

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND FINDING

In analysing the data, the writer finds out that the flouting of maxims makes the conversation interesting. Although it may sound a little bit awkward, the radio listeners surely prefer the advertisements in which the conversation flouts so many maxims. For advertising purposes, maxim of quantity is the most flouted among the three maxims, while maxim of relevance is violated rarely.

The maxims that are going to be discussed here are only three maxims, namely, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. The table in the next page shows the percentage of the flouting and following of maxims in radio advertisements.

Table 1. The Following and the Flouting of Maxims

Advertisements	MAXIMS					
	Maxim of Quantity		Maxim of Relevance		Maxim of Manner	
	Fl (%)	Ft (%)	Fl (%)	Ft (%)	Fl (%)	Ft (%)
Pantene	44	56	100	0	78	22
Pantene Pro-V	60	40	100	0	80	20
Clear	55	45	100	0	100	0
Sunsilk	63	37	100	0	88	12
Natur	43	57	100	0	86	14
Elida	73	27	100	0	91	8
Lifebuoy	50	50	90	10	80	20
Surf	67	33	100	0	89	11
New Era	44	56	100	0	100	0
Quaker Oat Meal	78	22	100	0	89	11
Lippo Visa Electron	67	33	78	22	78	22
Aqua	70	30	100	0	70	30
Zaiki	56	44	89	11	67	33
Ardath	40	60	100	0	70	30
Taruna	36	64	93	7	79	21
Average	56,4	43,6	96,7	3,3	83,0	16,9

4.1 Maxim of Quantity

Based on the rule of maxim of quantity, a participant should give enough information. To follow that rule, the speaker should not give less or more information that is required. The participants should answer the question precisely without adding information which is not asked. Otherwise, he or she would violate maxim of quantity. Other criteria used to determine whether the utterance flouts maxim of

quantity can be seen in appendix. Next is the discussion of the flouting and the following of maxim of quantity.

4.1.1 The Flouting of Maxim of Quantity

As we can see from the table above, maxim of quantity is the most flouted maxim in conversational radio advertisements. From the advertisements which are analysed, they violate maxim of quantity from 22% to 64% of their conversation. *Daihatsu Taruna* has the highest percentage of flouting this maxim among other advertisements. While *Quaker Oat Meal* is the least one flouting maxim of quantity. The rest flout maxim of quantity on the average of 40% of their conversation.

The flouting of maxim of quantity is mostly because of giving too much information which is not necessary. It is obviously seen that it is violated on purpose, like the following examples.

A1: "Anak papa sudah sarapan belum?"

B1: "Nomer 1, mama kan bikin Quaker
Oat Meal kesukaan Adek

Kalau papa sarapan apa disana?"

A2: "Quaker Oat Meal juga, karena Quaker Oat Meal baik untuk semua orang dan bebas kolestrol lagi, jadi..."

B2: "bikin jantung sehat."

(Advertisement: Quaker Oat Meal)

C1: "Shampoo apa?"

D1: "Itu lho, Sunsilk extra mild, tampil baru dengan kemasan lebih baru dan keren."

C2: "Shampoo baru?"

D2: "Iya, formulanya ringan, bahannya alami, ekstrak bunga camomile dan air mineral segar. Gimana Sunsilk nggak extra lembut?"

(Advertisement: Sunsilk Extra Mild)

E1: "Huh! Bilang aja jadi keren."

F1: "Iya, San."

E2: "Rambutnya jadi sehat dan bagus sejak dia pake Pantene baru."

F2: "Kamu tahu dari mana?"

E3: "Semua juga tahu. Pantene shampoo dan kondisioner baru membuat rambut jadi lebih sehat. Kalo punya rambut sehat dan bagus, hidup juga berubah, dong."

(Advertisement: Pantene)

K1: "Iya, iya, gue percaya. Aku juga tau Taruna emang keren dipakai kemana aja. Ah, udah ah, mau potong rambut, udah malam nih."

L1: "Ah, gimana, ya? Nggak enak nih ngomongnya. Ehm...sorry ya, besok aja. Gue balik kesini mau ambil sepatu, mau tennis sama Mbak Dewi, mumpung ada Taruna."

(Advertisement: Taruna)

The first three dialogues above flout maxim of quantity in answering the question (the underlining part). All of them give more information than what is questioned. Like in the first dialogue when the father asks whether his son has had breakfast (A1), his son's utterance (B1) does not only answer the question, but also adds another new information which is not questioned. Speaking a lot, it seems that the child wants to create a particular impression, for example showing that he is smart, or telling everything to his father since they have a close relationship.

Then, the last advertisement also violates the maxim of quantity in the second utterance (L1). The speaker means to say that he cannot have her hair cut at that time because he has to go out. However, he does not only tell her about his rejection, but also

gives more explanation which is not expected. It seems that he is afraid of hurting her feeling and tries to be courteous so that he tries to give reason for refusing her request. The conversation in that part violates quantity maxim because of the hairdresser's apology and being courteous.

Generally, giving more information is a common violation in these radio advertisements. Moreover, the writer recognised that every advertisement must flout this maxim. Actually, by flouting this maxim, the advertisers use it as a tool to inform and introduce the product. On the other hand, the additional information is not important to the participant if it is in a natural conversation in daily life. When a father asks his son if he has eaten yet, it is not necessary for the son to explain what he eats, or when a friend asks the brand of a shampoo, he/she does not need to inform how the package is like. However, since the conversation functions as a tool of radio advertisements, the additional information counts. Yet, it still flouts the rule of cooperative principle.

4.1.2 The Following of Maxim of Quantity.

From all of the advertisements here, there is no advertisement that follows maxim of quantity fully. The highest percentage of following maxim of quantity belongs to *Quaker Oat Meal* and it obeys the maxim of quantity 78% of its conversation. While other advertisements follow this maxim from 36% to 70% of their conversation. Below are some parts of advertisements showing that they follow maxim of quantity.

A1: "Oh, *Surep* yang baru itu?"

B1: "Iya, *Surf*, mas."

A2: "Ya itulah. Pas banget baru aja dateng, cepet abisnya, neng."

B2: "Laku ya, mas?"

(Advertisement: *Surf*)

C1: "Oh, pinter anak papa"

D1: "Iya, dong!"

C2: "Tapi masih ngompol aja."

D2: "Eh, papa, enggak!"

C3: "Hayo, ngaku aja!"

(Advertisement: *Quaker Oath meal*)

These advertisements above try to comply with maxim of quantity in their conversation. The speakers reply the other participants with adequate information, not less or more than it should be. For example in

Surf, the seller asks question to make sure the product that the woman is going to buy, and she answers him as well as make correction to the wrong pronunciation spoken by the seller. It is the same with a part of the conversation between a father and his son in which the participants do not add or leave other information.

4.2 Maxim of Relevance

According to Grice, to achieve the goal of communication, one of the rules should be followed is that we have to be relevant in our conversation. It means that the topic we are going to talk about ought to be related to the topic being discussed by our participant. If not, we might be considered that we do not want to cooperate in the conversation by trying to change the subject of discussion. Automatically, we are said to violate the maxim of relevance on purpose.

4.2.1 The Flouting of Maxim of Relevance

Maxim of relevance is the least flouting of maxim in those radio advertisements. Only 4 out of 15 advertisements, chosen by the writer, flout maxim of relevance. They violate this maxim not more than 22% of

their conversation. They merely violate the rule once or twice in their chat, for example like in *Taruna* and *Lifebuoy*. Both of them violate the rule mainly because they want to change the topic of dialogues by not answering the question or responding with different topic.

O1: "Sekalian mbak, 'kan keren pakai *Taruna*"

P1: "Tuh, 'kan, kelas gue kedongkrak. Namanya juga pakai *Taruna*, ayo-ayo aja. Rugi dong kalo nolak."

Q1: "Iya, iya, gue percaya. Aku juga tau *Taruna* emang keren dipakai kemana aja. Ah, udah ah, mau potong rambut. Udah malam, nih!"

(Advertisement: *Taruna*)

S1: "Bapak-bapak, Ibu-ibu, bisnya mogok. Ayo, kita dorong!"

R1: "Walah to, mas! Masa disiang bolong gini disuruh ndorong bis!"

S2: "1...2...3...do..Eh, eh, eh!
Mbak yu, kau sudah seminggu tidak mandi, ya?"

R2: "Sembarangan! Aku mandi tujuh kali tadi. Sabunku yang wanginya 'ehem' itu lho! Ini cium wanginya."

(Advertisement: *Lifebuoy*)

The short dialogue above flouts maxim of relevance because the third speaker (Q) tries to change the subject of conversation. From the whole conversation, at first, the hairdresser (P) only gives reason for going out and defending himself, but he and another participant (O) keep discussing about the car, *Taruna* (see appendix). The other woman (Q) replies them for while about it and after that she continues with another different topic. When this situation happens in real life, of course, Q is jealous with O, the owner of the car, and angry because she waits P for a long time to get a haircut, while P goes out with O. So, it is obvious that Q does not want to discuss about the car anymore and then changes the topic. Relating to the feature of advertisement, trying to be as real as daily conversation, the flouting of maxim of relevance here has a purpose to turn the topic of discussion about the car back to the talk about the woman's complain to have her hair cut.

The flouting of the maxim in the second advertisement above is also the same with the one before (*Taruna*). The driver flouts maxim of relevance by talking about another different thing (S2) which is

not related to what he and another participant have discussed before as seen in S1 and R1. First, both of them talk about the disfunction bus and start to give command to push the bus together. Despite of pushing the bus, suddenly the driver utters something about the woman's odour which does not have nothing to do with pushing the bus. Then, the conversation runs with that new topic which talk about the advertised product (see appendix). This obviously shows that the flouting of maxim here functions as a way to begin the talk about the advertised product. Starting with the woman's disturbing scent, the conversation then leads to the promotion of *Lifebuoy*.

Another characteristic of flouting maxim of relevance is that if the speaker questions something, the listener does not give the answer. Yet, he/she may talk about something else, like the following example.

T1: "Win, aku mau buka kartu nih
sama kamu."

U1: "Oh ya?" (*Akhirnya dia ngomong
juga*)

T2: "Tapi kamu juga harus buka kartu
juga dong! Biar sama seperti
aku."

U2: "Boleh! Boleh!"

T3: "Aku mau buka kartu debit Lippo Visa Electron."

U3: "Hah?!"

T4: "Iya, kartu ini kaya kartu kredit, diterima dimana-mana, tinggal tanda tangan, juga bisa ambil tunai di ATM manapun, dan gengsinya dong. Nggak Cuma aku lho yang ikutan, temen-temenku yang lain juga. Makanya kamu juga harus ikut."

In another situation:

T5: "Win, aku mau buka kartu, nih."

U5: "Emang ada yang lebih bagus dari Visa Electron?"

T6: "Aku jatuh cinta sama kamu"

U6: "Ah! Akhirnya buka kartu juga."

(Advertisement: Lippo Visa Electron)

Because the conversation above contains of an ambiguous phrase, the participants might be led to flout maxim of relevance. In a ambiguous sentence or phrase, there are two different meaning implied in that sentence or phrase. In the dialogue, the first speaker (T1) produces an ambiguous phrase, that is "buka kartu". If we read the whole dialogue, it may imply that the speaker would like to tell his secret (as the implicit meaning), or applying a credit card (as the

literal meaning). The other participant once has been wrong in interpreting the message, fortunately, she does not respond him. Then, in the second part of the same conversation, she replies him with her wrong interpretation (U1) that he would like to apply another credit card, instead of Lippo Visa Electron. In fact, the man means to tell his secret which he loves her. So, the utterance in part U1 is not related to T1 and T2 as the second speaker has a wrong interpretation toward what the first speaker means.

To make the advertisement more interesting and easy to remember, the participants sometimes use a rhymed poem to convey the message. In a rhymed poem, there are two different parts that do not relate to each other. Its first part does not relate to the following part since usually the first part only functions to accompany the real message of the next part. There is one example of advertisement that utilizes a rhymed poem to bring its message.

W1: "Pusing, Mas Timbul!"

V1: "Iki lho ngombe-o puyer Zaiki"

W2: "Buah manggis, buah kecapi.

Wajahku manis minum Zaiki"

V2: "Buah manggis endang banget"

(Advertisement: Zaiki)

The advertisement of *Zaiki* flouts the maxim in the forth utterance. Actually the topic of the conversation is about the aspirin. The woman does not like to take medicine that mostly has bitter taste for her headache, and her friend, Timbul, brings her another aspirin that is not bitter at all. Then, she uses a rhymed poem to express her feeling after consuming *Zaiki* that is able to get rid of her headache and her face become sweet again. On the other hand, Timbul uses that presiding part of the rhymed poem, "*buah manggis*", as his subject in V2 that does not relate at all with the aspirin they talk about. The conversation is unmatched because of Timbul's irrelevant response.

4.2.2 The Following of Maxim Relevance

Most of the conversation in daily life follows maxim of relevance, and so does the conversation in radio advertisement since they try to be as natural as in real life. From the analysis, all of the conversation in the selected radio advertisements follow maxim of relevance, except four conversations. The participants try to fulfil the rule by giving response which relates to the utterance of the speaker

before. Here are some short dialogues adhering maxim of relevance.

X1: "Akhirnya ketemu juga shampo yang bikin rambut lembut tiap hari."

Y1: "Shampo apa?"

X2: "Itu lho, Sunsilk extra Mild, tampil baru dengan kemasan lebih baru dan keren."

Y2: "Shampo baru?"

X3: "Iya, formulanya ringan, ..."

(Advertisement: Sunsilk Extra Mild)

A1: "Dipilin, dikepang, diikat-ikat, huh! Nggak oke!"

B1: "Unik lagi, kelihatan kulit kepala."

A2: "Huh! Ketombeku mau ditutupin pake apa?"

B2: "Ketombe ditutupin, dihilangkan dong. Aku sih pakai Pantene Pro-V anti ketombe."

(Advertisement: Pantene Pro-V)

C1: "Aduh panasnya... Ikannya nggak depat-dapet lagi. Udah, ah...Pulang-pulang!"

D1: "Sst! Namanya juga mancing, 'Ndri, harus sabar. Sambil nunggu, nikmati aja sama Ardath kemasan baru dan trendi."

C2: "Sabar sih sabar. Tapi kalian sadar nggak sih sekarang udah

jam berapa. Sekarang jam 12 lewat. Ini 'kan waktunya makan siang. Eh, tadi apa? Ardath kemasan trendi? Apaan 'tuh?"

D2: "Udah bicara melulu, nggak gaul lagi! Ardath kemasan trendi itu keluaran dari Ardath yang asyik punya. Isi 20 batang, harga Ok, gampang dibawa-bawa. Cari dapetinnnya juga mudah."

(Advertisement: Ardath)

Some of the advertisements only consist of one topic of conversation in their dialogues, like the first advertisement above, Sunsilk Extra Mild. It introduces and promotes the product directly, without talking about other topic. It is one way to avoid violating maxim of relation in the conversation for advertisements. Yet, some advertisements also have two topics in their conversation, like in Pantene Pro-V. It has an opening topic before going further to promote the selling good. As we can see, they talk about the hair style first, that shows the scalp. For people having dandruff, of course it is a problem, then the conversation moves into the main part about shampoo anti dandruff. It is not flouting the maxim as long as

the changing topic is still relevance with the topic before.

The other example, Ardath, also has two topics of conversation. Sometimes, the participants mix both of the topics in one utterance as seen in D1 and C2. First, they talk about fishing and then they continue with cigarette. Fortunately, their utterances are related and do not jump so that they do not violate the relevance maxim. This kind of advertisement, in which the participants talk more than one topic, is more risky to violate maxim of relevance.

4.3 Maxim of Manner

The main point of maxim of manner is that the speaker must be clear in delivering his/her message. To be clear, he/she has to follow some rules, that are avoiding ambiguity, avoiding obscurity expression, being brief, and being orderly. In other words, the participants should talk straight to the point, without causing the conversational partner confused.

4.3.1 The Flouting of Maxim of Manner

In advertisements, it is quite easy to obey maxim of manner because the participants in conversational advertisement have to talk in a limited time, so they would avoid using so many words and talk directly. This is proved in Table 1, showing that several advertisements do not violate maxim of manner and the rest only flout maxim of manner maximum of 33% of their dialogues. It means that they do not follow the rule for twice or three times in a conversation. They flout maxim of manner in a such way as follow:

E1: "Eh, eh, eh! Mbak yu, kau sudah seminngu tidak mandi, ya?"

F1: "Sembarangan! Aku mandi tujuh kali tadi. Sabunku itu yang wanginya "ehem" itu lho! Ini, cium wanginya."

...

F3: "Hah! BB?"

E4: "Betul, 'kan!"

F4: "He-eh! Tapi aku pakai sabun yang wanginya "ehem" itu lho, yang janjinya wangi terus."

(Advertisement: Lifebuoy)

G1: "Kulu..kulu.. hujan gede!"

H1: "Eh, Andi! Andi! Jangan main hujan! Ayo, masuk, masuk!"

G2: "Enggak, ma. Andi lagi minta hujan, supaya turunnya banyak, biar pohonnya pada minum."

H2: "Diajarin nenek, ya?"

(Advertisement: Aqua)

I1: "Huh! Potong rambut aja nunggu 4 jam."

J1: "Ih, marah, ya? Habis gua diajak keliling sama mbak yang cantik ini."

I2: "Mbak Dewi?"

J2: "Iya. Ih, keren deh! Habis gua diajak keliling pake Taruna, ya Mbak Dewi, ya?"

(Advertisement: Taruna).

All of the example above violate maxim of manner for being not clear in their utterances. As we can see in the first conversation above, there is unclear statements in F1 and F5 that are produced in purpose. The speaker would like to say how good the scent of her soap is. Anyway, it is not important since the soap the woman usually uses is not the selling product so that the advertisement does not expose the quality of that soap by saying something blurred, "ehem", in the conversation. Hence, this advertisement obviously does not fulfil the maxim of manner on purpose.

While the second advertisement flout the maxim not as obviously as the first one. It violates when the child acts as if he sang an Indian traditional song to call for the rain and his mother does not understand what he means. Since he imitates 'Indian song' which can be considered as using secret language, the boy break maxim of manner.

In the advertisement of *Taruna*, another participant cannot get the message of who the hairdresser going with since he does not mention directly in his utterance (J1). It makes the woman has to ask again to make sure she gets the right information. Thus, it can be said that the hairdresser flouts the maxim of manner because of his unclear utterance.

There is also discussion about flouting maxim of manner in another way, specifically in the way the speaker talks.

K1: "Iya, iya, gue percaya. Aku juga tau Taruna emang keren dipakai kemana aja. Ah, udah ah, mau potong rambut, udah malam nih."

L1: "Ah, gimana, ya? Nggak enak nih ngomongnya. Ehm...sorry ya, besok aja. Gue balik kesini mau ambil

sepatu, mau tennis sama Mbak Dewi, mumpung ada Taruna."

(Advertisement: Taruna)

M1: "Sabar sih sabar, tapi kalian sadar nggak sih, sekarang udah jam berapa. Sekarang udah jam 12 lewat. Ini 'kan udah waktunya makan siang. Eh, tadi apa? Ardath kemas trendi? Apaan 'tuh?"

N1: "Udah bicara melulu, nggak gaul lagi. Ardath kemas trendi itu ..."

(Advertisement: Ardath)

Talking a lot is also considered to fail in fulfilling the rule of manner. In the first conversation above, the hairdresser does not talk briefly to refuse to cut her hair. He tries to find appropriate words to explain his reason since he does not feel comfortable with the woman and he gets confused how to tell it. So, it takes a long time and wastes many words as seen in underlined example (L1), before he really refuses her.

The advertisement of *Ardath* disobeys the maxim of manner when one of the speakers tries to notify about the lunch time. Instead of inviting his friends to have

lunch, he asks about time and answers his question himself in order to remind his friends. To obey the maxim, he may say straightly, "*Sekarang waktunya makan, ayo kita makan!*" ("It's lunch time, let's eat!"), for example. Using so many unuseful words, it makes his friend gets bored by his own utterances as shown in his next respond in N1, "*Udah bicara melulu, nggak gaul lagi...*" ("You talk a lot, ..."). Obviously, he flouts maxim of manner in his way of speak.

Below is another example about ambiguity which included in the violating of maxim of manner.

T1: "Win, aku mau buka kartu, nih."

U1: "Emang ada yang lebih bagus dari
Visa Electron?"

T2: "Aku jatuh cinta sama kamu"

U2: "Ah! Akhirnya buka kartu juga."

(Advertisement: Lippo Visa Electron)

In the dialogue above, it consists of an ambiguous phrase in the utterance which is spoken by T1. The phrase "buka kartu" is considered ambiguous because it has literal meaning and implicit meaning which are not the same. The meaning of the phrase is uncertain that may cause the other participant gets confused since she has to guess what he intends, furthermore, she replies with her wrong interpretation, as seen in U1, "Emang

ada yang lebih bagus dari Lippo Visa Electron?" In fact, he does not talk about credit card as she thinks, but talks about his feeling. Her unmatched answer proves that the phrase is ambiguous. Avoiding ambiguity, he can add the phrase with more words that help giving a clue to the listener. If he would like to tell about applying a credit card, for example, he can say *"Win, aku mau buka kartu di bank (Lippo)"*, or *"Win, aku mau buka kartu hatiku"* for telling about his feeling. Although still using the phrase, it is not ambiguous anymore.

4.3.2 The Following of Maxim of Manner

The main point of following maxim of manner is just being clear in saying something. In advertising, the message surely must be clear so that the consumers can get the same interpretation as the message intends. The advertisements here follow maxim of manner in a quite high percentage for each advertisement. The least, *Zaiki*, obeys the maxim 67% of its conversation. In some advertisements, they seem to disobey the maxim since the participants do not use conjunctions or time order in a long sentence that possibly to cause the

message unclear. In fact, they indeed follow the rule, as proved in example below:

R1: "Aku mau buka kartu debit Lippo
Visa Electron."

S1: "Hah?!"

R2: "Iya, kartu ini kaya kartu
kredit, diterima dimana-mana,
tinggal tanda tangan, juga bisa
ambit tunai di ATM manapun.
Aman, praktis, dan gengsinya
dong. ..."

(Advertisement: Lippo Visa Electron)

U1: "Laku ya, Mas?"

V1: "Iya, deterjen Surep mah, oke
bersihnya, enteng harganya."

(Advertisement: Surf)

Both of the advertisements above are the examples of following maxim of manner. The speaker explains clearly and briefly about the card the woman questioning in R2. Though it is one long sentence with a few conjunction and many commas, it does not violate the rule, as well as V1. They are considered to not violate the rule of being orderly because the time order is not important in those sentences. Besides, the message is already clear enough and seems to be understandable easily.