top-rating television talk show, Mata Najwa. In addition, the implicatures of her utterances will also be analyzed.

B. METHODS

This study used a descriptive qualitative method to analyze the types of maxims flouted by the guest speaker, as a legislative candidate from a political party, when she was interviewed in a top-rating television talk show, Mata Najwa, and to find out the implicatures of her utterances. The data were downloaded from the YouTube video of "Gengsi Merebut Kursi" on Monday, June 9th, 2014. The total length of the videos was 21 minutes 17 seconds in which the data covered political issue regarding Indonesian legislative election in DPR. The script of video was taken from www.tempo.com. The data were then analyzed by identifying the utterances based on the conversational maxims suggested by Grice (1975), classifying the flouting of maxims, and finding the maxim that was mostly flouted in the video.

C. LITERATURE REVIEW

a. Implicature

It had been recognized that participants cooperate with each other when they are involved in a conversation. In this situation, the listener has to assume that the speaker is being cooperative, and give deep insight into what the speaker's hidden intention and implication under the words uttered verbally. The additional conveyed meanings more than what words the speaker literally says are called implicature (Grice, 1975, as cited in Brown & Yule, 1983, p. 31). Similarly, Sihai (2008, p. 10) defines implicature as a special case of situations in which the perceived meaning extends beyond the literal meaning.

According to Grice (1975, as cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 58), implicature is divided into two types which are conventional and conversational implicatures. Conventional implicature is generated by meanings of words used (and so is a

semantic, not a pragmatic, phenomenon). On the other hand, conversational implicature is generated by general rules of conversation in which the speaker's presumed adherence to The Cooperative Principle (CP), as applied to a particular context of utterance. However, the explanation of conventional implicature is not discussed in the present study.

b. The Cooperative Principle (CP)

In order to make the communication runs successfully, the participants are expected to follow the Cooperative Principle (CP) developed by Grice (1975, as cited in Levinson, 1983, p. 101). The Cooperative Principle (CP) leads them to make a 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 they are engaged (Grice, 1975, as cited in Yule, 1996, p. 37). In particular, Grice (1975) characterized The Cooperative Principle (CP) into four maxims (Levinson, 1983, p. 101 – 102; Thomas, 1995, p. 51; Grundy, 2008, p. 95 – 97). They are as follow:

1. The Maxim of Quality
 - “Make your contribution one that is true.
 - a. Do not say what you believe to be false.
 - b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.”
2. The Maxim of Quantity
 - a. “Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange).
 - b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.”
3. The Maxim of Relevance
 - “Be relevant.”
4. The Maxim of Manner
 - “Be perspicuous.
 - a. Avoid obscurity of expression.
 - b. Avoid ambiguity.
 - c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
 - d. Be orderly.”

The maxims above specify what the participants have to do in order to converse in a cooperative way (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2007: 23). It can be assumed that communication runs successfully since the participants follow the maxims. However, if the participants disobey the maxims, they might deliberately flout a maxim in order to convey implicit information or add some special meaning, which is called implicature (Yule, 1996, p. 35; Thomas, 1995, p. 66; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2007, p. 23; Grundy, 2008, p.92).

c. Flouting Of Maxims

Grice (1975, as cited in Thomas, 1995, p. 64) mentions five ways of failing to observe a maxim, including (a) flouting, (b) violating, (c) infringing, (d) opting out, and (e) infringing. He then argued that the most important category by far, the one which generates an implicature, is flouting a maxim. However, this present study only discusses one way of failing to observe a maxim that is flouting.

The speaker is said to flout a maxim when he/she prompts the addressee to look for an implicit meaning of what is said. For that reason, Grice (1975) calls this implicit meaning as “conversational implicature” and he terms the process by which it is generated as “flouting a maxim” (Thomas, 1995, p. 65).

According to Thomas (1995, p. 65), the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information, the speaker who flouts the maxim of quality seems to say something which is blatantly untrue or for which he/she lacks adequate evidence, the speaker who flouts the maxim of relevance seems to make a response which is irrelevant to the topic, and the speaker who flouts the maxim of manner seems to give an ambiguous and unclear utterance to a conversation.

d. Result Discussion

This study reveals the flouting of maxims that occurs in a top-rating television talk show, Mata Najwa, in which a female legislative candidate was a guest speaker. The flouting maxims found in the script of Mata Najwa’s talk show are divided into four categories as proposed by Grice (1975, as cited in Levinson, 1983, p. 101 – 102; Thomas, 1995, p. 51; Grundy, 2008, p. 95 – 97), including the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. The following table presents the summary of the flouting maxims.

Table 1. Summary of the Flouting Maxims

Types of the Flouting Maxims	Number of Occurrences	Percentage
Quality	1	3.5 %
Quantity	9	31 %
Manner	13	44.8 %
Relevance	6	20.7 %
Total Number	29	100 %

Table 1 indicated that there are 29 flouting maxims from guest speaker’s utterances in the Mata Najwa’s talk show. According to the Table 1, the flouting maxim is dominated by maxim of manner. It is flouted 13 times or 44.8 %. It is followed by the maxim of quantity that is flouted 9 times or 31%, the maxim of relevance flouted 6 times or 20.7%, and the maxim of quality flouted 1 times or 3.5%.

The aforementioned flouting maxims were then identified through six manners (Adapted from Levinson, 1983, p. 101 – 102; Thomas, 1995, p. 51; Grundy, 2008, p. 95 – 97). The summary of guest speaker's manners in flouting the maxims is shown below:

Table 2. Summary of guest speaker's manners in flouting the maxims

Manner in Flouting the Maxims	Number of Occurrences	Percentage
Giving more information	3	10.3%
Giving lack information	6	20.7%
Saying something untrue/ lack of adequate evidence	1	3.5%
Giving irrelevance response	6	20.7%
Saying something ambiguous/unclear	9	31%
Giving unnecessary prolixity (verbosity)	4	13.8%

a. The Flouting of Maxims Quality

In observing the maxim of quality, the speaker is expected to say something which is true or for which the speaker lacks enough evidence (Levinson, 1983, p. 101 – 102; Thomas, 1995, p. 51; Grundy, 2008, p. 95 – 97). The following conversation is the example of how the guest speaker flouts maxim of quality:

N = Najwa Shihab

GS = Guest Speaker

Example (1)

N : Bicara soal partai Islam, yang paling menarik adalah hubungan Islam dengan negara. Itu kan selalu menjadi problematik kalau bicara partai Islam. Pandangan Anda?

(Talking about Islamic party, the most interesting one is the relation between Islam and the government. Discussing Islam party always becomes problematic. What is your opinion?)

GS : Kalau partai Islam pada saat ini kan memang sedang merosot.

(Indeed, the Islamic party is declining nowadays)

Guest speaker's utterance in example (1) showed that she flouts the maxim of quality. By uttering 'Kalau partai Islam pada saat ini kan memang sedang merosot', the guest speaker gives information that lack of evidence. She does not explain adequately the reason of the declining. This implied that she does not know much about the factors that makes the popularity of Islamic party decline in the political situation.

b. The Flouting of Maxims Quantity

The speaker flouts the maxim of quantity when she gives more or less information than is required by the situation ((Levinson, 1983, p. 101 – 102; Thomas, 1995, p. 51; Grundy, 2008, p. 95 – 97)). Some examples of flouting the maxim of quantity which give more information can be seen in the conversation below.

Example (2)

- N : Bagaimana anggota DPR mengubah kemiskinan?**
(How does the legislative member change the poverty?)
- GS : *Dengan banyak cara.*
(Lot of ways)
- N : Misalnya, satu saja.**
(Give me one example)
- GS : Mungkin saya bisa mengubah pembangunan di sana.
(Probably, I can change the development in that area)
- N : Lewat cara apa?**
(what kind of ways?)
- GS : Kita lihat nanti dengan cara apa.
(We'll see what kind of ways it will be)

In the conversation above, the guest speaker does not give adequate information required by the interviewer. She only says 'dengan banyak cara'. In this situation, she seems less informative in giving the answer of how legislative member in DPR change the poverty. Actually, if she conveys the answer as informative as possible, she should explain the answer deliberately. For example, her utterance could be 'Dalam rangka memberantas kemiskinan, saya akan memberikan sekolah gratis bagi anak-anak kurang mampu agar mereka bisa mencari pekerjaan yang lebih layak dengan pendidikannya tersebut' (In overcoming the poverty, I'm going to give a school-for-free for those who cannot reach the education in order to be able to look for a better job).

c. The Flouting of Maxims Manner

The speaker flouts the maxim of manner when giving ambiguous and obscure utterances (Levinson, 1983, p. 101 – 102; Thomas, 1995, p. 51; Grundy, 2008, p. 95 – 97). Some examples of flouting the maxim of manner are presented below.

Example (3)

- N : Apa program yang Anda lakukan?**
(What is your program?)
- GS : Saya akan *masuk ke pertanian dan sekolah-sekolah.*
(I'm going to go into the agriculture and schools)

The italic utterance is obscure since it makes the hearer confused. In this situation the guest speaker does not clearly explain the word 'masuk' means. If she conveys the utterance clearly, her utterance could be 'saya akan memberikan lahan pertanian dan sekolah gratis' ('I'm going to give the land for farming and also education for free') or probably the implicature is 'saya akan mengunjungi para petani dan murid sekolah' ('I'm going to visit the farmers and the students').

d. The Flouting of Maxims Relevance

In observing the maxim of relevance, the speaker is expected to give irrelevant answer. Some examples of the flouting maxim of relevance are shown in the following example.

Example (4)

- N : Jadi akan belajar menjadi anggota DPR?**

So, you will learn how to be a legislative member, right?

GS : *Belajar memahami kondisi di dapil. Tapi trik seperti apa permainan di politik, sudah ada di pikiran saya.*

(Learn the condition of the election area. But what kind of tricks in politic will be, they are already all in my mind)

The guest speaker in example (4) flouts the maxim of relevance by uttering irrelevance answers. In example (6), the interviewer asks the speaker's willingness to learn how to be a legislative member in DPR. However, she answers 'belajar memahami kondisi di dapil. Tapi trik seperti apa permainan di politik, sudah ada di pikiran saya'. If she conveys the relevance answer, she could say, 'Ya, saya akan belajar dan berusaha menjadi anggota DPR yang amanah' (Yes, I will learn and work hard to be a trustful legislative member)

D. CONCLUSION

Based on the data in the previous part, the researcher conclude that four maxim introduced by Grice's that covers the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner are flouted by the speaker in the talk show "Mata Najwa". The most maxims flouted by the speaker are the maxim of manner.

In flouting the maxim, the speaker shows several manners. They are giving more or less information, saying something untrue, giving irrelevance responses, and saying something ambiguous. In flouting the maxim the speaker does not blatantly mislead the hearer. Those flouting maxims have their own implicatures related to the context of each conversation which shows the reason why the speaker flouts a maxim. In this context of the study, the speaker is a politician. Therefore she needs a strategy when she cannot answer the question, when having no adequate evidence about the topic or when she has to campaign her program. She has the responsibility to answer the question in order to be considered as a cooperative politician.

E. REFERENCES

- Brown, Gillian., and Yule, George. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M., and E. Olshtain. (2007). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Grundy, Peter. (2008). *Doing pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rahayu, Wulan. (2012). *The realization of Grice's Cooperative Principle in "Obama exclusive RCTI bersama Putra Nababan": Presidential interview*. (Undergraduate paper). Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia.
- Pham, Dinh T. (2010). The Cooperative Principle: Does Grice's framework fit Vietnamese language culture?. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*. 1 (2), 197 – 219. Retrieved June 3, 2014 from

<https://sites.google.com/site/linguisticsandlanguageteaching/home-1/volume-1-2010-issue-2/volume-1-2010-issue-2---article-pham>

Sihai, Wang. (2008). Study on teaching the interpretations of conversational implicature in listening comprehension. *CELEA Journal*. 31 (3): pp. 66 – 74. Retrieved from www.celea.org.cn/teic/79/080801_66.pdf

Thomas, Jenny. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.