

CHAPTER 2

FRAMEWORK OF THE THEORIES

Grice (1975) proposed four conversational maxims. These four sets of maxims are to guide those who are conversing with others in order that they can achieve the purpose of conversation maximally, efficiently, and rationally. For these purposes, they have to speak honestly not try to be trick, relevantly with give an answer that is relevant to the topic, clearly not give an answer that is unclear and ambiguous, and they give information as is needed with contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.

Grice introduces the cooperative principle to explain how hearers interpret the utterance implicature, as runs as below:

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 (Grice, 1976, p.45)

Consider the following scenario. There is a woman sitting on a park bench and a large dog lying on the ground in front of the bench. A man comes along and sits down on the bench.

Man	<i>:Does your dog bite?</i>
Woman	<i>:No. (The man reaches down to pet the dog. The dog bites the man's hand.)</i>
Man	<i>:Ouch! Hey! You said your dog doesn't bite.</i>
Woman	<i>:He doesn't. But that's not my dog.</i>

One of the problems in this scenario has to do with communication. Specifically, it seems to be a problem caused by the man's assumption that more was communicated than was said. It is not a problem with presupposition because the assumption in 'Your dog' (i.e. the woman has a dog) is true for both speakers. The problem is the man's assumption that is question 'Does your dog bite?' and the woman's answer 'No' both applies to the dog in front of them. From the man's perspective, the woman's answer provides less information than expected. In other words, she might be expected to provide the information stated in the last line. Of course, if she had mentioned this information earlier, the story would not be as funny. For the event to be funny, the woman has to give less information than is expected.

The concept of these being an expected amount of information provided in pre-conversation is just one aspect of the more general idea that people involved in a conversation will

cooperate with each other. (Of course, the woman may actually be indicating that she does not want to take a part in any cooperative interaction with the stranger.)

H. Paul Grice proposed the following cooperative principle: "make your 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" (Grice, 1976, p. 45). This involves four aspects that Grice formulated as "maxims":

1. Quantity : a contribution should be just enough, not too much and not too little.
2. Quality : a contribution should be true.
3. Relation : a contribution should be relevant.
4. Manner : a contribution should be brief, orderly, and not ambiguous, overly verbose, or obscure.

2.1 The Conversational Maxims

Below is a more detail explanation and examples about conversational maxim. The following are the four sets of conversational maxims (Levinson, 1983, p.101)

2.1.1 Maxims of Quality

Being true is appropriate:

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

These ideas run into three sets of problem; those are connected with the notion 'truth', those are connected with the logic of belief, and those are involved in the nature of 'adequate evidence'. In a conversation, each participant must say the truth, he will not say what he believes to be false, and will not say something that he has no adequate evidence. For example, *Mary is a lecture*, implicates I believe her and I have adequate evidence that she is a lecture. However, if later it is found out that she has no degree in education, it will appear that he disobeys the maxim of quality.

2.1.2. Maxims of Quantity

Say as much as is helpful:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

The maxim is “say as much is helpful but no more and no less”. In a conversation, the participants must present the message as informative as is required. For example, I bought a new car yesterday, will implicate that you not bought other thing besides a car. If it is later discovered that you buy something else, it means that you disobey the maxim of quantity, as you are not being informative.

2.1.3. Maxims of Relation

Make what you say bear on the issue at hand:

“Make your contributions relevant”

The maxim of relevance is treated to be the relevancy condition that is interpreted in such away to be directly relevant to the present interaction. It means that the connection between participants can be shown to be one of relevance not only in simple cases of replies. For example:

John : *Where’s the roast beef?*

Ann : *The dog looks happy.*

Ann’s answer means “the beef has been eaten by the dog, so the dog looks happy.” However, Ann does not say that, instead she says something that seems irrelevant to John’s question. Ann’s answer can be made relevant to John’s question, supposing Ann does not know the exact answer, by implicating that the dog may eat the beef since it looks happy and full.

2.1.4. Maxims of Manner

“Be perspicuous, and specifically”

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief.
4. Be orderly.

Thus, Gazdar (1979, p.44-45) rephrases these instructions to be; part (i) instructs speakers and addressers to use, and interpret each other as using the same language or to use intersection of their perspective languages or idiolects; part (ii) instructs not to use ambiguous expression; part (iii) concerns with quantifying over the length of expression at some level of representation; and part (iv) is the formulation requires tightening up, generalizing to cover more than two expression and generalizing to cover spatial precedence as well as temporal precedence.

An example of the first sub-maxim:

A : *What are you baking?*

B : *Be I are tea aitch dee ay wye see ay kay ee.*

B is going out of their way to be a bit obscure, spelling out the words rather than simply saying them. B is utterly failing to cooperatively follow the maxim of manner. B is being so obvious that A can infer that there must be a special reason for being so cooperative: for instance, B wants to make a surprise for someone's birthday and in coincidence, he or she is not far from them.

The maxims of cooperative principle that are stated by Grice above are not a scientific law but a norm to maintain the conversational goal. The conversational goal will be less function when one of those sub-maxims is not fulfilled maximally. Levinson says that these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in maximally efficient, rational, cooperative way: that should speak sincerely, relevantly, and clearly, while providing sufficient information.

Cooperative principle and conversational maxims are one part of the Pragmatic. Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. The advantages of studying language via pragmatics study is that one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kind of actions that they are performing when they speak. The big disadvantage is that all human concepts are extremely difficult to analyze in a consistent and objective way (Yule, 1996, p.4).

Pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatic is the study of the speaker meaning.

There are the four areas that pragmatics is concerned with. Pragmatics cannot stand alone to the science of language in linguistics, there is some science also support pragmatic, namely: semantics and syntax, there are some differences between syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Syntax is the study of the relationship between linguistics forms.

Semantics is the study of the relationship between linguistics forms and entities in the world, that is explain about how words literally connect to something. Semantics analysis also attempts to establish the relationship between verbal descriptions and state of affairs in the world as accurate or not, regardless of who produces that description (Yule, 1996, p.4).

2.2. Observing the Maxims

According to Thomas (1995, p.64), the least interesting case is when a speaker observes all the maxims as in the following example:

Husband : *Where are the car keys?*

Wife : *They're on the table in the hall.*

The answer in the above example is clear, without any implications. The wife answers clearly which is related to the Maxim of Manner, truthfully which corresponds to the Maxim of Quality and gives just the right amount of information which concerns the Maxim of quantity and is relevant to the topic that suits the Maxim of Relation.

2.3. Non-observance of the Maxims

Paradoxically and quite often, people fail to observe the maxim of cooperation, whether deliberately or accidentally. Thomas (1995) lists five ways of failing to observe a maxim:

- Flouting a maxim
- Violating a maxim
- Infringing a maxim
- Opting out of maxim
- Suspending a maxim

2.3.1. Flouting a maxim

Mey (1996, p.70) provides a comprehensive definition of “flouting”. *Id est*: “*we can make a blatant show of breaking one of the maxims... in order to lead the addressee to look for a covert, implied meaning.*” It reinforces Thomas’ claim (1995, p.65) that *a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning.*

On some occasions, speakers flout the cooperative principle and intend their hearer to understand this; that is, they purposely do not observe the maxim, and intend the hearer to be aware of this.

2.3.1.1. Flouting the maxim of Quantity

Flouts occur when the speaker gives too much or too little information than is required. The speaker may flout the Quantity of Maxim and deliberately talk either too much or too little in compliance with the goal of the ongoing conversation:

A : *Can I get six thin slices of Danish ham, please?*

B : *Six thin slices.*

A : *Yep.*

B : *They're all really thin, so...*

In the example, the serving person politely suggests that the customer should flout the maxim of quantity by saying more than is necessary, as the ham is already thinly slice.

2.3.1.2 Flouting the Maxim of Quality

A flout exploits the maxim of quality when the speaker says something which is untrue or for which he or she lacks of adequate evidence. The speaker says something that he does not represent what he or she thinks by using sarcasm, irony, and hyperbole to exaggerate. As in:

Teacher to a student who arrives late more than ten minutes to the class meeting:

Teacher : *Wow! You're such a punctual fellow! Welcome to the class.*

Student : *Sorry sir! It won't happen again.*

It is obvious from what the teacher says that he is teasing the student and his purpose is, by no means, praising him. He flouts the maxim of quality (being truthful) to be sarcastic. Likewise, the student seems to notice the purpose behind the teacher's compliment and offer an apology in return.

2.3.1.3. Flouting the Maxim of Manner

It involves the absence of clarity and transparency of communicative intentions. In the example below:

Interviewer : *Did the government promise teachers a raise and did not start any legal procedures about it?*

Spokesperson : *I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion.*

The long-winded and convoluted response is not caused by the speaker's inability to speak to the point. She would like to cooperate during the interview, but successful conversation conflicts with another goal: sparing the government she is the spokesperson from acquiring an unfavorable public image.

2.3.1.4. Flouting the Maxim of Relation

It occurs when the response is obviously irrelevant to the topic (quick change of topic, over failure to address interlocutor's purpose in asking a question):

- Indonesian people** : *What do you do in America?*
American people : *I worked as a teacher.*
Indonesian people : *It's a good job. Isn't it?*
American people : *Well, just so so.*
Indonesian people : *Then, how much is your salary every month?*
American people : *Oh no...*
Indonesian people : *What's wrong?*
American people : *Why are you asking that?*

The American people flout the maxim of relation because his answer is irrelevant to the question that Indonesian people asked. Indonesian people asks the American people about his salary as a teacher in America. But, the American People answers the question by saying "oh no."

2.3.2. Violating a maxim

Violation is defined as the unostentatious or "quiet" non-observance of a maxim. The speaker who violates a maxim "will be liable to mislead" (Grice, 1975, p.49). Violating a maxim is the opposite of flouting a maxim. Violating a maxim prevent or discourages the hearer from seeking for implicatures and encourages their taking utterances at face value.

When violating the maxim of quantity, the speaker does not provide the hearer sufficient information. The speaker is not honest by providing wrong information. While violating maxim of manner, he or she may say everything excepting what the hearer desires to recognize. Concerning the last maxim, of relation, here one can observe that the speaker endeavors to change the discussion subject or to deflect to hearer. Example:

2.3.2.1. Violation of the Maxim of Quantity

In this conversation below, Mother asks Jake whether he have done his homework and dinner.

- Mother** : *Have you done your homework and dinner?*
Jake : *I have dinner.*

Jake violates the maxim of quantity because he does not give the contribution as informative as required for the current purposes of the exchange. Jake just answers one

question, in fact, there are two questions. He just answers the question “have you done your dinner? It generates conversational implicature, Jake does not finish his homework yet, but he had dinner.

In the conversation below, Bella asks Marry whether or not she see her car keys.

Bella : *Did you see the car keys?*
Mary : ***I not see the keys because I just got home from school.***

Mary violates the maxim of quantity because she gives information more informative than is required. Actually, if she just answered with the word that I have written in bold; it would be enough to answer the question. The answer of Mary generates conversational implicature, she answers the question by adding information that she just gets home from school to make her answer more powerful than just say I not see the keys.

2.3.2.2. Violation of the Maxim of Quality

In this conversation below, Mary asks Betty about her new car that she bought.

Mary : *What do you think about my new car?*
Betty : *(my car is better than her) fantastic!*

Betty violates the maxim of quality because she is not telling the truth to answer Mary’s question. It generates conversational implicature, Betty does not like Mary’s new car because she thinks her car is better.

In this conversation below, Donald asks Adam whether or not he know that the lecture is Harry’s brother.

Donald : *Did you know that our lecture is Harry’s brother?*
Adam : *I guess I know, because once I saw him talk with Harry in front of his office.*

Adam violates the maxim of quality because he gives an answer that he not believes that the answer is right and lack adequate evidence. This answer generates conversational implicature, because of he saw Harry talk to the lecture, and it makes the answer like the truth. However, the answer is lack adequate because he just sees they have conversation in front of lecture office. It can be wrong that he knows that the lecture is Harry’s Brother.

2.3.2.3. Violation of the Maxim of Relation

In this conversation below, Adam asks Jane whether they can meet tomorrow.

Adam : *Can we meet tomorrow?*
Jane : *I guess next week would be better.*

Jane violates the maxim of relation because she gives an answer that is not relevant to the question. It generates conversational implicature, Jane really cannot meet Adam tomorrow or Jane just makes a reason to avoid Adam's invitation because she won't meet him.

In the conversation below, Andy asks Michael could he pass the salt to him.

Andy : *Would you mind to pass the salt?*

Michael : *it besides the paper.*

Michael violates the maxim of relation because he gives an irrelevant answer to the question. His answer generates conversational implicature, Andy asks Michael could he pass the salt to him, but he answers by telling the position of the salt. That answer indicates that he does not want to pass the salt to Michael. In other words, he tells Michael to take it by himself.

2.3.2.4. Violation of the Maxim of Manner

In this conversation, Billy asks John whether he did have fun in his cousin's wedding party or not.

Billy ★ : *Did you have fun at your cousin's wedding?* ★

John : *The location was near a lake, there many guests, international foods, and it was do fun.*

John violates the maxim of manner because she gives an answer that has unclear and has ambiguous meaning. It generates conversational implicature, if we look to his answer, we could interpret that he has fun in his cousin's wedding party.

Lissa : *What do you think about my dress, which one is better, the blue dress with pink ribbon or the red dress with big flower?*

Lucy : *Absolutely good.*

Lissa violates the maxim of manner because her answer is unclear and has ambiguous meaning. Lissa asks Lucy about her dress, which one is better between the blue dress and the red dress, but she answers the question by saying "Absolutely good." That answer is unclear and has ambiguous meaning.

2.3.3. Infringing the Maxim

Maxims infringing occurs when a speaker fails to observe the maxim, although he or she has no intention of generating an implicature and no intention of deceiving.

Usually, infringing results from defective linguistic performance (for instance; a child, a foreigner, or a drunk person who cannot speak the language well) or from impaired linguistic performance brings emotions such as excitement, nervousness, etc. For example:

Jessica : *Yeah, and also we need more umm, drinks. Hold on a second. (gets up but stumbles a little bit.) Whup, okay. (she makes it to the phone and picks it up, without dialing.) Hello! Vegas? Yeah, we would like some more alcohol, and y'know what else? We would like some more beers. Hello? Ohh, I forgot to dial!*

Kate : *That must be our alcohol and beers!*

Mike : *Hey!*

Kate : *Ohh, it's Mike!*

Jessica : *Ohh, I love Mike! Mike lives with the duck!*

Mike : *Hi!*

Jessica : *Hey!*

Mike : *Look-look-look you guys, I need some help! Okay? Someone is going to have to convince my hand twin to cooperate!*

Kate : *I'll do it. Hey, whatever you need me to do. I'm your woman. (she starts to sit down on the bed. There's one problem though, she's about two feet to the left of it. Needless to say, she misses and falls on her butt.) (Loking up at Mike) whoa-oh-whoa! Are you, are you okay?*

2.3.4. Opting out of the maxim

Speaker opts out of observing a maxim by indicating unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. The speaker deliberately implicates the truth in order to obey the rules or ethic codes (Thomas, 1997, p.74). For example, *The Conservative M.P, Teddy Taylor, had been asked a question about talk he had with Colonel Gadafy:*

'Well, honestly, I can't tell you a thing, because what was said to me was told me on confidence' (Thomas, 1995, p.75)

Mr. Teddy opts out the first maxim of Quantity in order to preserve confidentiality. He explicitly informs that the maxim cannot be satisfied.

2.3.5. Suspending the maxim

When one suspends a maxim, it is understood that what is said is not completely true or that there are things the speaker ought to say, for example taboo words. It may be due to cultural differences that a speaker suspends a maxim or to the nature of certain events or situations (Thomas, 1995, p.77). To illustrate with an example from Thomas (Meaning in Interaction):

... they told him he could not be cured, Bistie's daughter said in a shaky voice, she cleared her throat, whipped the back of her hand across her eyes. 'That man was strong', she continued. 'His spirit was strong. He didn't give up on things. He didn't want to die. He didn't hardly say everything at all. I asked him. I said, My father, why- she stopped, "Never speak the name of the dead, chee thought. Never summin the Chindi to you, even if the name of the ghost is Father" (Thomas, 1995, p.77)

Chee suspends the maxim of quantity when he mentions a name of a dead person, a taboo in her culture.

2.4. Conversational Implicature

According to Thomas (1995, p.57) Grice distinguishes two types of implicature; conventional implicature and conversational implicature. They both convey some additional meaning, i.e. the one that lies beyond the semantic meaning of the words uttered. However, the difference is found in that conventional implicature conveys always the same implications, regardless of context, while what is implied by conversational implicature varies depending on the context of utterance.

Levinson (1983, p.97) also states that implicature, or rather conversational implicature, is one of the most important notions in pragmatics. It "provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually 'said' (i.e. more than what is literally expressed by the conventional sense of the linguistic expressions uttered". He illustrates the notion of conversational implicature on the following example:

- A** : *Can you tell me the time?*
B : *Well, the milkman has come.*

From a semantic point of view the exchange is interpreted as follows:

- A** : *Do you have the ability to tell me the time?*
B : *(pragmatically interpreted particle) the milkman came at some time prior to the time of speaking.*

However, it is quite clear to most of the readers, taking pragmatics into consideration, that the dialogue implies more than is said, that there are extra levels of meaning:

- A** : *Do you have the ability to tell me the time of the present moment, as standardly indicated on a watch and if so please do so tell me.*
- B** : *No, I don't know the exact time of the present moment, but I can provide some information from which you may be able to deduce the approximate time, namely the milkman has come.*

It follows from the example that a request for specific information and an attempt to provide a satisfactory answer are not directly expressed and “the gap between what is literally said in (2) and what is conveyed in (3) is so substantial that we cannot expect a semantic theory to provide more than a small part of an account of how we communicate using language. The notion of implicature promises to bridge the gap (...)” (1983, p.97-98). Analyzing the phenomenon of implicature in more details Levinson notices that “the truth-conditional content of an utterance (what, in Grice’s special sense is said) may be only a small part of its total meaning, (...)” (1983, p.132).

Levinson (1983, p.127) specifies conversational implicature in this way: “Conversational implicature are non-truth-conditional inferences that are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expressions.” He argues Grice provides only two examples of this kind. One is the word *but* which has the same truth-condition content as the word, with an additional conversational implicature to the effect that there is some contrast between the conjuncts. The other word is therefore that contributes nothing to the truth conditions of the expressions it occurs within. Other two examples – *even* and *yet* – have been suggested by other authors as Levinson says. This sort of implicature is not usually considered in the discourse analysis. Nor is it much discussed by linguists in their studies.

2.5. Conceptual Framework

In conducting the research, I use some theories from linguistics experts; they are Grice (1975), Thomas (1995), and Yule (1996). The Cooperative Principle, conversational implicature, non-observance of the maxims, especially, the violation of maxim, Grice and Yule’s Theories are the most significant theories during the process of the research. The interview uses the theories of Thomas and Cohen to support the data in analyze the conversational implicature.