

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

We all human being engage in communication or interaction with others right from our birth. The most common form of communication or interaction is conversation. Levinson (1983: 284) defines conversation as the familiar kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking, which occurs generally outside specific institutional settings like religious services, law courts, classrooms, and the like. From the definition, it is reckoned that, at least two participants, the addresser and the addressee, carry out the conversation and they interchange the roles.

The way of people making conversation works is recognized as cooperative principles (CP). Grice (1975) proposes four CP known as conversational maxims that involve in the pragmatic of natural language. The maxims are ways to explain the link between utterances and what is understood from them. They are based on CP of Grice who states, "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." The principles describe how effective communication occurs in conversation. Further, they are divided into four maxims, namely maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner.

According to Paul Grice, for an effective communication, the speaker and the listener, sender and receiver involved in a conversation try to be

cooperative. The participants expect that each will make a “conversational contribution such as is required by the accepted purpose or the direction of the talk exchange.” The maxims specify what the participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, and co-operative ways. It is, therefore, generally assumed that communication is successful because interactants adhere to the CP.

CP gives emphasis that conversation is not chaotic and without rules. It plays a very useful role in any conversation, but exceptions are always there. For instance, according to Stenstrom (1994:1), “This does not mean, of course, that the listener always waits for the speaker to finish before taking over. Nor does it mean that speaker never disagrees, objects, or contradicts each other.” Therefore, violation of maxims is not a rare case. In other words, speaker and listener do not always follow or abide the maxims. They sometimes may not observe the maxims even though the non-observance is not an indicator of a breakdown of interaction (Levinson, 1983:109). Once these contributions are broken, interlocutors try to interpret, induce, or search for inferences or conversational implicatures (Leech, 1983:12).

Thomas (1995: 64) states that there are five ways of non-observing a maxim, namely: (a) flouting, (b) violating, (c) infringing, (d) opting out, and (e) suspending. Thomas argued that the most important category by far, the one which generates an implicatures is flouting a maxim (major violation) whereas, the other four (minor violation) do not generate an implicature.

The speaker is thought to flout the maxim when s/he wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the

expressed meaning. Grice called this additional meaning as “conversational implicature” and he termed the process by which it is generated as “flouting a maxim” (Thomas, 1995: 65). Violation, according to Grice (1975), “is quiet and unostentatious”. If the speaker violates a maxim, s/he is liable to provide insufficient, ambiguous, or irrelevant information, which might negatively affect communication and do not lead to implicatures.

Meanwhile, infringing stems from imperfect linguistic performance (in the case of a young child or a foreigner) or from impaired linguistic performance brought about by nervousness, drunkenness, excitement, or disability. Then, the opting out of a maxim often occurs when someone wants to withhold the truth for reasons that are ethical or private. Suspending a maxim takes place when participants in a conversation are expecting the maxims to be fully unfulfilled, since the participants are withholding information that is to them culturally necessary or taboo to utter.

In natural or daily conversation, the following dialogue may happen:

A : Sayang gak kamu samaku? (Do you really love me?).

B : Aku pengen sekali liburan ke Bali, Lombok, dan Bunaken. Alamnya sangat eksotis” (I love to spend my holiday in Bali, Lombok, and Bunaken. The atmosphere is extremely exotic).

From the dialogue we understand that the interlocutor is changing the topic. S/he violates or fails to observe relation maxim that expect other to be relevant. Here, maxim of relation is being flouted. The interlocutor implicatively is sending a signal that s/he doesn't want to respond to or perhaps s/he has problems discussing her/his feelings or the answer is “no”.

Similarly, if we see another context, for example business or politics, when people do not frankly or directly state something, Grice's maxims will always be flouted (Sylvia, 2011). In a diplomatic way, people are communicating each other effectively without providing some expected or prescribed elements that should be followed.

President A: How's your country GNP?

President B: No people in my country is starving

In this case president B flouts maxim of quality and manner. President B's utterance needs to be cross-checked whether it is true (quality) that no people in his/her country is starving. It also resides ambiguity (manner) that triggers implicature.

In line with the natural conversation, non-observance maxims can take place in television talk shows. Television talk shows such as Oprah Winfrey in USA, Kick Andy and Mata Najwa on Metro TV, Hitam Putih on Trans7, Indonesia Lawyers Club on TV One and many others in Indonesia, have been recently phenomenon in delivering information. Different from conventional programs in reporting information, the talk shows contain conversations guided by smart, talented and selected hosts with competent guests or interviewees and with different topics, such as politics, economy, law enforcement, education, social phenomena and health issues. The TV talk shows phenomenon is in line with the phenomenon of non-observance maxims in conversations found on the TV talk shows themselves.

The non-observance phenomenon of conversational maxims, for example, can be found in Mata Najwa talk show hosted by Najwa Shihab and Joko Widodo as the guest (Episode: Kocok Ulang Kabinet, August 12, 2015).

Host : Berarti benar sejak beberapa bulan lalu anda sudah merasa bahwa kinerja kementerian di bawah kementerian di bidang ekonomi tidak sesuai dengan harapan anda?" (it means that since several months

ago you had felt that the ministry work under the ministry of economy was not suitable with your expectation?).

Jokowi : Akh... menurut saya memang akh... negara membutuhkan itu. agar ada public trust ada kepercayaan masyarakat ada rasa aman masyarakat ada rasa optimisme masyarakat yang ingin kita bangun. Bahwa dengan tim ini mereka yakin ekonomi akan tumbuh lebih baik." (ukh... in my opinion, it is, ukh... this country needs it. There should be public trust, there is security feeling of the people, and we are constructing people' optimism. By this team, the people believe that economy will grow better).

By saying "this country needs it" and the whole his utterances, Jokowi did not meet any questions or statements delivered by the host. Based on Gricean maxims, Jokowi had violated maxim of relation, the answer is not relevant with the previous question or statement uttered by the host. Or the interviewee purposely tried to flout the maxim as a signal he refused to answer the question as stated by Cruse (2000:360).

Similarly, in Mata Najwa Talkshow on Metro TV (Episode: Kocok Ulang Kabinet, August 12, 2015) we can also find how Joko Widodo violated or opted out the question asked by the host, Najwa Shihab.

Host : Betulkah pak Jokowi anda sempat mempertanyakan loyalitas menteri-menteri anda sebelumnya? (Is that right Mr Jokowi, you are doubtful about your previous ministers' loyalty?).

Jokowi : Kalau itu biar menjadi rahasia saya." (Let it be my secret).

In this case, Jokowi opted out the maxim which indicates unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires.

The examples above trigger the researcher to conduct a study in order to discover whether the phenomena of non-observance maxims also occur in other Indonesian television talk show programs.

1.2 Problems of the Study

In accordance with the background of the study, the problems are formulated in questions as the following:

- 1) What types of non-observance maxims are found in Indonesian television talk shows?
- 2) How are the non-observance maxims realized in Indonesian television talk shows?
- 3) Why are the maxims not observed in Indonesian television talk shows?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

In line with the problems above, the objectives of the study are:

- 1) to examine the types of non-observance maxims found in Indonesian television talk shows.
- 2) to describe the non-observance maxims' realization in Indonesian television talk shows.
- 3) to find out the reason(s) of non-observance maxims in Indonesian television talk shows.

1.4 Scope of the Study

Conversational maxims occur not only in daily conversation but also in talk shows broadcasted on televisions. This study is limited only in observing the non-observance maxims occurrences in Indonesian television talk show

programs. Also, the selected topics of Mata Najwa talk show, Kick Andy talk show, and Indonesia Lawyer's Club talk show will be restricted to politics.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The findings are expected to be worthwhile theoretically and practically for:

- 1) the enrichment of linguistic knowledge in the field of pragmatics.
- 2) the development of further studies on conversational maxims.
- 3) the interviewers or hosts in conducting effective interviews or talk shows and for interviewees or guests in elevating effective communication.
- 4) speakers and listeners in elevating mutual understanding by handling cooperative, relevant, clear, sincere, and sufficient conversation in daily communication.