

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

In this section, the researcher presents the data analysis and findings. The analysis is based on the statement of the problem which is presented in the chapter 1 (one). The statement of the problems consist of 3 (three) questions, they are (1) What maxims are flouted in the 10 (ten) television advertisements, (2) How are the maxims flouted in the 10 (ten) television advertisement, and (3) What are the possible reasons for flouting the maxims. To answer the problems, the researcher will follow the procedure that has been mentioned in the chapter 3 (three). For the next part, the discussion will lead this study into conclusion.

4.1 Analysis

In this section, the researcher presents the description of flouting analysis of the utterances in television advertisements. In here, there are ten objects which are analyzed by using discourse analysis, Grice's theory (1975) and some other theories that are related to maxims. The results are presented here:

4.1.1 Datum1

Advertisement by Blueband

- Doni : Nasi gorengku mana ya?
(Where is my fried rice?!)
- Boy : Ini aja
(You can eat this...)
- Doni : Terima kasih
Tapi punyaku nasi goreng Blueband
(Thank you...
But mine is Blueband fried rice)

Sister : Belok kiri bu!
Kak Doni, nasi gorengmu ketinggalan!!!
(Turn left mom!
Doni, you forget your rice!!!)
Doni : [smile]

This advertisement is performed by four players which tells about how Doni forgets to bring his fried rice and he has just realized as he rides the school bus. Based on that situation, the conversation is created by Doni and his friend. The context of the conversation between Doni and his friend is they almost have similarity background knowledge particularly interpersonal context. When Doni said that he unintentionally left his fried rice at dining table, his friend directly offers him to eat his fried rice.

It proves that they have already known each other so the language used between them is not too formal. When the speaker tells he left the fried rice, his friend makes assumption that Doni really wants to eat fried rice. But after the friend offers Doni his fried rice, Doni rejects it gently.

The adjacency pairs show that the second utterance unrelated to the first utterance. The participants of this utterance do not share the same situational context, thus, the adjacency pairs are not coherence. Actually, an utterance or text can be called coherence if the meaning is making senses and sequences of ideas relate to each other (Nunan, 2:1993). From the discussion of the context in datum1, the researcher finds two utterance which flout the cooperative principle.

As in;

- [1] Doni : Where is my fried rice?!
Boy : *You can eat this....*
- [2] Boy : You can eat this...
Doni : *Thank you...*

But mine is blue band fried rice.

Based on Grice's theory, the boy's remark in [1], 'you can eat this....' cannot be called cooperative reply because it is not relevant to Doni's question. The utterance is considered to flout the maxim of relation by not giving the relevant answer to Doni's question. Grice states this maxim makes people speak relevantly with the preceding utterance (in Yule, 1986:37). So, that why the boy's remark does not obey this maxim, because he does not give a relevant answer to Doni's quest. Thus, it can be inferred that the possible violation of this maxim; first, the boy really does not know where it is, because he is just Doni's friend who only meets Doni in the school.

The second reason is, the boy wants to act polite towards Doni, as linked with Leech's theory, conversation goals depend on each speaker's interest. In this case, speaker flouts the cooperative principle because he wants to reach social conversation goals. Doni's goal in producing the utterance is to find the answer, and the boy's remark also connects with Doni's goal. However in the story Boy choses to imply it using polite way.

The boy offers Doni his fried rice possibly because he wants to respect him as his friend and due to the fact it is associated to politeness. So in this case, the flouting of maxim can be stated as the best way to avoid the inconvenient relation.

In the utterance [2] also flouts the maxim of cooperative principle, Doni answers with saying "thank you... But mine is blue band fried rice". From the utterance, it can be seen that the utterance is not a cooperative reply. According to Grice's theory, this utterance also flouts the maxim of manner, the maxim is flouted by giving obscurity of expression, ambiguity, not be brief (unnecessary

prolixity) and not be orderly when answers Boy's remark. When Boy offers him to eat the other fried rice, he should say "yes, I will eat it, thank you" or "no, thank you" and then say "mine is blue band fried rice" in order to give clear information as want.

So, the reason which can be concluded is, Doni tries to be polite without intending to hurt Boy by rejecting the offer. Indirect way, he intends to hint at Boy's fried rice that he only wants to eat Blue Band fried rice which his mom made, and maybe he only wants to eat Blueband fried rice or he does not want to eat fried rice which is not made without putting Blue Band.

Thus, by analyzing some flouting in datum 1, the researcher can conclude that in these utterances, there are two maxims that are flouted. Those maxim are: the maxim of relation and the maxim of manner. The possible reasons for these flouting are the matter of the politeness, because in Indonesian's culture, it is better to say implicitly than utter the notion directly (in this situation).

In order to prevent the flouting, but still give positive assumption, the speaker can add the hedges and coherence markers, the utterance should be like this 'I'm sorry, I can't help you to find your fried rice but anyway you can eat this'. This utterance looks more modest than before but still obeys the maxim. In the utterance [2], this expression can be used, 'I'm not sure if this makes sense but before I say thank you... mine is blue band fried rice.' From sample utterance like those, it is expected speakers can avoid the flouting of cooperative principle but still in the good sense.

4. 1. 2 Datum 2

Advertisement by Djarum 76 Cigarette

Headman : [Give sign to ask a bribery]
Man : Dasar rampok!!!
(Bandits!!!)
[Unintentionally kicks a jar which consist a genie who wearing a Javanese clothes and he come out]
Jin : Kuberi satu permintaan, monggo...
(I give you one request, please...)
Man : Korupsi, puli, sogokan hilang dari muka bumi ini!!!
(I want all corruptions, illegal levies, briberies gone from this earth!!!)
Jin : [stroke the chest with apprehensive face]
Man : Isa jin?
(Could you do that, genie?)
Jin : Bisa diatur...
Wani piro?
(It's okay, it can be arranged...
How much do you dare to pay?!)
Man : [shocked]

The situational context of this advertisement tells a man who disappointed with the bureaucracy in one of the government office, who always ask a bribery in every transactions. When he comes out, not long after that he unintentionally kicks a jar which inside it there is a Javanese genie. Surprisingly the man is offered to make a wish by the genie because he has released the genie. The man offers a request, and with poker-face the Javanese genie listens to him. After making the request, the man wishes that the genie makes his wish comes true. But shockingly the Javanese genie says the similar utterance as the officer “how much you dare to pay?”

From the context above, in this datum the researcher finds two utterances which are considered do not obey the principle of cooperative.

- [1] Jin : I give you one request, please...
 Man : *I want all corruptions, illegal levies, briberies
 gone from this earth!!!*
- [2] Man : Could you do that, genie?
 Jin : *It's okay, it can be arranged...
 How much do you dare to pay?!*

Based on the theory, the first utterance flouts the maxim of quantity, this maxim requires us to give the contribution as informative as is required and do not make the contribution more informative than is required (Grice in Yule, 1983:37). In the context, the genie only give the man one wish to make, but the man asks more than one wish. Thus, he is considered as giving longer information than is required. The adjacency pairs is fulfilled, because the question and the follow up are coherence.

This utterance is considered as flouting the maxim of quantity because he gives information more than required by asking three requests as corruptions, illegal levies, briberies. In datum [1], there is an invisible meaning that can create the possible reason of the flouting. Maybe in this utterance the man feels disappointed with the bureaucracy in the government office which familiar to bribery to smoothen every transaction. So that's why when the genie asks him a request, indirectly he uses this chance to ask three request which is hoped that he and all other people could free from these illegal transactions anymore.

The second utterances is said by the genie, in [2] "it's okay, it can be arranged... how much do you dare to pay?!" If it is linked of Grice's theory, the speaker flouts the maxim of manner, it is caused in this maxim should make people avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid

unnecessary prolixity) and be orderly, and what has genie done is different with the maxim. In the second utterances [2], the man only asks genie's ability to break the black transaction like that.

But what the man get is unorderly and does not a brief answer. It can be said that in here, genie does not cooperative with the man's quest and also the genie cannot give clear answer in the man's quest, his answer contains ambiguity, the expression is very obscure as well. Because the uncooperative answer, the hearer (the man) feels confuse in concluding the meaning and also disappointed, it might be the man intends that the genie could answer the request, and he think only by the magic way, the problem will be gone.

When he is listening the man's request his expression does pay attention and looks like disappointed like the man's feeling, but unconsciously after saying "it can be arranged..." he says again "How much do you dare to pay?!" with laughing, from the utterances, the researcher can conclude that the possible reason of why the genie flouts the maxim is, he wants to tempt the man by following the character of the headman. In the story seen that, the genie is not seriously ask the illegal levies because his style in speaking and the gesture really does not serious, and maybe he only makes a joke because the man looks so serious in asking request.

Moreover, in this remarks also flouts the maxim of quality, as Cutting states, flout the maxim of quality can do in several ways, one of them is speakers may flouts by alluding as in the irony. Leech in Cutting also states that while irony is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness). Thus in the case of irony, the speaker expresses a positive statement and implies the

negative one (Cutting, 2002:38).The speaker flouts the maxim by giving positive statement and indirectly the genie allied the system of operational in government around here, and does not mean allied the hearer.

So, in conclusion, one utterance can flout two maxims all at once. When it is stretched with Leech's opinion that conversational goals may include both social goal and personal goals (95:1983) or only consist of one of them. And in these flouting, the researcher finds that the conversational goal is based on the personal goal. So that why in this conversation there are three maxim which are flouted and in that flouting has each intended meaning.

From the datum 2 in utterance [1] the possible intended meaning is, the disappointed of the style in bureaucracy system around him and in the [2], there are two flouting, first is the flouting of maxim manner and the possible reason is makes a joke and the second is flouting the maxim of quality with the possible reason is allied the bureaucracy system.

Actually, in this case the speaker can say, 'I won't bore you with all the details but I want all corruptions, illegal levies, briberies gone from this earth!!!' to push away from the flouting maxim of quantity. And say 'just to clarify one point, it's okay, can be arranged but how much do you dare to pay?!' to avoid flouting maxim of manner however the utterance still give bad sense but it is better than before.

4. 1. 3 Datum 3

Advertisement by Kapal Api Coffee

Man : [ride the motorcycle, park and go inside to Black essence KapalApi Café]
Kapal api spesial
(Special KapalApi!)

Waiter : Seperti biasa?!
(As usual?!)

Man : [Nods his head and sits, then
He smells the coffee and slurps it slowly]

Woman : [She smells the coffee aroma]
[Talk to waiter] I want that one...

Woman : [Slurp the coffee slowly]

Man : Suka yang hitam ya?
(Do you like the black one, yeah?)

Woman : [Only smile]

In one of coffee cafe namely Black essence Kapal Api Café. Outside the cafe, there is a man is parking his motorcycle and entering the cafe with ordering a cup of black coffee. Then he sits in the restaurant corner. Beside him, there is a beautiful woman sits nicely. When the man's coffee already came, the woman smells the black coffee aroma. She is looking at the man when he is slurping the coffee, not long after that she asks the waiter to change her coffee with Kapal Api black coffee.

The situational context above is shown by the similar knowledge of the black coffee, but the adjacency pairs between the woman and the man are not fulfilled. As Paltridge states that adjacency pairs can be called success in sending the messages when the second speaker follow – up the related utterance of the speaker one (115:2006). And the utterance is expected be the coherence conversation and also success in sending the message.

Due to the adjacency pairs which are not fulfilled, it is considered relate to the cooperative maxim, thus this utterance called flouting the maxim. As in,

Man : Do you like the black one, yeah?
Woman: (*only smile*)

The woman's reply in datum 3 is an act that flouts the cooperative principle. When the man tries to make sure that the woman likes black coffee as him or not, the woman instead only answers with smile. Her smile does not cooperative because cannot answer the man's quest. It makes the hearer confuse to find the answer. From the situation, it can be called that the woman flouts the cooperative principle, particularly flouts the maxim of manner. This maxim talks to make people should avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity) and be orderly.

The woman's smiling has already given unclearness meaning in this advertisement. Thus the researcher can assume some possible reason, the possible reason is, she likes the coffee but shy to confess. Because when she orders the black coffee, the man sees her, and when the coffee has already done he asks the question directly. And maybe, at the time she has just met the man and do not know each other, so that would be the reason of why she only smiles. Actually, her smile can give mysterious effect.

As the state by Paltiridge, a speaker is flouting a maxim if they do not observe a maxim but has no intention of deceiving or misleading the other person (2008:65). Here, the woman has no intention to flout the maxim, it is only caused that the culture, when someone meet with a new man or other people, it is better to give smile first than talk a lot. The reason above is part of the conversational goal, so it means the conversational goals is because the social goal and also personal goals. If she flout the maxim because modest reason, so she choose social goals but here social goals does not stand up alone because she reach

personal goal can be to keep her image as a beautiful woman who cannot directly say something for a new man who just met in the public place.

Thus it can be conclude that, this flouting much flounce by politeness strategy. The politeness is done to keep the image in front of new people, especially in this story is keep image in front of a man. Also it can be called that, the flouting of cooperative principle can save somebody to act better and look nice. Whereas she can say something as ‘this is maybe a bit confuse but yeah, I just fallen in love with the aroma.’ to prevent the maxim of manner and give chance to the man knows her answer.

4. 1. 4 Datum 4

Advertisement by Hi-Lo milk

Basketball players	: Wow!
Son	: Mama?
Mother	: He...he...he...
Boy	: Tante, umurnya berapa sih? (How old are you, aunty?)
Mother	: Beda tipislah (We are at the quite same age)

The situational context starts when in the park which has a basketball field, there are some boys playing basketball. In the side of the field, there is a woman sit on the bench with reading a book. When she is reading a book, she is repeatedly struck by basketball until she changes her sit position. Because she feels disturbed, she changes her position again, but the ball still struck her. Suddenly, she stands up and catches the ball till she makes three point shoot. Because her ability, it makes her look amazed in front of the boys. In the boy’s

view, indirectly he has already had general cultural background knowledge of the woman's age. Thus, it makes one of the boys asks her age.

The adjacency pairs between basketball boy and the mother does not shows coherence conversation, it proves by the question of the boy then the second speaker follow – up by answering irrelevantly, so the woman's utterance is flouting the cooperative principle. In:

Boy : How old are you, aunty?
Mother : *We are at the quite same age*

In this case, she gives answer which is not match with the fact, and it means, her utterance shows incooperative way in giving reply. If it is measured from the Grice's theory, the woman's remark is flouting cooperative principle. The utterances which is spoken by the women is flouting the maxim of quality and relation in all once.

Based on the Grice's theory in Yule, in this maxim the speaker makes the contribution one that is true by not say what speaker believe to be false and do not say that for which speaker lack adequate evidence (1996:37). But in this TV advertisement, the woman do the other thing. She answers the question by giving the wrong fact that is also realized by the hearers because it is impossible if the woman has a little different ages among the boys.

In addition Cutting states that, they may quite simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think (2002:37). And in this advertisement, the woman says something that obviously does not represent what she thinks in answering the questions also when she says that, it rather looks funny.

And for flouting maxim of relation, it is related to the woman's utterance which is not relevant to the boy's quest. According to Grice in Cutting (35:2002) speaker are assumed to be saying something that is relevant to what has been said before. So, in this form the woman cannot be called cooperative because do not give answer as boy wants, her utterance does not have correlation with boy's quest. It can be seen in the utterance in the datum 4, when the question asking an age and the answer must be said with the number of his age. But in here, she answers without saying the number of the age and imply the answer.

The possible purpose of personal goal here is, if it is looked from the answer that she can shows what in her mind and there is no social goal (politeness goal) that she want to reach. As in the Leech, conversational goals may include both social goal and personal goals (95:1983). From the goal, the researcher can assume some possible intended meaning as, the woman looks as a young girl that full of skill and energy as her soul by answering the question with kidding and she does not care if her information is wrong.

Or maybe, she does want to give information about her real ages. And almost women do not want to show their ages to other people. Then, she chooses the way to answer it with lying and kidding so the hearers are still curious. However the boys look impolite by asking her age, it does not matter for her. It is maybe because she feels proud when the boys are amazed with her skill in playing basketball and maybe she becomes good mood because the praise.

It also can be considered as the polite way to avoid a conversation which talks about secret thing. And in this function, to avoid the maxim of quality the woman enough to say 'I'm not sure if this right, but maybe it is just a little

different than you' or 'We are at the quite same age, I guess'. And to avoid maxim of relation can use 'well anyway, not much different than you' or also can use 'Well, I'm only ... years old'.

4. 1. 5 Datum 5

Advertisement by Lifeboy shampoo

Mother : [the phone is ringing]
Tini? Lagi keramas...
(Tini? She is shampooing...)
Security A : Bapak ada?
(Is your husband at home?)
Mother : Lagi... keramas...
(He is shampooing...)
Security A&B : Wha... [Smile]
Boy A : Andi-nya ada bu?
(Is Andi at home, mom?)
Mother : Lagi... keramas...
(He is shampooing...)
Boy A, B and C : [Smile and shocked]

The context which can be described here is, a mother who looks after her family members well. The story begins when a mother answers the phone from somebody over there, who maybe asks the presence of her daughter 'Tini' at home or no, and she only answers 'She is shampooing'. And not long after that the home's bell is ringing, two securities ask the presence of her husband, and she only answer it by saying 'He is shampooing'.

And the last guests are her son's friends who also ask the presence of 'Andi' her son's name but she also answers that her son is shampooing. When she answers the quest of two securities and her son's friends she is flipping her hair in front of them and make them feel unnerved because the smooth and hairs' aroma.

Particularly in sending the messages, the context used between the speakers are interpersonal background knowledge. Where they already knows each other privately relates to the daily life of the speaker.

The pairs of each utterance in this conversation is the first speaker stops first then allowed by second speaker. Whereas the second speaker doing adjacency pair correctly by answering the first speaker's quest, it still cannot be referred as coherence conversation due to the mother is flouting the cooperative principle. In,

[1] Mother : (The phone is ringing)
Tini? She is shampooing...

[2] Security A : Is your husband at home?
Mother : *He is shampooing...*

[3] Boy A : Is Andi at home, mom?
Mother : *He is shampooing...*

Based on the context of the story and the theory by Grice, the speaker is flouting maxim of manner and maxim of quantity. The flouting maxim of manner due to she does not give clear answer to the quest, when all the guest ask the presence of her daughter, son and husband she should answer it with saying 'Yes, he is at home' in order to give clear answer. In this maxim, speaker should avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity) and be orderly. And what have she done is she flouts the cooperative by answering every questions with 'She is shampooing...' or 'He is shampooing...' it means that she does not answer properly and the effect is the hearers have to find the meaning itself.

And the flouting of maxim quantity is caused by, she gives too little information than is required. This maxim should make people to give information as required, do not give information too much or too little because it can risk their hearer not being able to identify what they are talking about because they are not explicit enough (Cutting 35:2002). Thus in this function, the woman are not explicit enough to tell her family members' presence, although all of them are in the house. She makes the hearers can assume what she uttered without saying some related word that hearers need. So, she no needs to talk a lot in explaining her families' presence, or maybe she knows that her family members are people who has influenced in her neighborhood and some people always has business with them. Thus, to cut long utterance she only talk as she wants and must not think their hearers feeling.

Then, the other possible reason of her flouting is, she wants to show her beautiful hair to all her guesses. So, when the guesses ask the other of her family members' presence, she flips her hair which also describe if all her all member have beautiful hair because they love shampooing. The other reason of her indirect way in flouting is maybe she wants the guesses find the meaning itself by saying that, it means her other family is still in the home and in the one of part room of her house and shampooing. She does not tell that her family member is in the bathroom but as we know that usually people who are shampooing is in the bathroom.

So if it is related to Leech's analyzing in the conversational goals (95:1983), the flouting in this datum is for personal goals. The goals are depend on the speaker's possibility in flouting the cooperative principle. Here, the

flouting makes some implicit meanings which to intend on speaker's weight. And it can be said that, the flouting maybe because she be able to make every people know her beautiful hair also the families' member.

It can protect her by the exhibit act that she has done as well. Thus, inadvertently the flouting of maxim manner can make people stay in positive self-image. Also in order to obey the maxim but still reach personal goals, she be able to say as, 'I don't know if this is clear, but I think Tini is shampooing'. The utterance looks better and the hearers will accept it clearly. And to avoid flouting maxim of quantity she can say, 'as you probably know. He is shampooing now'.

4. 1. 6 Datum – 6

Advertisement by Calciskim milk

- Woman A : Aduh, Yuk a... capcus!
(Aw... come on... let's go..!)
[Bring a hand bag, sit down and then the table falls down
because the bag is too heavy]
Ya ampun! Eh... eh...
(Oh my god... eh...eh...).
- Woman B : Tasmu beratnya sama lho sama keponakanku
Memang harus seberat itu?!
(Your bag is as heavy as my nephew
Should it be as heavy like that?!)
- Woman A : Ya harus!!! Trus ini taruh dimana dong?
Tas kosmetik, tablet-3, I-pad, parfum, catokan, cermin,
power bank...
(Of course!!! Then where should I put these all?
Cosmetic bag, tablet 3, I-pad, perfume, hair iron,
mirror, power bank...)
- Woman B : Yakin tulanmu bisa menahan tas beratmu?
(Are you sure your bone can hold your heavy bag?)
- Woman A : Hah?! Oh my god!!!

In every conversation always have a topic that evolve and makes the story more meaningful. As in the story of this advertisement, the speakers is talking about the strength of the bone to hold the heavy things as woman hand bag. The situational context here is, the woman A, who brings the heavy hand bag cannot answer correctly of woman B' question. Their conversation cannot be stated as a coherence conversation because the sending of the messages do not conveyed properly. It is linked with Nunan which says, an utterance or text can be called coherence if the meaning is making senses and sequences of ideas relate to each other (2:1993).

The adjacency pairs of the utterance in this datum shows the similar pattern as when the first speaker shows the end of the speech then the second speaker follow – up. However the adjacency pair walk correctly, it cannot ensure that the message of conversation deliver properly. As this conversation, the incoherence answer of the speakers cause the flouting the cooperative principle, as in:

- [1] Woman A : Aw... come on... let's go..!
 Oh my god... eh...eh....
 Woman B : *Your bag is as heavy as my nephew*
 Should it be as heavy like that?!
- [2] Woman B : Your bag is as heavy as my nephew
 Should be as heavy like that?!
 Woman A : *Of course!!! Then where should I put these all?*
 Cosmetic bag, tablet 3, I-pad, perfume, hair iron,
 mirror, power bank...
- [3] Woman B : Are you sure your bone can hold your heavy bag?
 Woman A : *Hah?! Oh my god!!!*

In the utterance of woman B' in [1] is an utterances which flout maxim of relation. It is considered on the Grice's theory (in Cutting, 35:2002) that in this maxim, speakers are assumed to be saying something is relevant to what has been said before. The flouting is measured from the utterance that has been said before, which actually Woman A asks Woman B to hang out right now but Woman B answers with the other utterance that has not any relation with the utterance before.

The possible reason of why the speaker flouts the maxim is, maybe for her it is so strange that A' carries the hand bag which the weight is as heavy as a child in eight-teen months years old, and because her thought she continues her utterance by asking 'should be as heavy like that?!' it is not explicit enough in saying something as what in her mind. The implicit meaning maybe that she warns her friend do not carry a heavy hand bag because it can risk her backbone. And it is acceptable in Indonesian society to warn someone using a polite act. It is needed because to keep good relation between them although they are look like a couple good friend. So, that means this flouting is based on the society goals that include in polite goals.

The next is from Woman B's reply in [2], the actress is flouts maxim of quantity. When is boarded from Grice's theory (in Cutting, 34:2002), speakers who flouts this maxim will give too little or too much information as what hearer requires. So in this utterance, the speaker flouts the cooperative principle because she has already given information too much that is required. The partner only needs the answer such as "yes, of course" or "no, of course not", but the speaker rather says information that is not needed such as tell all the things inside the hand

bag. And maybe it can bother and boring the hearer because the speaker does much talk.

In other side, the conversational goals here is based on the speaker's importance that means is a personal goals. If looked from the speaker's side, there will be a reason why the speaker does that although she does it without any planning in flouting the maxim. Then, the possible reason for her flouting is, maybe she wants to explain clearness why she does it. It also intends to avoid misunderstanding between them, she tries to make the hearer believes that what she have done is true. As in the conversation in [2], she tells that all the things which she brings have each function. So, when she talks, it is expected can make the hearer understand well. Thus, behind the flouting, there is an intended meaning, what have she talked is different with what does she meant.

The last utterance which flouts the maxim is in [3], according to Grice's theory, A's Reply is flouting the maxim of relation and quantity. Consider the theory from Grice (in Cutting, 39:2002) the speaker who flouts the maxim of relation means they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance that do not say, and make the connection between their utterance and the preceding one(s). A's Reply is irrelevant to the preceding utterance, B' asks the ability of her bone to hold the heavy bag but she is only screams and talks as she is feeling shock. As the theory above, she implies it and she expects that the hearer can imagine what the utterance beyond it.

This utterance happens because a possible reason as what she implies in her answer. The possible reason here is, After A' asking, she cannot answer directly, maybe she just felt shocks with the questions. She cannot believe that her

heavy hand bag is dangerous for her bone, it can cause the bone brittleness. It is might because her frightened, so she flouts the maxim and implies it also can be stated that this flouting is because personal goals which full of intended meaning behind it.

Then in the flouting of maxim quantity, she gives information too little than is hearer needs as linked with Grice's theory in Cutting that speaker should be as informative as is required, that they should give neither too little nor too much (34:2002). And it can make the hearer confuse to get the point in understanding what she means and what does she imply. When the utterance is saying in the short way, means it has more implicit meaning than long way as in [3]. In the story, looks that after the woman B ask a question, she becomes panic and maybe because that case makes her utterance becomes too short.

So, it can be conclude that in this datum is their implicature because both of social goal and personal goal. The social goal is in the utterance [1] that the woman B wants to act politer in warning the woman B and the personal goals is in the utterance [2] and [3] that have each possible reasons in the flouting. What is said is different in the meaning, thus the hearer is expected to be able to conclude the intended meaning itself.

Actually, in this datum the speaker can say 'oh, by the way your bag is as heavy as my nephew, should be as heavy like that?' to avoid flouting maxim of relation in the utterance [1], and say 'I won't bore to all the details, yes of course!!! Then where do I put these all? Cosmetic bag, tablet 3, I-pad, perfume, hair iron, mirror, power bank...' to avoid flouting maxim of quantity as in [2], and

the last to avoid the flouting of relation and quantity in the [3], speaker can say ‘hah?! I don’t think so, oh my god!’

4. 1. 7 Datum – 7

Advertisement by Ponds

- Woman A : Korea... Indah sekali...
(So... Korea is beautiful, isn't it?)
Woman B : Kamu punya fans sampai di Korea?
(Do you have fans up to Korea?)
Woman A : Enggaklah... ini efek dari kulit jernih putih merona
(Absolutely not, it is because the effect from white clear
blush skin)

The context of the advertisement’s story here is interpersonal knowledge. where when the speaker A talking the second speaker (B) already had an interpersonal context of woman A. The speech above, seems that both of speakers already known each other. When she says ‘Do you have fans up to Korea?’ it shows that she knows the background life of woman A well before they go to Korea together. The factor of the utterance rush up is the curiosity of woman B in looking for the information of woman A’s fans in Korea.

The adjacency pairs walks orderly, due to the question of woman B is answered by woman A. But, the utterance in this advertisement cannot be called as a coherence conversation because is the exchange information between them make a flouting of cooperative principle, as in:

- Woman B : Do you have fans till Korea?
Woman A : *Absolutely not, it is because this effect from white clear
blush skin.*

The utterance is considered flouts maxim of quantity, it is measured from Grice's theory in Cutting (37:2002). This theory states that the speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information as requires. When her friends ask what does she have fans in the Korea, she can answer with saying "oh, of course I don't have fans till Korea, as you probably know it is the from white clear blush skin".

But in here, she puts additional information than is required directly without adding the hedges as 'as you probably know' and it makes her breaks the principle. In the other word, when she breaks it, the effect can be said that her flouting can gives benefit to the hearer because the hearer get more information relate to the speakers live, although it will there is no problem if she does not tell that.

Thus, from the utterance some possible reason in this flouting are guessed; first, she knows well what her friend's mean, maybe in her opinion her friend feels curious with the situation. The hearer knows well that she is not from Korea but the way of some Korean people when look at her is amazing. They look her as a famous Korean actress who has many fans around there. Second, she wants to clarify that she does not have fans in Korea, what did happened to her is only because her white clear blush skin. So, many people look her as a woman who are as beautiful as a famous Korea actress. Then the other reason is only to inform her friend without any other mean. The speaker knows well the situation in there so in her thought she needs to tell it, she thinks that the information will be useful for the hearer.

From some reasons above, it can be concluded that the implying is based on the personal goals. Or in the other hand the goals of conversation is for speaker's importance such as to find the fans presence in Korea, and woman A's reply. The goals cannot be said as the fail goal because the hearer still give related answer but is longer that is required.

In A's reply, she adopts B's goal and give the information required however flouts the maxim, by giving too much information than required. When she flouts it she does not realized that she is flouting a cooperative principle. Thus, the effect is the hearer must interpret the meaning by herself and it will be done if both of them have the same background knowledge.

4. 1. 8 Datum – 8

Advertisement by Konidin

- Girl : Kamu pilih dia atau aku?
Pilih dia atau aku?
(Which one do you choose her or me?)
(Which one do you choose her or me?)
- Boy : Uhuukk...uhukkkk [coughing]
[Hold the hand of the seller]
Konidinya ada bu?
(Is there any...e... Ko..nid..din mom...)
Uhuukk...uhukkkk

The situational context of this advertisement is when at the night there is a heavy rain, three young people are standing in front of parking area, two of them are girls and one is boy. The conversation only said by two people that is one of the girl and the boy. They are seems in the love conflict, it is looked from the question that the boy must choose one of the girl. The girls look angry and sad,

until they do not care how the rain wetting them. When the boy is faced in that situation, he almost cannot say anything. He is only cough and say another something.

The way of the girl asking is a typically, she repeat it twice to make the boys answer her quest. The adjacency pairs here is not fulfilled because he prefer talks to the seller than to the girl. Thus, this conversation are incoherence and when it is linked with cooperative maxim's theory, the researcher finds the flouting of some maxim in cooperative principle, as in:

Girl : Do you choose her or me?
Do you choose her or me?
Boy : *Uhuukk...uhukkkk (coughing)*
Is thre any..e... Ko..nid..din mom...
Uhuukk...uhukkkk

Boy's remark in this datum is flouting a cooperative principle, he is flouting maxim of manner and relation. It is linked when using Grice's analyzing, Grice in Yule (37:1996) states that this maxim should make people be perspicuous by avoiding obscurity of expression, avoiding ambiguity, being brief and being orderly. Here, he is flouting the maxim of manner because he speaks ambiguity, 'Is there any...e... Ko..nid..din mom...' is an utterance that cannot be understood by hearer and also cannot answer the girl's quest.

Here, the speaker is also considered flout the maxim of relation, it is measured from Grice's theory which states that speaker must be relevant with preceding utterance. In Boy's remark, he fails to make a relevant utterance from the girl's question. The girl asks a question however she intends to offer the boy, so it can be said that she speaks an offering to the boy indirectly. Apart from the girl's style question, the boy's answer cannot be called cooperative reply.

From the unclearness and irrelevant boy's answer, the researcher finds some possible reasons. And the reasons are based on the goals, here the goals are based on the personal goals that presents some assumptions for girl's purpose and it is continued with boy's reply which fails to answer the girl's quest. And it create some possible reasons in the failure of Boy's remarks as in this exchange: first, it is difficult for him to answer the question right now. May be it is happen because he is coughing mortally and difficult to speak at the moment also when he is under the heavy rain can makes his condition getting worse.

Second, at a glance, he looks like already chosen one of the girl but after watching till the ending, he chooses the hand's seller and ask some medicine to cure his ill. So, maybe it can be one of the reason that he better choose the seller's shop than the girls because the seller can give solution in curing her coughing or he choose the seller because cannot hold the coughing.

The last possible reason is, maybe he tries to look for the way to avoid the girl's question. In the story, he does not intend to do that intentionally, his confusion makes him to find the easiest way in answering the quest. However, in the story he does not give the real answer but indirectly he wants the hearer can conclude the meaning it self.

The maxim also can be flouted to some purposes, and he uses it for himself-purpose. The infringement that he has done is part of his conversational implicature and he intends to imply the meaning. Thus, the exchange in this datum cannot be called a successful conversation. In order to make the contribution obeys to the maxim of manner he can talk as this way; in flouting [1] 'this is may be a bit confuse, but I'm still ill. Let me find the medicine first.' Or,

‘just to clarify this point, I’ll tell later after I cure this coughing’ and to avoid the flouting in [2] is; ‘anyway, may I go to the shop to look for a medicine?’ Or, ‘well, anyway. Wait a second I want to buy a medicine first for my coughing and after that let’s talk again.’

4. 1. 9 Datum 9

Advertisement by Toko Bagus

Woman : Ngapain?
(What are you doing?)
[Looks surprisingly]
Man : Kenapa?
(Why?)
[Look at the woman]
Woman : Itukan baju jaman dia bayi...
(That was the clothes when he was a baby... use that drawer!!!)
Man : Manaku tau?!
(How did I know?!)

The situation happens in the house, a man is enrobing a boy a T-shirt, trousers and shocks. When he is enrobing the clothes, suddenly the woman comes. She seems come from outside and after riding motorcycle because she is still using helmet and bringing something in the plastic bag. In there, she asks some questions due to there is something wrong in the man’s behavior. When the speaker are exchanging information. They have difference view of situational context of the drawer, which makes conversation more attractive.

The adjacency pairs are uttered by a man and a woman. The fail adjacency pairs of the utterance in this datum, can be caused the second speaker does not have similar situational context. Where in the adjacency pairs the second utterance

is identified as related to the first one as an expected follow – up to that utterance (Paltridge, 115:2006). Thus, the adjacency pairs are not fulfilled.

The conversations in this datum, beside the adjacency pairs and the situational context, it also called incoherence conversation because violation of Grice's maxims. Then, the researcher finds two flouting of maxims, as in:

[1] Woman : What are you doing?
Man : *Why?*

[2] Woman : That was the clothes when he was a baby... use that drawer!!!
Man : *how did I know?!*

The conversation goals in [1] fails, because the woman cannot find the correct answer as her required and in [1], the flouting is done by the man. He is considered flouts the maxim of quality, quantity, relation and manner. Firstly, the caused of why the utterance cannot be called obey to the maxim of quality because the speaker are expected to be sincere, to be saying something that they believe corresponds to reality. According to Grice in Yule speaker make the contribution one that is true by not say what speaker believe to be false and do not say that for which speaker lack adequate evidence (1996:37). This maxim makes speaker saying something true as the fact or with other words do not give information if speakers have lack to inform it.

Secondly, the flouting maxim of quantity. This maxim according to Grice in Yule tells that speaker contribution is as informative as is required and do not make the contribution more informative than is required or less informative than is required (37:1996). And in [1], the speaker saying the answer too short till the hearer cannot catch the meaning directly. His answer is does not show the

cooperative in giving information as is required. The short answer cannot make the hearers understand well what the speaker intends. Thus, the hearers only can assume what is in his mind.

Thirdly is the flouting maxim of relation. This maxim only makes people should say relevant from the utterance before. Here, his answer is irrelevant to the quest so it cannot be stated as a good answer because in the answer he puts information unclear. When the woman asks the question, he should give an answer which has correlation with what has been said before. But here, the man gives an answer a question too that can make the hearer confuse.

Then, this utterance is also flouting maxim of manner. Whereas this maxim asks the speaker should be perspicuous with avoiding obscurity of expression, ambiguity, not brief and not orderly (Grice in Yule (37:1996)). It is because the man's answer to the question is not perspicuous. He gives obscurity of expression, and ambiguity however he is brief and orderly. But his brief and orderly makes the speaker still cannot find the suitable answer.

Next, from measuring the utterance in [2] using Grice's theory, the researcher finds the flouting is the maxim of quantity. Grice in Cutting states that a speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity will give information too much or too little than is required (37:2002). In [2], the woman asks the man to use the other drawer but the man tells information too little than is required.

Based on the flouting and the context above, the researcher puts forward some possible reasons in the situation. If it is looked from the flouting in [1] to flouting in [2], there will be an orderly possible reason as these; when the woman asks in [1], maybe he feels strange with the woman's quest and in his mind he has

already done the true thing. Also maybe in his thought he does not need to answer clearly because without answer clearly the woman will know by watching him. Or, he consider the woman's quest does not clear enough so that why he ask again.

And what does he think is true, then the woman says "that was his clothes when he was a baby... use that drawer!!!" [2], and then the man answers with does not cooperative. The possible reason of his behavior here is, he really does not know that there are other clothes in boy's size as now in the other drawer. Or maybe, at the moment he just comes to the house after going to somewhere for a long time and when he back to the home and together with the boy needs some clothes he look for the clothes in the old drawer.

And maybe the other possible reason is, he does not fell wrong with what has he done, so he only answers "how did I know" to protect himself from the mistakes. Or he thinks that he is a man who does not have to fell wrong when does the mistake like that. So, with his guy's style he answers the question with little information that can makes the woman gets angry.

From some possible reasons, the researcher can conclude that, all the utterance above are have implicit meaning. There are other meanings beyond their word, in the other hand, the flouting in this datum consists of many kind of implicit meaning which do not be said. And to avoid the flouting maxim as in [1], if he really does not know the woman's utter he can say such "as far as I know, I only see this drawer which consist of his clothes", or can say "as you probably know, I only find the clothes in this drawer" or can be also "hem, anyway I don't know if there are other clothes in other drawer" and the last chosen he can say

“what do you mean? I’m not sure if this makes sense, but I use some clothes from this drawer, but I don’t know if it is wrong.” And to avoid the flouting maxim in the utterance [2], he can say as, “as you probably know, I don’t know if this there are another clothes in the other drawer.”

4. 1. 10 Datum 10

Advertisement by EnduroMatic oil Motorycle

- Woman : Kamu udah yakin?
(Are you sure?)
- Man : Pastinya
(Absolutely)
- Woman : Siap menjaga aku?
(Are you ready to keep me safe?)
- Man : Hujan atau panas, aku siap menjaga dan melindungimu.
(Whether rain or sunny, I’m ready to keep you safe and protect you)
- Woman : Beneran mas?
(Is that true, mas?)
- Man : Enduro matic setia ke semua motor matic.
Sehidup,,, sematic...
(Enduromatic oil, it’s loyal to all matic motorcycles
Sehidup,,, sematic...)

Those arguments represents a similar pattern as the second speaker follow – up the first speaker orderly. For a while those adjacency pairs look normal, then if the viewer see further in the last utterance, will seems incoherence answer. The story is begun in the in the repairshop, there is a man who is repairing his motorcycle and he wants to change the oil motorcycle. When the motorcycle is repairing, the man is sitting on the waiting chair and talking with a woman, maybe the woman is his girlfriend or a woman who close to him.

In the conversation, it can be seen that there is the difference interpersonal context between them. The difference context has also resulted incoherence utterance. An utterance or text can be called coherence if the meaning is making senses and sequences of ideas relate to each other (Nunan, 2:1993). And if linked with cooperative principle, those differences produces maxims violation the speakers are flouting maxim of quantity and flouting maxim of relation. As in;

- [1] Woman : Are you ready to guide me?
 Man : *Whether rain or sunny, I'm ready to keep you safe and protect you.*
- [2] Woman : Is that true, mas?
 Man : *Enduromatic oil, it's loyal to all matic motorcycles
 *Sehidup... sematic...**

The utterance in [1] can be called that, the speaker is flouting maxim of quantity. When seen in the term of measured from the Grice's theory that states, this maxim should make people give information as is required or in the other word, speaker who flouts this maxim seems to give too little or too much information (Cutting, 37:2002). And when it is linked with the utterance in [1], man's remark is consider flouts the maxim of quantity. It is caused by giving information too much than is required by saying additional information as "whether rain or sunny, I'm ready to keep you safe and protect you". Actually in the conversation, the woman only asks his undertake in guiding her but he answers it too long than is required, however his flouting can give luckiness for the woman.

And in the utterance [2], the researcher finds flouting maxim of manner. It is based on the Grice theory in Cutting (35:2002), in this maxim says speaker should be brief, be orderly and avoid obscurity and ambiguity. And the utterance

in datum 10, the man almost answers all the questions with relevant answer and there is no something wrong, but when he answers the last question seems that all the preceding answers are not be brief and orderly also giving obscurity and ambiguity.

After analyzing both of flouting in that utterance, the researcher can assume some possible reasons from flouting [1] to [2], as here; in [1] the possibility can be caused the man really loves his, the researcher say 'his' because what does he love is unpredictable, 'his' can be his motorcycle or the woman who sits beside him. But everything is that, he flouts it maybe because does not want to make his love suffers in every conditions and situation, he will keep safe everywhere and every time.

The other possible reasons are maybe he talks too much more than required is to make sure that he really can keep it safe and protect it as the best as he can. Or if he says it for a woman is as the culture, that a man is always like be worshiped, he speaks beautiful words a lot, so the woman can fall in love deeper than before or only to look for the woman's attention.

Then continue to the flouting in [2], the researcher considers the flouting is caused by the man answers ambiguity to the woman's quest as in the utterance 'Enduromatic oil, loyal to all matic motorcycles. Sehidup... sematic...' when he says that, it is really looks that there is no relation between question and answer. Woman's remark is asking the truth of his preceding utterance and the man says something relate to the motorcycle. The researcher can assume that it is maybe happened because his utterance is a part of strategy of the man to say something beyond the word.

The implicit meaning maybe to clear misunderstanding between them. Maybe he knows that the woman already thought that all answer is for her, so he directly answer it without saying 'by the way' or 'anyway' to make connection to the utterance before. He also say something more in the last utterance, what is more he says are 'sehidup... se-matic...' that in the researcher mind sehidup is from Indonesia language 'seluruh hidupku' or in English is 'a whole of my life' and se-matic is from the Indonesian word ' semati' but in here change into se-matic, that maybe from the word 'automatic' because the advertisement is taken with automatic motorcycle, so se-matic means semati which in English is 'a whole of my die'.

The flouting can be happened because possible reason as, he tries to be modest in front of the woman. He tries to think clearly, how to save his self-image and the woman from this misunderstanding, As Cutting states that if speaker flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make connection between utterance and the preceding one(s) (39:2002). So in the utterance [2], he flouts the maxim can be caused he expects that the woman will understand the utterance what did not say and make a conclusion based on her mind.

Actually, to make the utterance goes fluently and reach the goal, in utterance [1], the man can say as, "yeah, to cut long story. Whether rain or sunny, I'm ready to keep you safe and protect you". Or "I won't bore to all the details but if rain or sunny, I'm ready to keep you safe and protect you." Those utterance much better and looks more romantic than before. Then in the utterance [2] the man can utter such, "just to clarify one point, actually Enduromatic oil, loyal to all

matic motorcycles. Sehidup... sematic...” or can be like this “this is maybe a bit confuse, but my love to you is alike an Enduromatic oil, which loyal to all matic motorcycles. Sehidup... sematic...”