

**THE FLOUTING AND HEDGING MAXIMS
USED BY THE MAIN CHARACTERS IN
“BEND IT LIKE BECKHAM”**

THESIS

**BY
NURUL AFIATI
NIM : 03320095**



**ENGLISH LETTERS AND LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF HUMANITY AND CULTURE
THE STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF MALANG
2007**

**THE FLOUTING AND HEDGING MAXIMS
USED BY THE MAIN CHARACTERS IN
“BEND IT LIKE BECKHAM”**

THESIS

**Presented to
the State Islamic University of Malang
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of
*Sarjana Sastra (S.S)***

**Advisor:
Drs. Nur Salam, M.Pd**



**By:
Nurul Afiati
NIM: 03320095**

**ENGLISH LETTERS AND LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF HUMANITY AND CULTURE
THE STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF MALANG
2007**

APPROVAL SHEET

This is to certify that The *Sarjana* thesis, entitled “The Flouting and Hedging Maxims Used by the Main Characters in ‘Bend It Like Beckham’”, written by Nurul Afiati has been approved by the advisor for further approval by the Board of Examiners.

Malang, 8th October 2007

Approved by
Advisor

Acknowledged by
the Head of English Letters
and Language Department

Drs. Nur Salam, M.Pd
NIP. 131602091

Dra. Hj. Syafiyah, M.A.
NIP. 150246406

the Dean of Humanity and Culture Faculty

Drs. H. Dimjati Ahmadin, M.Pd
NIP. 150035072

LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that The *Sarjana* thesis, entitled “The Flouting and Hedging Maxims Used by the Main Characters in ‘Bend It Like Beckham’”, written by Nurul Afiati has been approved by the Board of Examiners as one of the requirements for the degree of *Sarjana Sastra* in English Letters and Language Department, Faculty of Humanity and Culture, the State Islamic University of Malang.

the Board of Examiners

Signature

- | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------|
| 1. <u>Drs. H. Djoko Susanto, M.Ed, Ph.D</u>
NIP. 150299503 | (Chairman) | (.....) |
| 2. <u>Prof. Dr. H. Mudjia Rahardjo, M.Si</u>
NIP. 150244741 | (Main Examiner) | (.....) |
| 3. <u>Drs. Nur Salam, M.Pd</u>
NIP. 131602091 | (Advisor) | (.....) |

Malang, 8th October 2007

Approved by

the Dean of Faculty of Humanity and Culture

Drs. H. Dimjati Ahmadin, M.Pd
NIP. 150035072

MOTTO

ومثلا حكمة اتبعها بكلمة تكلم اذا قل العا

The wise man attaches wisdom and model to his words

(Imam Ali bin Abi Tholib r.a.)

Language is Functional and Must Be Context Jalised

(Jane Crawford)

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP

Name : Nurul Afiati
NIM : 03320095
Department : English Letters and Language Department
Faculty : Faculty of Humanity and Culture

certify that the thesis I wrote to fulfill the requirement for the degree of *Sarjana* thesis entitled *The Flouting and Hedging Maxims Used by the Main Characters in "Bend It Like Beckham"* is truly my original work. I do not incorporate any materials previously written or published by other people, except those indicated in quotation and bibliography. Due to this fact, I am the only responsible for the thesis if there are any objections or claims from others.

Malang, 8th October 2007

The Writer,

Nurul Afiati

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All Praise and Gratitude be to Allah SWT, the Almighty and Merciful who has given me great affection and guidance in finishing my thesis entitled “The Flouting and Hedging Maxims Used by The Main Characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”. His mercy and peace are for the prophet Muhammad SAW who has brought us from the darkness to the brightness by Islamic values of the Holy Qur’an to people all over the world.

Then, I would like to thank those who have assisted me in writing this thesis. I express my first gratitude to Drs. Nur Salam M.Pd who has consciously guided me through out the entire process of the thesis writing with all of the constructive comments, which helped me make this more perfect.

Likewise, my sincere gratitude goes to the Rector of UIN Malang, Prof. Dr. H. Imam Suprayogo, the Dean of the Faculty of Humanity and Culture, Drs. H. Dimjati Ahmadin, M. Pd., and the Head of the Letters and Language Department, Dra. Hj. Syafiyah M.A. and all my teachers who had been taught me and transferred their knowledge, thanks so much.

Above all, I express deepest thanks to my beloved family who has given me endless love, prayers, sacrifices, a spiritual and material supports for me especially my parents: my dad, Muhammad Ikrom who has implanted the strength seeds into the bottom of my heart, to my mom, Siti Bariyah, who has provided me her massive affection in perpetuity to steal my pains away and given me advice. To my brothers and sisters, Imam Muslim, Muftihatun Aliyah, Munjiatun Aliyah,

Muhammad Arif Rofiuddin and Fitri Ifada Mubaridah; thanks for love, support and prayer you gave to me. To my beloved, the one whom I'll build my home with; thanks for love, care and support. To My uncle, Zainuddin and his family and Mbak Heni and her family; thanks for supports, care and time you gave to me. Hopefully, Allah provides me a chance to repay all of your everlasting love and prove my devotion along my lifetime.

Next, I would like to give my gratitude to my companions, Aya, Farid, Hisan, Yans, Fitri, Hanis, Noor and Susil, thanks for helpings and friendship. To all my friends in English Language and Letters Department then, all of the students of English Letters and Language Department of 2003, especially Sensa-C class who always accompany my days and all others who I cannot mention them in this occasion. To all my friends of Sina 26 (Yans, Asti, Arisma, Dwi, Ella and Indri); thanks for your friendship and togetherness wether in happy or in sorrowful. To all my friends in Nurul Ummah Dormitory, especially A3's, (Fia, Rofiatul, Wiwit and Ria); thanks a lot for your support and togetherness. Also to all who have ever helped and given me support and advice.

Finally, I admit that this thesis is truly not perfect. Therefore, any constructive comments from the readers will make this writing better. It is hopeful that this writing can provide a valuable contribution to the field of Linguistics, in particular discourse analysis.

Malang, 8th October 2007

the writer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL SHEET

LEGITIMATION SHEET

MOTTO	i
DEDICATION	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF APPENDIX.....	vii
ABSTRACT	viii

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Problems of the Study.....	7
1.3 Objectives of the Study	7
1.4 Significance of the Study	7
1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study	8
1.6 Definition of the Key Terms	8

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Discourse Analysis	10
2.2 Context and Text	13
2.2.1 Context	13
2.2.2 Text	16
2.3 Written and Spoken Discourse	18
2.4 Implicature	19
2.5 Cooperative Principle	21
2.5.1 Maxims of Quantity	23
2.5.2 Maxims of Quality	24
2.5.3 Maxims of Relation	25
2.5.4 Maxims of Manner	26

2.6 Flouting Maxims	28
2.6.1 Tautology	30
2.6.2 Metaphor	31
2.6.3 Overstatement	32
2.6.4 Understatement	34
2.6.5 Rhetorical Question	35
2.6.6 Irony	36
2.7 Hedging Maxims	37
2.3 The Synopsis of <i>Bend It Like Beckham</i>	38
2.4 Previous Studies	40

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Research Design	43
3.2 Research Subject	44
3.3 Data Source	44
3.4 Research Instrument	44
3.5 Data Collection	45
3.6 Data Analysis	45
3.7 Triangulation	45

CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Research Finding	47
4.2 Discussion	84

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion	87
5.2 Suggestion	88

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIX

ABSTRACT

Afiati, Nurul. 2007. *The Flouting and Hedging Used by the Main Characters in "Bend It Like Beckham"*. Thesis. English Letters and Language Department, Faculty of Humanity and Culture. The State Islamic University of Malang. Advisor: Drs. Nur Salam, M.Pd.

Key Words: Flouting, Hedging, Maxims, Utterance, Bend It Like Beckham

The effectiveness and efficiently of delivering information are needed in communication. That is why, it is essential to use Grice's maxims theory of cooperative principles to avoid misinterpretation and misunderstanding. Maxim is a basic assumption and it can be changed. There are four maxims, namely maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Thus, we are have to obey the rules of four maxims to communicate smoothly.

This study focuses on analyzing the hedging and flouting maxims used by the main characters in "Bend It Like Beckham". The maxims are violated and overtly broken, that cause the sentences seem informative, well founded and relevant. It also causes the sentences have some implied meaning and sometimes it is difficult to understand less informative. The research problems in this thesis are (1) How are the maxims flouted by the main characters in "Bend It Like Beckham?" (2) How are the maxims hedged by the main characters in "Bend It Like Beckham?". A descriptive qualitative method is used because the data are explained descriptively. The data are taken from the main characters' utterance in conversations in "Bend It Like Beckham".

After the data obtained and analyzed, it is found that the most of the data are flouting the maxims, especially the maxims of quantity and quality. So it uses the sentences which have some of data flouting maxim of manner because the data can cause ambiguous and obscurity. Therefore, the data are using exaggeration statement which is also classified on understatement and overstatement. The data also uses metaphor, rhetorical question and irony to indicate that they are not literally true conveyed some implied meanings. It is also found tautology on the data. Moreover, flouting the maxim of relation is found in the data. Then it is found understatement, because less information.

There were also some data that were hedging the maxims. It is found that most of them are hedging the maxims of quality, because there are many data, which show the statement is doubtful. Besides, it is found that the data are hedging the maxims of relation and manner because the utterance is expressed in long drawn way and has relation one each other. It is found also that there are some data, which abides the maxims of quantity, because the data fulfilled the data is informative as is required. Some data fulfilled all the maxims of quality because there are true, fulfilled all the maxims of quantity because they are informative, fulfilled the maxims of relation because they are relevant, and fulfilled the maxims of manner, because they are not ambiguous.

It is found that (1) Exaggerated statements are used maxims were flouted when they were overtly broken by the main characters' utterance of "Bend It Like Beckham" such as tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rethorical question and irony. (2) Maxims of quantity itself is flouted when the utterances are overstatement. (3) Rethorical question in the main characters' utterance do not use "wh" question or it is ungrammatically, however it is a rethoric because of its intonation.

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

The introduction below deals with the background of the study, the problems of the study, objective of the study, significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study and definition of the key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

لتعارفوا شعوبا و قبائل وجعلناكم نثى ذكروا من انا خلقناكم يا ايها الناس

(١٣: الحجرات)

“Mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nation and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise) each other verily the most honoured of you in the sight of God is the most Rightous of you. And God has full knowledge and is well acquainted (Al-Hujurat: 13).

This statement is one of ayat from Holy Kur’an that is a basic to human people to know one each other. Based on this ayat shows that knowing others is impossible without communication. And Language is a mean of communication. It is used to communicate and know one each other. Thus, understanding language use in community is very important in our life.

In study of language or Linguistics, especially in English, we know some branches of Linguistics; they are Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Pragmatics and

Semantics. In this case, study of language use is a part of Pragmatics. Therefore, Discourse Analysis is study of language use to communicate in human life.

When we want to analyze the way how sentences work in a sequence to produce coherent sentences of language, at least there are two main point approaches which can be used, namely discourse analysis (focuses on the structure of language); however, in particular with discourse analysis and text analysis can be used in much broader sense to include all language units with definable communicative function, whether spoken or written, Edmadson in Farida (2003:1).

Brown and Yule (1983:9) specify the meaning of discourse analysis as the study of human use language to communicate in particular, how addresses work on framework deals with the language in use and how it is that language users interpret what other language users intend to convey and what has essential role in the study of language.

The cooperative principle and its maxims in discourse study are often referred to as they provide a lucid description of how listeners (and readers) can distill information from the utterance even though that information has not mentioned outright. Consequently, it refers that conversation or communication can go on smoothly if the cooperative principle is used (Grundy, 2000:23). Moreover, the cooperative principle of conversation stated that participant expect the stage at which it occurs, by accepted purpose or direction of the table exchange (Google: 2006).

Grice in Renkema (1993:11) however have a number of additional comments concerning with the cooperative principle. First, the maxims are only valid for language use. Second, there are, from the esthetic or social point of view. Grice suggests the maxim '*be polite*'. Third, an overabundance of information does not necessarily have to mean that it is this maxim that is being violated, since it can also been as a waste of time and energy and thus as violation of some efficiency principle. Fourth, some maxims are vague. Through this principle, Grice interprets language on the assumption that its senders obey four maxims in their conversation.

Within this principle, Grice in Leech (1983:8) distinguishes four categories that are formulated in basic rules of maxims or popular with Grice's maxims, namely maxims of quantity, maxims of quality, maxims of relevance and maxims of manner. Maxims of quantity occur when the speakers make contribution as informative as is required and do not give much informative than is required. Speakers should tell the contribution as informative as possible; it should be neither too little nor too much. Maxims of quality are speakers' contributions should be as clear as brief and must be on evidence. Speakers should tell the truth; they should not say what they think is false or make statements that they lack on evidence. Maxims of relevance; it should be relevant. We have to make the contribution relevant to the aims of conversation. Maxims of manner; it is to the point, be brief and be orderly.

Although it is always used to communicate in conversation, but not all communication either verbal or nonverbal communication uses Grice's maxims or

this cooperative principle. It may disobey Grice's maxims either one maxim or this cooperative principle. It disobeys Grice's maxim either one maxim or more. It is called by "flouting and hedging maxim". Grice did not, however, assume that all people should constantly follow these maxims. Instead, he found it interesting when these were "flouted" or "violated" (either purposefully or unintentionally breaking the maxims) by speakers, which would imply some other, hidden meaning. The importance was in what was not said (Google: 2007).

In addition, it is flouting when the speaker violates some maxims in producing the utterance in the form of rhetorical strategies, namely tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rhetorical question, and irony. Furthermore, the maxims are hedged when the information is not totally accurate but seem informative, well founded and relevant; moreover the speaker quotes the information from other people.

Wardhaugh (1986:274) acknowledges that in speaking to one another, we make use of sentences, or, to be more precise, utterances. To produce utterances, everyone needs language in communicating with others whenever and wherever they are. Conclusively, language involves a system of arbitrary vocal symbols of human communication (Wardhaugh, 1986:13).

To ensure a smooth communication and harmonious interpersonal relationship in non-hostile social communication, flouting and hedging maxims are used. Those strategies can be applied in both oral and written communication. Anyway, people can communicate orally by many kinds of media; one of them is movie. And movie is one of media to apply verbal communication in form of

conversation among one character to another. Most of movies provide lots of conversation among characters; and thus, it is quite appropriate to investigate phenomena of flouting and hedging maxims in the movie. Thus, the researcher wants to explore the data through movie in studying flouting and hedging maxims.

The object of this study is chosen because of some reasons. The general reason that underlines why the researcher selects this movie is the language used. Besides, an exploratory of some utterances in conversations which give more data in analyzing the phenomena of flouting and hedging maxims is interesting because there were not researcher who researched this field from movie. Further, it is quite appropriate to investigate flouting and hedging maxims field through the apparent context, utterances and setting in order to know how the theory of Grice's Cooperative Principle are applied in the movie.

Comedy is a genre that not provides huge entertainment but also containment. Its jokes and slapsticks can be treated as an approach to deliver entertainment to audiences and its innuendoes have undeniable links to the present historical and social contexts. Comedy movie can be discussed from various perspectives, from psychology, gender, class and history (http://www.wallflowerpress.co.uk/publications/film/film_comedy.html). "Bend It Like Beckham" is one of comedy movies. It includes in a sporty comedy movie which the main character of this movie is Indian; however, she lives in London and her family still hold the original tradition. Besides, the language use in this movie is switched between Indian and English, so it makes new style in producing

or uttering and the way how the main characters state the utterance of language use. There are utterances stated by giving hearer do not understand what the main characters mean. In addition, it earned over 11 million pounds or \$32,543,449 at the UK box office. It has nominated for Golden Globe, and won 17 awards in various categories and events. It also won the British Comedy awards, 2002, in Best Comedy film category. In addition, the film topped the box office charts in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa and won audience favorite film awards at the Locarno, Sydney and Toronto film festivals, and was nominated for Best Film by the European Film Academy and the Best European Film.

Actually the previous researchers have already conducted; the study of discourse has been done by some of university students from many perspectives. This study has relation with the studies done previously conducted Hanifa (2001) who investigated flouting of the felicity conditions of conversational maxims in Oliver Goldsmith's *She Stop The Conquer*, Saifullah (2002) who investigated implicatures on the headlines of the Jakarta Post, Hariyanto (2003) who investigated conversational maxims on the special terms used by Indonesian chatters in IRC Malang channel, and Romlah (2006) who investigated flouting and hedging maxims used by Syaikh Ahmed Deedat and Pastor Stanley Sjoberg in a great open debate "Is Jesus God?".

To distinguish the study with those previous explanations mentioned above, the researcher is interested in investigating flouting and hedging maxims of utterances used in the movie especially the utterances used by the main characters in "Bend It Like Beckham". It is expected that the researcher will give scientific

contribution about how to analyze flouting and hedging maxims in “Bend It Like Beckham”.

1.2 Problems of the Study

With regard to the description above, this research focuses on the following questions:

1. How are the maxims flouted by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”?
2. How are the maxims hedged by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

As stated in the problems of the study, the objectives of this study are:

1. to describe the way maxims are flouted by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”
2. to describe the way maxims are hedged by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study is expected to give valuable contributions theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the findings of this study were expected to be one of the sources in discourse studies especially on the analyzing flouting and hedging maxims spoken language.

Practically, this study is also expected that it would be useful for the teachers and students of UIN Malang, especially those of English Letters and Language Department. It is expected to be one of input in discourse analysis and to give knowledge how to analyze flouting and hedging maxims in spoken language. Therefore, it can be applied in teaching and learning process. The researcher also expects the result of this research can give an important direction for others who are interested in doing similar research in field in the future.

1.5 Scope and Limitation of the Study

This study focuses on analyzing the flouting and hedging maxims that is used by the main characters. There are components dealing with this study. The first is cooperative principle that contains four maxims: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner and maxim of relevant. The second is implicature that is divided into conventional and conversational implicatures. Moreover, conversational implicature is divided into generalized and particularized implicatures. But this study is limited only on studying the flouting and hedging maxims of utterances used by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”.

1.6 Definition of the Key Terms

In order to avoid misunderstanding of the terms used, the researcher states some key terms in this study which are defined as follows:

1. Flouting maxim is that the speaker breaks the maxims when producing the utterance in the form of rhetorical strategies, namely tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rhetorical question and irony.

2. Hedging maxim

Hedging maxim is that the speaker breaks the maxims when the information is not totally accurate but seems informative, well founded and relevant.

3. Implicature

Implicature is anything that is inferred from utterance but it is not a condition for the truth of utterance.

4. Utterances

Utterances are the words spoken by the main characters in *Bend It Like Beckham* movie. They are Jessminder, Joe and Julie

5. ‘Bend It Like Beckham’

“Bend It Like Beckham” is a sporty comedy film which released Premier in UK at April 11th 2002 and directed by Gurinder Chandha. It tells about an origin Indian young girl who wants to be a soccer-player professionally like her hero David Beckham. However, her parents prohibit her and do not let her dream.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the discussion about several theories dealing with the focus of this study that support this study. Those are; Discourse Analysis, discourse analysis is Context and Text, Written and Spoken Discourse, Implicature, Cooperative Principle, Flouting Maxims, Hedging Maxims, The Synopsis of “Bend It Like Beckham” and Previous Study.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Renkema (1993:1) says that discourse studies are the discipline devoted to the investigation of the relationship between form and function in verbal communication. It defines that the investigation of the relationship between forms of communication are statement, question, and the function of communication such as invitation, refusal, complaint etc.

Moreover it states that a discourse is a social text. So when we focus on discourse means that it concerns with ‘talk and texts as parts of social practices (Potter in Alvesson and Scoldberg, 2000:203)

There are many definitions of “Discourse Analysis” and this term is defined in many interpretations. The term discourse analysis was first employed by Zellig Harris in 1952 as the name for ‘a method for the analysis of connected speech (or writing) that is, for ‘continuing descriptive linguistics beyond the limits of a single sentence at a time’, and for ‘correlating “culture” and language’.

Schiffrin (1994:39) states that discourse analysis learns about utterances has to do with what we know about communication and that the produces of discourse analysis can be integrated with our knowledge of communication. Discourse is used for communication: people use utterances to convey information and to lead each other toward an interpretation of meanings and intentions.

Brown and Yule (1983:1) acknowledge that discourse analysis is committed to an investigation of what and how that language is used for. It means that discourse analysis is concern with the language used for communication and how addresses something on linguistic messages by interpreting them to get the goal in communication's purposes. In sum, "*Discourse Analysis*" can be defined with the analysis of language in use.

Discourse analysis (DA) reveals a certain similarity with post structuralism, in that people are assumed inconsistent and language is not seen as reflecting external or internal (mental) conditions. Discourse analysis claims that through language people engage in constructing the social world. There are three aspects to this. First, people actively create accounts on a basis of previously existing linguistic resources. Secondly, they are continually and actively involved in selecting some of the infinite number of words and meaning construction available, and in rejecting others. Thirdly, the chosen construction has its consequences: the mode of expression has an effect, it influences ideas, generates responses and so on. Thus, discourse analysis means studying conversation, interviews statements and other linguistic expression, without drawing any

conclusions that are clearly “beyond” the micro situation constituting the context in question.

Besides, discourse analysis is defined as concerned with the language use beyond the boundaries of a sentence or utterance, concerned with the relationship between language and society, and concern with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication (Stubbs, 1983:3).

Cook (1989:1) suggests that the discourse analysis examines how stretches of language considered in their full contextual, social and psychological context, become meaningful and unified for their users. It means that how the language user employs texts to convey their intended meaning if related with the social and psychological interaction.

The term discourse analysis is very ambiguous. It refers mainly to the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring-connected speech at written discourse. Roughly speaking, it refers to attempt to study larger linguistics units, such as conversational exchanges or written text. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language use social context, and it particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers (Stubbs, 1983:1).

Based on the previous explanations above, understanding the speaker’s intended message is insuperable from understanding the context of situation, which carries it, since both of them are interconnected in communication.

2.2 Context and Text

2.2.1 Context

Discourse analysis is describing text and context all together in the process of communication. Moreover, (Cook, 1989:10) says that context is the unity of discourse with considering the word at large, and it is the influenced by the situation when we receive the messages, cultural and social relationship within the participant, what we know and assume the sender knows.

Further, we can understand the text and context from their utterances is when we want to understand about meaning of utterances. As Cook in Sobur (2001:56) acknowledges that the text is all of the linguistic form not only the printed words but also all the communicative expression, such as speech, music, picture and so on, while context is all of the situation from out of the text which influence the language is produced. That is why the meaning of the text depends on the context carries it. Context decides utterance meaning at three distinguishable grades in an analysis of the text of discourse. First, it will generally, if not always, make clear what sentence has been stated if a sentence has really been uttered. Second, it will generally make clear what proposition has been stated, if proposition has been, if proposition has been stated. Third, it will generally make clear that proposition has been stated with one sort on illocutionary force rather than another, in all of those aspects, context is relevant to the determination of what is said.

Context is provided by a drawing that is intended to constrain subjects' responses to open-ended, descriptive/explanatory questions. It emerges that

quite different notion of context are examined by clinical linguistics studies (Cumming, 2005:255).

Besides, when we use a language, the environments, circumstances and contexts are important aspects, which must be referred (Brown and Yule, 1983:25). It means that context is on the particular occasion, contexts and that speakers are related each other. Moreover, in speech, meaning of the word is not made by language alone. The meaning of the sentence is right when we know the speaker is and who hearer is, that is why we should know the context.

Moreover, Cook (1989:10) states that context is the unity of discourse with considering the word at large, and it is the influenced by the situation when we receive the messages, cultural and social relationship within the participant, what we know and assume the sender knows. In addition, discourse analysis is describing text and context all together in the process of communication.

Brown and Yule (1983:37) remarks that language is only meaningful in its context in situation. Logicians are apt to think of words and propositions as having meaning somehow in them selves, a part from participant in context of situation. Speakers and listeners do not seem to be necessary. Further, Firth suggested that voices should not be entirely dissociated from the social context in which they function and that therefore all texts in modern spoken languages to typical participants in some generalized context of situation.

Firth in Brown and Yule (1983:37) remarks that language is only meaningful in its context in situation. Logicians are apt to think of words and propositions as having meaning somehow in them, a part from participants in context of situation. Speakers and listener do not seem to be necessary. Further, Firth suggested that voices should not be entirely dissociated from the social context in which they function and that therefore all texts in modern spoken language to typical participants in some generalized context of situation.

The difference can also be described in terms of situation. Verbal interaction is a part of shared situation, which includes both speakers and listeners. In such a situation, information is also passed along through means than other language, such as posture, intonation, hand gestures, and etc. moreover, speaker can quickly react to non-verbal reactions on the part of listeners. A written discourse, in other hand, is not part of a shared situation existing between writers and readers.

Sobur (2001:57) states that there are four kinds of context in communication or in the language use that is physical context, epimistic context, linguistic context and social context. Physical context is the place where the conversation happens, the object presented in communication and the action of language users in communication. Then epistemic context refers to the background of knowledge shared by both of the speaker and hearer. Linguistic context consists of utterance under consideration in communication. The last is social context, which means the social relationship

and setting of speaker and hearer. Understanding the context of situation will make the reader or hearer easy in catching the implied message.

2.2.2 Text

Text and context cannot be separated one each other in the study of discourse analysis. Halliday (1992: 13) states that text is a unity of sentence or language that have function in certain context. It refers to all linguistic aspects in written or spoken natural language, i.e. the word used to form the utterance or written text. Text could be a word, a sentence, a paragraph, or a longer stretch of language, in other words any length of words used to create text.

Text is spoken language implemented into written form and discourse or written language can be considered as a text if we analyze them by looking at their relationship between speeches, Ricoeur in Sobur (2001: 53). Moreover, text is a set of sign, which is transmitted from the sender to the receiver through the specific codes. Those codes are interpreted by the receiver to arrive at the speaker's or writer's intended message. Besides, text refers to the record of communicative act (Brown and Yule, 1983: 6).

Text as the linguistic content of utterances: the stable semantic meaning of words, expressions, and sentences but not the inferences available to hearers depending upon the contexts in which words, expressions, and sentences are used. Text provides for the 'what is said' part of utterances; context combines with "what is said" to create an utterance (Schiffrin 1994:379). Although all the approaches to discourse that we discuss are concerned with language and

with the utterance, not all the approaches are explicitly concerned with the text and utterances.

Another definition of text is that it is not more than groups of letters, words and sentences, which use conventional sign system that it can reveal its intended message (Sobur, 2001: 54). Furthermore, sentences are always hang together and interconnected in a text. It means that sentences display some kind of mutual dependence; they are not occurring at random. It must be coherent as well as cohesive that the concept and relationships expressed should be relevant to each other, thus enabling us to make plausible inferences about the underlying meaning, since the meaning of the text is conveyed not by single sentences but by more complex exchanges in which participant's beliefs and expectation, the knowledge they share about each other and about the world and the situation in which they interact, play a crucial part.

A text consists of structured sequenced of linguistic expression or constitutive rules. It means that a text should provide a list of constitutive rules by which a text is brought into being and is read as a text. It should consider the cohesion (how to clauses hold together), coherence (how do the propositions hold together), intentionality (why did the speaker/writer produce this), acceptability (how does the reader take it), informativity (how does it tell us), relevance (what is text for) and intertextuality (what other texts does this one resemble). So a text is a structured sequence of linguistic expression forming a unitary whole (Edmondson, 1981: 4).

2.3 Written and Spoken Discourse

Both written and oral communication include in discourse. In other word, written and oral communication are parts of discourse. However, there are differences between spoken and written discourse. Wallace Chafe in Renkema (1993: 86) argued that there are two distinguished factors between spoken and oral there are two factors, which explain the differences between spoken or oral and written discourse.

Two factors explain the differences between written discourse and verbal communication:

1. Writing takes longer than speaking. 2. Writers do not have contact with readers. *The first factor* is responsible for what Chafe calls integration in written language as opposed to the fragmentation that supposedly takes place in verbal interaction. This integration is achieved through, among other things, the use of subordinate conjunctions. These coordinate conjunctions occur more often in written language than they do in verbal interaction. *The second factor* is responsible for the detachment from reading public in written language as opposed to the involvement that is present with verbal interaction. Speakers and listeners are more involved in communication than writers and readers. This express it self, according to Chafe, in references to the participants in the conversation and comments on the topic of conversation. That the involvement in written language is not a great as made clear, among other things, by the more frequent use of the passive voice in which the person who is acting remains in the background.

A spoken language is a human natural language in which the words are uttered through the mouth (Wikipedia: 2007).

Generally, written and spoken language is quite different functions in society have been forcefully. Then in everyday communication, spoken language plays a greater role than writing in terms of the amount of information conveyed. In addition, spoken language is always the way in which every native speaker acquires his mother tongue, and writing is learned and taught later when he goes

to school. For modern linguistics, spoken language reveals many true features of human speech while written language is only "revised" record of speech. Thus, their data for investigation and analysis are mostly drawn from everyday speech, which they regard as authentic.

2.4 Implicature

The term "implicature" is used to account for the distinction between what is said and what is implicated by a speaker. Grice in Brown and Yule (1983:31) stated implicature is used to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as a distinct from what a speaker literally says. So, the speaker does not directly utter what the speaker intends to. The speaker tends to make certain utterance, that contain implied meaning and the listener can understand it.

Furthermore, Yule (1996:36) adds that implicature is a primary example of more being communicated than is said, but in order for them to be interpreted, some basic Cooperative Principle must be assumed first to be in operation. Implicature is inductive inference which the hearer draws, and may therefore be cancelled (Grundy, 2000:81). An implicature is a result of an addressee drawing an inductive inference as to the likeliest meaning the give in context. It is caused when someone is trying to tell us something, it will give rise to quite different implicature from that inferred. For example: "*Do you have any T-shirt on you?*" It means, "*I do not have any T-shirt, can I borrow any T-shirt from you?*"

Grice in Brown and Yule (1983:32) also divides implicature into two kinds of implicatures, they are *conventional implicature* and *non-conventional*

implicature (conversational implicature). Conventional implicature is non-truth conditional inferences that are not derived from super ordinate pragmatics principles like the maxims, but are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expression. For example, when our children once choose of toothpaste on the grounds that it had colored stripes in it and the legend on the tube said, “*actually fight decay*”. The lexical item “*actually*” has a literal meaning or entailment – it means in reality or actuality, because it is closely associated with the particular lexical item, so, it can be said as conventional implicature (Grundy, 2000:84).

In addition, he distinguishes conversational implicature into *generalized* and *particularized conversational implicatures*. He asserts that generalized conversational implicature is implicature that arises without any particular context or special scenario being necessary (Levinson, 1992:126). Besides, Grundy (2000:81-82) states that generalized conversational implicature arises irrespective of the context in which it occurs and it has little nothing do with the most relevant understanding of an utterance; it derives entirely from the maxims, typically from inferable without reference to a special context. As an example whenever I say (1) I shall be taken to implicate (1a): (1) “*I walked into a house*”. (1a) “*the house was not my house*”.

In contrast with the generalized conversational implicature, particularized conversational implicature do require such specific context. It means that conversational implicature is derivable only in a specific context (context-bounded). Besides, all implicatures that arise from the maxims of relevance are

particularized for utterances are relevant only with respect to the particular topic or issue at hand. In addition, most of the exploitation or flouting maxims can be categorized as particularized implicature (Levinson, 1992:126). For example, the sentence in (2) will only implicature (2a) if (2) occurs in particular sort of setting illustrated in (2b): (2) *"The dog is looking very happy"*. (2a) *"Perhaps the dog has eaten the roast beef"*. (2b) A: *"What has happened to the roast beef?"* B: *"The dog is looking very happy"*.

In sum, those implicatures have a special importance for linguistic theory since it is in particular will be hard to distinguish from the semantic content of linguistic expression in all ordinary contexts.

2.5 Cooperative Principle

We should concern with many factor, such as our hearer, what contextually appropriate topics, how to open, to maintain and close our communication in arriving an effective communication. It requires the cooperative situation between speaker and hearer. The idea that successful communicate proceed according a principle, known and applied by all human being, was first also proposed *Herbert Paul Grice*. He described the principles as the Cooperative Principle. Grice's cooperative principle is set of norms expected in conversation (Google: 2007).

The success of a conversational depends on speakers' approaches to the interaction. Thus, one of the most basic assumptions we must make in getting communication successfully. The way how people try to make conversations

work is called by a cooperative principle. The Cooperative Principle is enunciated as the following way: 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 (Finegan, 2004: 300).

The conversational convention or well-known as maxims supported this principle is as follows: Concerning with his Cooperative Principle, Grice in Leech (1983:8) divided a set of maxims related with what should be said in conversation and how it should be said. This pact of cooperation touches on four areas of communication, each of which can be described as a maxim or general principle. Then, Grice in Grundy (2000:74) divided cooperative principle into four basic conversational maxims. Those are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation and maxim of manner. It is similar with the statement of Brown and Yule (1983:32):

The conversational convention or well-known as maxims, which support this principle are as follows: Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as is required (for current purposes of the exchange). Do not make your contribution more informative than is required; Quality: Do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence; Relation: Be relevant; Manner: Be perspicuous; Avoid obscurity of expression; Avoid ambiguity; be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity); and be orderly.

Speakers shape their utterances to be understood by hearers. Grice analyses cooperation as involving four maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Speakers give enough and not too much information: quantity. They are genuine and sincere, speaking "truth" or facts: quality. Utterances are relative to the context of the speech: relation. Speakers try to present meaning clearly and concisely, avoiding ambiguity: manner.

In speaking, people speak something based on the reality although it is difficult and it must be based on the fact. It means that it is based on the context. As stated on “Islamic wise word”, which states that **مرا ولو كان لحق اقل**.

However, some people sometime speak do not base on the reality. There are some reasons why people tend to use maxims; these maxims allow us to be briefer and simply in communicating, since we do not need to say everything we would need to if we were being perfectly logical (we don't say “Aan has 4 and only 4 books). Besides, they allow us to say things indirectly to avoid some of the discomfort which comes from saying unpleasant things directly. They also allow us to insult or deride people indirectly without as much danger of confrontation. They allow us too to imply dissatisfaction or anger without putting us in a position where we will have to directly defend our views. One of the main uses of the maxims, aside from describing how communication generally takes place, is to signal the presence of indirect speech. (<http://www.ling.ohio-state.edu/~kdk/201/spring02/slides/pragmatics2-4up.pdf>).

2.5.1 Maxims of Quantity

A contribution should be as informative as is required for the conversation to proceed. It should be neither too little, nor too much. 1) Make your contribution as informative as is required; 2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required. Quantity: speaker is as informative as required

The maxims of quantity provides that, in normal circumstances, speakers say just enough, that they supply no less information –and no more– than is necessary for the purpose of the communication: *Be appropriate informative* (Finegan, 2004:300). It is not how one can decide what quantity of information satisfies the maxim in given case. We usually assume that people tell us everything or information we need to know. When they do say anything, then we assume they simply do not know that information. For example: When Father just came home from the office, his son –Joe– asked him to help his son doing homework, but directly Father answered: “I’m tired”. From father’s answer, Joe understood that his father did not help him doing the homework. The kind of this answer fulfills the maxim of quantity because it is informative and implicitly tells the refusal to play without telling much information.

2.5.2 Maxims of Quality

Maxims of quality can be defined be as truthful as required. It means that speakers should tell the truth and they should not say what they think is false, or make statements for which they lack on evidence. 1) Do not say what you believe to be false, i.e. “do not lie”; 2) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence, i.e. “do not say things which you cannot back up.” Quality: speaker tells the truth or provable by adequate evidence.

Besides, in Ali’s short saying is stated that

نه لسا راء و الاحمك قلب و قلبه وراء قل العالسان . It means that when a wise man wants to express something. First of all, it refers to the heart (as a center of emotion) and mind weighing the meaning and good or point in what someone's wishes to express. The wise person uses his heart and mind prior to using his tongue. Thus, someone will speak truth. They speak the truth and they should not say what they think is false, or make statements for which they lack on evidence.

In maxims of quality, speakers and writers are expected to say only what they believe to be true and to have evidence for what they say. Again, the other side of the coin is that speakers are aware of this expectation; they know that hearers expect them to honor the *maxim of quality*. Without the maxims of quality, the other maxims are of little value or interest. Whether brief or lengthy, relevant or irrelevant, orderly or disorderly, all lies are false. Still, it should be noted that the maxim of quality applies principally to assertion and certain other representative speech acts. For example:

- a) Most of the tenth class students of MAN I Malang always getting bad marks for their Physics test. So, they have some difficulties in this subject. Then, it can be proved that the statement below is true: "*Physics is difficult*" Being assumed to be well founded gives rise to the implicature, the speaker believes or has evidence that it is. So, it fulfills the maxim of quality.
- b) Anne is one of Oxford University students who will join Debate Competition next week. She knew that on Monday the rules of competition

were announced, but she cannot attend because she is sick. Then, she asks her friend who will also join this competition. So, it is true when she asks: “What are the rules?” It fulfills the maxim of quality since it is assumed to be a sincere question, gives rise to the implicature that the speaker does not know, has wanting to know and thinks the addressee does know.

2.5.3 Maxims of Relation

Maxims of relation or maxims of relevance mean make what you say bare on the issue at hand. In addition, it means that the utterance must be relevant which the topic being discussed. Speakers’ contribution should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange, it should be relevant. Relation: response is relevant to topic of discussion. Finegan (2004:301) stated that this maxim directs speakers their utterances in such a way that they are relevant to ongoing context: *Be relevant at the time of the utterance*. For example:

Nikita : “Where is my fried chicken?”

Jane : “The cat looks happy there”

Any competent speaker knows that Jane means something like “in answer to your question is that the chicken has been eaten by the cat.” Certainly, she does not say that –we work it out on the basis, first, that what she says is relevant to what she has been asked. If mentioned the cat, then the cat must be some kind of answers. This perhaps the most utterly indispensable and foundational assumption we make about the talk we hear– that it is relevant to what has immediately gone before. Thus, it fulfills the maxim of relation.

2.5.4 Maxims of Manner

Maxims of manner; it is to the point, be brief, be concise, be perspicuous and be orderly. These maxims relate to the form of speech we use. Speakers should not use words they know but their listeners do not understand or say something, which they could be taken multiple ways. Speakers should not state anything in a long, drawn-out way if they could say it much simpler manner. Being an orderly representation of the world give raises the implicature. It is classified as maxims of manner since the information is clear, brief and avoids obscurity and ambiguity. Manner: speaker's avoids ambiguity or obscurity, is direct and straightforward. Besides, it is *be orderly and clear* Finegan (2004:301). For example:

On Dave's party, his friends planned to give a present for him. Then, they gathered to collect their presents and put them on a box as well they wrapped it. But they got a trouble to decorate it, because all of them were boys and there was only a girl, Donna.

John : "Is there anyone who can make this present looks good?"

Donna : "I can do it."

Donna's statement or *I can do it* shows that she can decorate the present and does not do other things. It implies that she is a girl; and girls usually like to decorate and make something looks beautiful. So, the statement above fulfills the maxim of manner because it is brief and ambiguous.

In short, these four maxims (Quantity, Quality, Relevance and Manner) are powerful because they make conversation easier. These maxims keep the

conversation flowing because we assume that they are being applied by speakers, more or less. Moreover, these help us to express ourselves briefly without fear of being misunderstood. The maxims of the cooperative principle can be used to describe how participants in a conversation derive implicature (Renkema, 1993:10). As well Cook (1989:29-30) acknowledges that using this assumption, combined with general knowledge of the world, the receiver can reason from the literal, semantic meaning of what is said to the pragmatic meaning and induce what the sender is intending to do his or her words. When we talk about people following the cooperative principle, it does not mean that they can consciously and explicitly formulate it to themselves. It means that people often act as though they know the rules of grammar, in fact, there are very few people can even begin to formulate them and nobody can formulate them completely.

From explanation mentioned above, we can conclude that although it is very difficult to obey and use all of the cooperative principles and its maxims in uttering or writing the sentences, but it is essential to follow the cooperative principle and its maxims in order that the language user it more effectively in communication.

2.6 Flouting Maxims

Grice in Grundy (2000:75) states that Maxims of Quantity are: firstly, make your contribution as informative as it required (for the purposes the exchange); secondly, do not make your contribution more informative than it required (Grundy, 2000: 74). Therefore, each participant's contribution to

conversation should be just as informative as it requires; it should not be less informative or more informative. And say as much as helpful but not more informative or less informative. For example:

“The students are making progress”

Being all the information that the speaker provides gives rise to the implicature that the students are not doing brilliantly. This example is classified as Maxims of Quantity because the contribution is informative as is required, not more or less informative.

Maxims are the basic assumption, not rules and they can be broken. It is usual case in which someone is disobeying some maxims, but it is not done so purposefully with the intention that the hearer recognizes that a maxim is being disobeyed. However, Grice distinguishes between the speaker successfully obey the rule and the one breaking the maxims such as by lying, which he termed flouting or hedging maxims and overtly breaking them for some linguistic effect, which he call as Flouting maxims. Moreover, flouting maxims describe as situation in which a maxim is being deliberately disobeyed with the intention that the hearer recognized that is the case ([http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/~Mind Dict/grice.html](http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/~MindDict/grice.html)). It means that the speaker violates some maxims; therefore the listener must conclude the violation was purposeful.

There are four criteria which determine the flouting of each maxim, they are:

- 1) A speaker flouts the maxim of quantity when his contribution is not informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchange and more informative than is required.
- 2) A speaker flouts the maxim of quality when his contribution is not true and he says something for which lacks adequate evidence.
- 3) A speaker flouts the maxim of relation if his contribution is not relevant.
- 4) A speaker flouts the maxim of manner if contribution is not perspicuous it may be obscure, ambiguous and disorderly
(<http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/~Mind Dict/grice.html>).

Flouting of maxim is results of the speaker conveying, in addition to the literal meaning which is conversational implicature (Brown and Yule, 1989:32). Furthermore, it is still has an implicature to save the utterance from simply appearing to be a faulty contribution to a conversation in spite of disobeying Grice's maxims. As Grundy (Grundy, 2000: 78) states Flouting a maxims is a particularly salient way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an implicature, thus there is a trade-off between abiding by maxims.

For example:

"Well, it is a university".

This sentence tells us that addresses will try to work out of what he or she is intending to convey, in addition to the information that already known to term (i.e. that we are in university) perhaps that there is no part in complaining since what the complainant has noticed to be expected.

Flouting maxims usually can be found on Tautology, Metaphor, Overstatement, Understatement, Rhetorical question and irony (Grundy, 2000: 76-77). The detailed description is as follows:

2.6.1 Tautology

A statement which true by its own definition, and is therefore fundamentally uninformative is called by tautology. Logical tautologies use circular reasoning within an argument. Tautology is saying of the same thing more than once in different ways without making one's meaning clearer or more forceful (Hornby, 1995: 1224). A statement as "*Women are women*" is an example of tautology. It conveys no information if taken literally and thus implicates more than the words themselves. Women are a special people in life. They have special characteristic that did not own by men. The speaker cannot explain what the definition of women is because it is difficult to explain it. Based on this definition, the example is classified as tautology since there is repetition of word that is the word "*women*".

Based on the definition, the example is classified as tautology because there is repetition of word that is the word "*to pay*". Tautology usually flouts the maxim of quantity. But uttering a tautology, speaker encourages listener to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance, it may be an excuse (Goody: 225). For example: (a) "*War is war*" (b) "*Boys will be boys*". It is also tautology because there are repetitions of words. Tautology may be a criticism, for example: "*Your clothes belong where your clothes*

belong, my clothes belong where my clothes belong-look upstairs". Moreover, tautologies serve similar function, for example a refusal of request: "*If I will not give it, I will not (C.I. I mean it)*", or complain, for example: "*If it is as a road, it is a road! (C.I. Boy, what a terrible road!)*".

2.6.2 Metaphor

Metaphor is one of the most frequent violations of Grice's conversational principles. We use metaphor words to indicate something different from the literal meaning. In metaphor a word which in literal usage denotes one kind of things. For example: "*Money does not grow on trees but in blossom at our branches (Lioy's Bank Advertisement)*". This example uses symbolic; therefore the listener must conclude what is implied meaning from his utterance.

Besides, metaphor is the imaginative use of word or phrase to describe something as another object in order to show that they have the same qualities and make the description more forceful (Hornby, 1995: 734), e.g. "*She has a heart of stone*". Another example that is categorized as metaphor is from Holy Kur'an; it is Ar-rum: 19. It states that

الارض ويحي الحي من الميت ويخرج الميت من الحي يخرج
(19: الروم) تخرجون كذلك و بعد موتها

"It is He who brings out the living from the dead, and brings out the dead from the living, and who lives life to the earth after it is dead; and thus shall ye be brought out (from the dead)"

Metaphors are further category of quality violations, for metaphor is literally false. The use metaphor is perhaps usually on record, but there is possibility that exactly which of the connotations of the speaker intends may be of record (Goody: 227). For example: “*Harry is a real fish*”. It means that he drinks or swims or is cold blooded like a fish.

Based on the definitions, the examples above are classified as metaphor because are not the real condition but it use symbolic.

2.6.3 Overstatement

The opposite of understatement is overstatement. Overstatement is expression or stated of one’s too strongly (Hornby, 1995: 829). It means that the speaker says more than is necessary that violating the maxim of quality. In another way, he may also convey implicatures. He may do this by the inverse of the understatement principle that is by exaggerating on choosing a point on a often lie far beyond what is said scale which is higher than the actual state of affair. For examples:

- (1) “*Now we have all been screwed by the cabinet (Sun headline)*”
- (2) “*There were a million people in the room tonight*”

These examples are classified as overstatement because use exaggeration statements (*we have all, a million people*); therefore, the information are more informative.

Moreover, overstatement also conveys an excuse for being late and it could an apology for not getting in touch, for example: I try to call a hundred

times, but there was never any answers. It is also could convey the relevant criticisms, for examples: (1) *“you never do the washing up”*. (2) *“Why are you always smoking?”*. Furthermore, if the speaker wishes to convey an off record sarcasm he might use over statement as a trigger for the appropriate implicatures (Goody: 225). For example: *“Oh no, John, we never meant to cause you any trouble. Nothing could have been further from our minds. I cannot imagine how you could come to that conclusion. It is out of question”*. This example also exaggerated statement because the speaker gives more informative information.

2.6.4 Understatement

In Understatement, the statement is less informative or too economical so it is not informative (Hornby, 1974: 940). Understatement is one way of generating implicatures by saying less than is required. Typical ways of constructing understatement are to choose a point on a scalar predicate (*e.g. tall, good, nice*) that is well below the point that actually describes the state of affairs (Goody: 222). Besides, Hornby (1995: 1299) states that understatement is a statement that expresses an idea, etc in a very weak way. For examples:

(1) *“This is not a man who would have been a natural member of the Liberal Democrats (Paddy Ashdown, farmer leader of the Liberal Democrats. Following the death of the Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping. Today BBC Radio 4)”*.

(2) A: *“What do you thing of Harry?”*

B: "Nothing wrong with him (C.I. I do not particularly like it)".

Those examples are classified as understatement because the speakers give less informative statement.

Understatement can be in the form of:

- (1) Accepting a complement, for example: A: *"What a marvelous place you have been here?"* B: *"Oh, I do not know it is a place"*.
- (2) Insult, for example: A: *"I do indeed come from Scotland, but I cannot help it..."*, B: *"That, Sir, I find, is what a very great many of your countrymen can not help"*.
- (3) Accepting an offer, for example: A: *"Have another drink?"* B: *"I do not mind if I do"*. All of the examples above give less informative information (Goody: 224).

2.6.5 Rhetorical Question

In Rhetorical question, one asked only to produce an effect or make a statement rather than to get an answer (Hornby, 1995: 1008). In other word, it is one that requires no answer because the answer is obvious and does not need be stated. The speaker (of the rhetorical question) is not looking for an answer but it is making some kind of point, as in an argument (<http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/rhetorical-question.html>).

For example:

"Who cares?"

“How many times do I have to call you?”, (I have called you many times, but you were not there).

Those are classified as rhetorical question because the speaker does not expect the answer from the hearers.

Sometimes the rhetorical question is evidenced only in sequencing.

Rhetorical question usually uses the words that help to force the interpretation of questions (to push them on record), such as just event, ever (Goody, 1996: 229). For example: A: *“Did he even or ever come to visit me once while I was in hospital?”* B: *“Just why would I have done that?”*

2.6.6 Irony

Irony is the expression of one’s meaning by saying the direct opposite of what one is thinking but using tone of voice to indicate one’s real meaning. (Hornby, 1995: 632). By saying the opposite of what he means, again violation of quality maxims speaker can directly convey his intended meaning, if there are clues that is intended meaning is being conveyed indirectly (Goody: 226). It means irony refers to the sense of difference between what is asserted and what is actually the case. Verbal irony is a statement in which the implicit meaning intended by the speaker differs from what he ostensibly asserts. Moreover, irony is closely related to understatement (Kenney, 1966: 71). For example:

(a). *“The world is most exiting politician (said of the unglamorous Bob Dole, the Republican Candidate in the 1996 American Presidential Election)”*.

(b). *“John is the real genius (after john has done stupid things in a row)”*.

Based on the definition, these examples are classified as irony because the speakers said the opposite not the real condition.

2.7 Hedging Maxims

The maxims are hedged when the information given is not completely accurate except seems informative, well founded, as well as relevant. The information is taken by quoting from other person opinion. Besides, the maxims hedges or intensifiers are that none of them adds truth-value to the utterances to which they are attached. This confirms that the hedges and intensifiers are more comment in the extent to which the speaker abiding by the maxims, which guided our conversational contribution than a part of what is said or conveyed (Grundy, 2000: 79). For example:

“They say smoking damage your health”.

The speaker is not taking full responsibility for the truth of his utterance that is suggested as quality hedges. In addition, it quality hedges that weaken speaker’s commitment may redress advice or for making promises. *“He says that experience is the best teacher”*. *He says* would be understood as a hedge on the maxim of quality and would serve as a warning to the addressee that the information from the speaker might not be as well founded as normally expected.

However, quantity hedges may be used to redress requests; for example, “*All I know living in the village is good for our health*”. By prefacing it with *all I know*, the speaker simultaneously advises the addressee that the quantity of information being conveyed is limited. Relevance hedges are useful ways of redressing offers or suggestion. For an example: “*Where do you go by the way?*”. *By the way* here shows that what the speaker has just said is not as relevant at the stage at which it occurs in the conversation as he is entitled to expect. Manner hedges can be used to redress all kinds of FTA; for example, “*I’m afraid to kill him if you see what I mean*”. “*If you see what I mean*” hedges the maxim of manner that in order to advise us of the obscurity of her utterance. There are some expressions that sometimes speaker used, such as *I absolutely, they say, It seems, as I remember, as you and I both know, by the way, well, etc.*

The speaker may ‘opt out’ the maxim expectations by using expressions; such ‘No comment’ or ‘My lips are sealed’ in response to a question in conversation. An interesting aspect of such expressions is that, they are naturally interpreted as communicating more than is said (i.e. the speaker knows the answer) even though they are typically not ‘as informative as is required’ in the context. This typical reaction (i.e. there must be something ‘special’ here) of listeners to any apparent violation of the maxims is actually the key to the notion of conversational implicature (Yule, 2000: 39).

2.8 The Synopsis of “Bend It Like Beckham”

This movie told about a kaleidoscope of color and culture clash humorously as an Indian family in London tried to raise their soccer-playing daughter in a traditional way. There were some actors and actresses who played and supported “Bend It Like Beckham”. They were Jonathan Rhys-Meyers as Joe, Parminder K. Nagra as Jess, Keira Knightley as Julie, Anupam Kher as Jess’ father, Archie Panjabi, Shaznay Lewis, Frank Harper, Juliet Stevenson, Shaheen Khan, Ameet Chana, Poojah Shah, Paven Virk, Preeya Kalidas, Trey Farley, Saraj Chaudhry.

The main character is one who influences the whole story. There were three main characters that hold important action in this movie; they were Jess, Jules and Joe. Anyway, the main characters of “Bend It Like Beckham” were friends and they had similar hobby, that was playing football.

Unlike tartly elder sister, Pinky, who was preparing for an Indian wedding and a lifetime of cooking the perfect chapatti, Jess dream was to play soccer professionally like her hero David Beckham. Wholeheartedly against Jess unorthodox ambition, her parents eventually revealed that their reservations had more to do with protecting her than with holding her back. When Jess was forced to make a choice between tradition and her beloved sport, her family must decide whether to let her chase her dream...and a soccer ball. However, after she knew Julie who always gave her support to reach her impossible dream, Jess got spirit to make her dream came true. And she was asked to join Jules’ team. By this team, she played football on some big tournaments.

Her dream was also supported by her coach “Joe”. He never interested in her foot-play at the first time, but after he saw how Jess played football as well as David Beckham, he welcomed Jess to join the club that he coach. Then he was interested to know more about Jess and her family. Finally, he fell in love with Jess.

Their relationship had been broken because of Jules’ jealousy. She was jealous with Jess. Although Joe and Jules made a relationship and Jules fell in love with Joe but they did not make a commitment for their relationship. Fortunately, their relationship became in a peace because of football tournament.

Lastly, both of Jess and Julie went to Santa Clara to join girl team which is coached by Joe. But in the end of their war/tournament, he could not join them to Santa Clara as a couch because he was a couch to a boy team in London.

2.9 Previous Studies

The study of discourse has been investigated by some of university students from many perspectives. Djatmiko (1993) investigated the Shakespeare’s Othello and found that violated the maxims mostly Othello and Desdimona employ only a few violations of the maxims and cooperative especially in their last discourse before the one. In which the murdered take place, but he did not analyze flouting and hedging maxims in detail.

Besides, Tambunan (1999) investigated the application of cooperative principle in Poem and Novels as reading material for the students of SLTA (High School). The writer of the novel intentionally did not fulfill Grice’s cooperative

principle called the flouting maxims. The writer mostly flouted the maxim of quality by presenting imaginative information and illogical event in order to (1) Encourage his reader' durable interested in reading it; (2) Create funnies; (3) Create a surprising situation of his readers; and (4) Implicit meaning.

Hanifa (2001) investigated the flouting of the felicity conditions of conversational maxims in Oliver Goldsmith's *She Stoops The Conquer*. She found that the flouting of the felicity conditions cover the flouting of the preparatory rule, the sincerity rule and the essential rule on the act of stating or giving information, the act of requesting or ordering, questioning, advising and promising. She also found that the flouting of two rules of conversations has function to (1) develop ridiculous plot, (2) provide the readers of drama with the amusing situation, (3) keep the readers to read it, and (4) criticize the existing habit.

Saifullah (2002) investigated the implicatures on the headline of the Jakarta Post could be particularized and generalized implicature. Generalized implicature was used when the information being conveyed was clear, brief, in chronological oral and no context was required by reader to understand the information in the headlines. Furthermore, particularized implicature found when the journalist did not give the clarity, brevity, sufficiency and information to the readers. So, the context was required by the readers to understand the journalist's intended messages. He also found that the maxims in the headlines of the Jakarta Post could be flouted and hedged.

Hariyanto (2003) investigated the use of conversational maxims on the special terms used by Indonesian Chatters in IRC Malang Channel. In his study, maxims on the special terms were hedged and flouted the maxims for the Beginner Chatters. The special terms were abbreviations or short messages. He flouted the maxims when these terms were sent to the beginner chatters and these special terms were hedged the maxims when the chatters sent less information of the messages on the special terms. He found that maxim of manner and maxim of quantity are often flouted and hedged in the conversational text chatters often repeat the messages and emoticons to their partner or provided uninformative responses or messages.

Rusdiana (2004) investigated flouting and hedging maxims on comic strip “Born Loser” in the *Jakarta Post* newspaper. She stated that the maxims were flouted when they were overtly broken by the speakers in the utterances of comic strip “Born Loser” such as producing the utterances in the form of rhetorical strategies; namely; tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rhetorical question and irony. Moreover, the maxims were hedged when the utterances that produced were not totally accurate, invalid whether the information was right or wrong, thus there was no responsibility for the truth of the utterances.

Those previous studies were used by the researcher as sources and to compare her study. Here, the researcher investigates that exaggerated statement is used maxims were flouted when they were overtly broken by the main characters’ utterance of “Bend It Like Beckham” such as tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rethorical question and irony. Maxims of quantity itself is flouted

when the utterances are overstatement. Besides, rethorical question in the main characters' utterance do not use "wh" question or ungrammatically.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

There are two possibilities that we use in conducting the research method, they are quantitative and qualitative research methodology. This study uses descriptive methodology since it analyzes the data in form of words descriptively based on flouting and hedging maxims found in movie. In this chapter, the researcher will discuss some sections; they are Research Design, Research Subject, Data Source, Research Instrument, Data Collection, Data Analysis and Triangulation.

3.1 Research Design

The descriptive qualitative method is used to conduct this research design of this study. The data are in the forms of utterances and the data are analyzed how the maxims are flouted and hedged by the main characters in *Bend It Like Beckham* movie descriptively based on the Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle, especially how the maxims are flouted used by the main characters in "Bend It Like Beckham" and how are the maxims hedged used by main characters in "Bend It Like Beckham". To arrive at the objectives, then the rich description of data is unavoidably needed.

3.2 Research Subject

The research subjects concern with flouting and hedging maxims produced by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham” movie. It deals with utterances are the subjects of this research.

3.3 Data Source

The researcher uses “Bend It Like Beckham” movie as data source, while the data are the main characters’ utterances which use flouting and hedging maxims. In the movie, the researcher focuses only on the main characters’ utterances. Besides, she investigates the utterances produced the main characters from the first scene up to the last of the movie and gathered them from “Bend It Like Beckham” movie which merely consists of flouting and hedging maxims. In the purpose of achieving a deep analysis and understanding on the flouting and hedging maxims in “Bend It Like Beckham” movie based on Grice’s theory of Cooperative Principle.

3.4 Research Instrument

Research instrument is important to obtain the data of this study for it is a set of methods, which used to collect the data. Here, the researcher is the main instrument of this research because it is impossible analyzing the data directly as well without any interpretation from the researcher herself. Moreover, the researcher needs other instruments, such as: watching the movie and reading script of the movie.

3.5 Data Collection

To collect the data, the following steps are done: First, investigating the data from Bend It Like Beckham movie. The researcher collects the data by watching the movie from the beginning up to the end to know how frequent the data were presented. Second, transcribing the data of utterances produced by the main characters in Bend It Like Beckham movie into written text. It is intended to make the data available to be analyzed. The next, understanding the data, which have been transcribed. The last, selecting the data which contain of flouting and hedging maxims.

3.6 Data Analysis

After obtaining the data, the data are analyzed into the following steps, namely; first, finding the context of utterances produced by the main characters; second, categorizing the data accordance with the flouting and hedging maxims; third, discussing the data from each category based on the Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle; fourth, discussing the whole data and continuing by making conclusion from the result of analysis to find out the answers of the research questions.

3.7 Triangulation

To check the validity of the data, the researcher uses triangulation. It is the way to check the validity of data by using other thing outside the data to check and compare them. The use of multiple lines of sight is frequently called

triangulation (Berg, 1989:4). Besides, it is used to increase one's understanding of whatever is being investigated to get the data validity from the field of research.

In this study, the researcher uses the triangulation of the data because there are some idiomatic and imageries expressions of utterances that need to be discussed with the experts by interviewing the English lecturer that is Drs. Nur Salam, M.Pd who has capability in Discourse Analysis especially in analyzing flouting and hedging maxims to obtain the validity of the data.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the research findings and discussion. In this chapter, the analysis of the data is done in line with the formulated research questions. The data are analyzed based on Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle particularly its maxims, namely; maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevant and maxim of manner. To answer the problems, the data are classified into flouting and hedging maxims. Flouting means that the speaker breaks the maxims when producing the utterance in the form of rhetorical strategies, namely; tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rhetorical question and irony. In addition, hedging maxims means that the information is not totally accurate but seems informative, well founded, and relevant. As the next part, the discussion is done which is geared toward deriving conclusion.

4.1 Research Findings

There are some data obtained from the utterances of the main characters in "Bend It Like Beckham" when are uttering conversation with other character that can be classified into flouting and hedging maxims. Those are as follows:

Data 1:

Jess: *"Mum, do I have to go shopping again?"*

Mum: "My mother chose all my dowry suit herself I never complained"

Context:

This utterance is stated by Jess when she is asking to her mother what she must do. She enjoys her day in the bedroom while her mum asks her to help, but her mum does not instruct her to buy something but just help. However, factually, she has known what happens and what she has to do after her mother states that makes Jess deliver rhetoric question.

When the speaker is asking to her mother, she states: "*Mum, do I have to go shopping again?*". She uses a rhetoric question signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition. Therefore, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is "*do not say what you believe to be false*".

Data 2:

Jess: "I nearly scored from yards today"
"Bent it and everything"
"I could have played all night"
"It's not fair that boys never have to come and help"
"If I had an arranged marriage, *would he let me play football?*"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is saying about her hobby on football and her future. She hopes that she will be allowed by her husband to keep on playing football and supporting her. When she is laying in the bedroom, her father comes then. He asks her to help him.

When the speaker is uttering the statement, she states the utterance “*would he let me play football?*”. It signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition.

Data 3:

Jess' Friend: “Go on. Lover boy's calling you!”

Jess: “*You know he's just my mate; we're not all slags like you lot!*”

Context:

This statement is stated by Jess when she is delivering her statement to her friend in yard where she and friends usually play angrily with high intonation to convey their friends that she does not have a special relationship with Tony.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement in delivering his opinion, which makes the information too or more informative than what is required or it is categorized as overstatement by saying “...*You know he just my mate, we’re not all slags like you lot!*” Actually, the speaker is enough to say, “*You know he just my mate,*” because it seems informative. However, in this utterance, the speaker adds the utterance by saying “*We’re not all slags like you lot!*” to strengthen his opinion being conveyed. Therefore, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”.

Data 4:

Jules: “*I wasn’t whining!*”. “*There was nothing for us girls*”
“*There was junior boy stuff, but when he busted his knee, he set up a girls’ side and he’s been on my case ever since!*” “They made me start at the bottom”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jules. She is saying, “*I wasn’t whining!*”.

“*There was nothing for us girls*”, what Jules says about how her feeling in the past. However, her statements are added by other statements that convey her statement, so that Joe gets more information than is required.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement to convey her statement, which makes her statement more informative than what is required or it is indicated as overstatement by saying the word “*I wasn’t*

whining!”. “*There was nothing for us girls*”. Actually, the speaker is enough to say the utterance without adding the word “*I wasn’t whining!*”. “*There was nothing for us girls*” but she says it to give. Therefore, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly stated and make an ambiguity without knowing the context.

Data 5:

Joe: “You can’t get much lower than her!”

Jules: “*You’re so full of it*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jules when she responds Joe’s statement about her skill of football in yard or their exercise’s place. She has better skill than Jules. However she disagrees with him, because she is new player and just demonstrate her skill in order to be received in his team. She states “*You’re so full of it*” in stating her utterance to Joe.

The word “*You’re so full of it*” invites an implicature that it is hedged by the speaker because this utterance is not totally accurate which make the information is less informative than what is required because it makes the listeners don’t understand what is the word “*You’re so full of it!*” means, without knowing the context. Therefore, the speaker overtly hedged the first maxim of quantity that

is “*make your contribution as informative as is required*”. Moreover, this utterance is also not clearly stated what the utterance means and creates an ambiguity. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly stated and make an ambiguity without knowing the context.

Data 6:

Jules: “He likes you”

Jess: “*You think so?*”

Context:

This utterance is stated by Jess when she is stating a question that she is still doubt about Joe’s feeling to her. She does not use word question but her intonation shows that she is asking something. Consequently, she is stating a statement and a rhetoric question too which actually she has known the answer.

When the speaker also states the utterance that is “*you think so?*” signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity

condition. As the result, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “do not say what you believe to be false”.

Data 7:

Jules: “*He asked you back, didn’t he?*”

Context:

This utterance is stated by Jules when she is asking to Jess about what Joe does after she exercises together. Besides, she wants to know the fact, but Jules just predict what Jess does with Joe.

When the speaker uses irony, she says “*He asked you back, didn’t he?*”. She says one thing but wants you to understand something different. By saying the opposite of what she means, again violation of quality maxims, speaker can directly convey her intended meaning. As the result, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “do not say what you believe to be false”. Based on the definition of irony, so this statement is classified as irony because the speakers said the opposite not the real condition.

Moreover, when the speaker also states the utterance that is “*He asked you back, isn’t he?*” signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide her with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because

question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition.

Data 8:

Jules: "How long have you been playing?"

Jess: "*For ages, but just in the park*"

Context:

This utterance is stated by Jess when she answers Jules' question. She states this statement so short and she adds some other words to make Jules get more information than is required.

When the speaker states "*For age, but just it the park*", it has an exaggerated statement to convey her statement which is too strong and appears worse than she really is. That is the word "*For age, but just it the park*". Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are "*make your contribution as informative as is required*" and "*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*".

Besides, this utterance is also not clearly stated what the utterance means and creates an ambiguity. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly stated and make an ambiguity without knowing the context. In addition, it is classified as hedging maxim of relation that the utterance must be relevant which the topic being discussed. "*Speakers'*

contribution should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange, it should be relevant”.

Data 9:

Joe: **“*Yeah, yeah. I’m a right sob story, aren’t I?*”** Come on! I want to see some sweat on you!”

Context :

This utterance is stated by Joe when he tells his experience to Jess in football court where they usually do playing football. He states this utterance after Jess telling her awful story in the past and he states this utterance to make Jess keep strong in doing exercise.

When the speaker uses irony, she says “*Yeah, yeah. I’m a right sob story, aren’t I?*”. He says one thing but wants you to understand something different. By saying the opposite of what she means, again violation of quality maxims, speaker can directly convey her intended meaning. As the result, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “*do not say what you believe to be false*”. Based on the definition of irony, so this statement is classified as irony because the speakers said the opposite not the real condition.

Moreover, when the speaker also states the utterance that is “*Yeah, yeah. I’m a right sob story, aren’t I?*” signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows

the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition.

When the speaker states the utterance, he uses an exaggerated statement to convey his opinion which is too strong and appears worse than he really is, and the speaker also repeating the word more than twice, that is the word " *Yeah, yeah. I'm a right sob story, aren't I?*". Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are "*make your contribution as informative as is required*" and "*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*". In this case, it is also classified as tautology because there is repetition of the word that is the word "*Yeah, yeah*".

In addition, the word "*I'm a right sob story*" is categorized as metaphor because the speaker does not state the real condition. He uses a word in literal usage denotes one kind of thing. In sum, the speaker, the examples above are classified as metaphor because are not the real condition but it use symbolic.

Data 10:

Jess: "At least I can still skin you alive! *The skill, the skill!, The skill!*"

Context:

This utterance is stated by Jess when she has already played with her friends in yard. Her friends do not believe if she plays in a big girl's team in London and will be play in Germany.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement to convey her opinion which is too strong and appears worse than she really is, and the speaker also repeating the word more than twice, that is the word "*The skill, the skill! The skill!*". Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are "*make your contribution as informative as is required*" and "*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*". In this case, it is also classified as tautology because there is repetition of the word that is the word "*The skill, the skill! The skill!*".

Data 11:

Jules: "...now we've got that sorted, show me what fella can do!"

Jess: "***He's not my boyfriend! I'm not her boyfriend!***"

Context:

This statement is stated by Jess when she is accompanied by Jules. Jules says to Jess about Tony and Jules says that Tony is her boyfriend but Jess disagrees with Jules because she does not have special relationship with Tony. He is her friend.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement to convey her opinion which is too strong and appears worse than she really is, and the speaker also repeating the sentence which has similar meaning in order to convey the utterance, that is "*He's not my boyfriend! I'm not her boyfriend!*". Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the

result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”. In this case, it also can be classified as tautology because there is repetition of the meaning of both words; those are “*He’s not my boyfriend! I’m not her boyfriend!*”. Although each sentence is different but both of them are has similar purpose.

Data 12:

Jules: “*How many people support us? Are you promised to someone?*”

Jess: “*Nah, my sister’s getting married*”

“*It’s a love match*”

Context:

The utterances are stated by Jules first. It happens when Jules and Jess are still doing exercise in the court where they usually doing exercise. Jules states the utterance to make Jess is able to join the tournament in spite of her family prohibit her to stop playing football. So Jules asks her, in fact Jules know that Jess does not answer her question. Jules uses rhetoric question. After that, Jess says “*It’s a love match*”.

When the speaker states the utterance, she states; “*How many people support us? Are you promised to someone?*”. She uses rhetoric question signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate

information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition. Therefore, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is *“do not say what you believe to be false”*.

The utterance *“Nah, my sister’s getting married”*, *“It’s a love match”* is the second speaker that has relation with the question of the first speaker or it includes in maxims of relevance, which means it makes what you say bare on the issue at hand. In addition, it means that the utterance must be relevant which the topic being discussed and *“Speakers’ contribution should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange, it should be relevant”*. Then the utterance *“It’s a love match”* invites an implicature that it is hedged by the speaker because this utterance is not totally accurate which make the information is less informative than what is required because it makes the listeners don’t understand what is the word *“It’s a love match”* means, without knowing the context. Therefore, the speaker overtly hedged the first maxim of quantity that is *“make your contribution as informative as is required”*. Moreover, this utterance is also not clearly stated what the utterance means and creates an ambiguity. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly statement and makes an ambiguity without knowing the context.

Data 13:

Jules: “You’ll marry an Indian, then!”
Jess: **“Probably”**

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is still in bathroom where they are usually doing exercise. She states “*Probably*” in responding Jules’ statement. She states only one word. Therefore, it makes Jules unsatisfied.

The word “*Probably*” invites an implicature that it is hedged by the speaker because this utterance is not totally accurate which makes the information is less informative than what is required because it makes the listeners don’t understand what is the word “*Probably*” means, without knowing the context. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly stating and make an ambiguity without knowing the context.

Data 14:

Pinky: “Don’t tell Mum and Dad.
Jess: “*I kept teeth a secret for you*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is speaking to Pinks. Her sister, Pink asks her to keep silence about her secret because she does not want if her mother knows what the real happen is.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement to convey her statement which is too strong than she really is. She states “*I kept teeth a secret for you*”. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second

maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”.

Data 15:

Jess: God! My mum had a fit when she saw the boots! And *I smelt like bleedin’ ashtray!* I had to clean all the big saucepans.

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when is doing exercise in football court with Jules. She tells to Jules that her mum dislike her smell. Her smell likes smoker who has already smoked.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement which makes the information too or more informative than what is required by saying “*I smelt like bleedin’ ashtray!*” to emphasize his statement being conveyed. Actually, she is enough saying I smell smoke. It is in order to convey the utterance, so she states “*I smelt like bleedin’*”. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”. In this case, it also can be classified as metaphor because she states “*I smelt like bleedin’*”. The speaker does not state the real condition. She uses metaphor to indicate something different from the literal meaning. In sum,

the speaker, the examples above are classified as metaphor because are not the real condition but it use symbolic.

Data 16:

Joe: *“Good, Mackie! Good, Sally”. “Excellent! Excellent!”*

Context:

The utterance is stated by Joe when he is coaching Jeminder, Jules and others. He states the utterance to give Jess’s friend keep having spirit to do exercise.

When the speaker states the utterance, he uses an exaggerated statement to convey her opinion which is too strong and appears worse than he really is, and the speaker also repeating the sentence which has similar meaning in order to convey the utterance, that is *”Good, Mackie! Good, Sally”. “Excellent! Excellent!”* Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are *“make your contribution as informative as is required”* and *“do not make your contribution more informative than is required”*. In this case, it also can be classified as tautology because there is repetition of the meaning of both words; those are *“Good, Mackie! Good, Sally”. “Excellent! Excellent!”*.

Data 17:

Joe: “Jess! *You can stop now! Stop!* You’re doing yourself an injury! ... *I said stop!*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Joe when he is saying to Jess. He asks Jess to stop running laps around the tract. However, Jess does not want to stop, until she gets a sprained.

When the speaker states the utterance, he uses an exaggerated statement to convey his opinion which is too strong and appears worse than he really is, and the speaker also repeating the sentence which has similar meaning in order to convey the utterance, that is ” *You can stop now! Stop!* You’re doing yourself an injury! “... *I said stop!*”. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”. In this case, it also can be classified as tautology because there is repetition of the meaning of both words; those are “*You can stop now! Stop!* You’re doing yourself an injury! “... *I said stop!*”.

Data 18:

Jules: “Listen... “ “I hope Joe wasn’t too hard on you”.

“Some of the girls think he’s too strict”

Jess: “no, *he was really nice, just really professional*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is delivering his opinion about Joe. Both of them are interested to Joe, so both of them laud him.

When the speaker states the utterance, he uses an exaggerated statement to convey her opinion which is too strong and appears worse than he really is, and the speaker also repeating the sentence which has similar meaning in order to convey the utterance, that is " ..., *he was really nice, just really professional*".

Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are "*make your contribution as informative as is required*" and "*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*".

Data 19:

Jules' mum: "Is that Indian?"

Jess: "*It's really Jesmider, but only my mum calls me that*"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is answering Jules' mum in Jules' house. Actually Jules' mum asks to Jess about what Jess is Indian name? However, Jess just states that her name is Jess and she is usually called.

When she states the utterance, she uses understatement because when she is saying "*It's really Jesmider, but only my mum calls me that*" she the speaker gives less informative statement. It is "*one way of generating implicatures by*

saying less than is required” and to make something appear smaller or less important than is really is. It can be used to encertain or to reduce the importance of the truth. Besides, it is also categorized as hedging maxim of relation. The utterance *“It’s really Jesmider, but only my mum calls me that”* is the second speaker that has relation with the question of the first speaker or it includes in maxims of relevance, which means it makes what you say bare on the issue at hand. In addition, it means that the utterance must be relevant which the topic being discussed and *“Speakers’ contribution should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange, it should be relevant”*.

Data 20:

Jules’ Mum: “Jess, I hope you can teach my daughter a bit about your culture, including respect for elders and the like, eh?”

Jess: *“Cheeky madam!”*

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is answering Jules’ mum question. Her statement is too short and spontaneously.

When the speaker is uttering the statement, she uses ambiguous. The word *“Cheeky madam!”* invites an implicature that it is hedged by the speaker because this utterance is not totally accurate which make the information is less informative than what is required because it makes the listeners don’t understand what is the word *“Cheeky madam!”* means, without knowing the context.

Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly stated and make an ambiguity without knowing the context.

Data 21:

Jules: *“Everyone I know’s a prat They think girls can’t play as well as them, except Joe of course”*

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jules when she is stating her opinion about everyone skill. Jules states everyone can do something without seeing their sex, whether there are men or woman. That is not different.

When the speaker is delivering his opinion, she uses an exaggerated statement to convey her opinion, which is too strong and appears worse than he really is, and the speaker also repeating the word by saying *“Everyone I know’s a prod. They think girls can’t play as well as them, except Joe of course”*.

Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required because she states two statements that have similar purpose. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are *“make your contribution as informative as is required”* and *“do not make your contribution more informative than is required”*. In addition, based on the second problem “How are the maxims hedged by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”, it is found that the maxims are hedged when the utterance produced is not totally accurate but it seems informative, well founded and relevant. In this case, the maxim of the quality that is *“make your contribution as informative as is*

required” is hedged when the speaker produces his opinion being conveyed is less informative. For example: “*They think girls can’t play as well as them, except Joe of course*” .

Data 22:

Pinky: “the wedding off ‘cause of you

Jess: “*Me?*” “*Why?*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she and Pinky in the living room. Jess is accused by her sister, Pinky as a trouble maker of her marriage’ planning. However, Jess disagrees about it.

When the speaker states the utterance, she states; “*Me?*” “*Why?*”, she uses rhetoric question signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition. Therefore, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “*do not say what you believe to be false*”.

Data 23:

Pinky: "Why didn't you do it in secret like everyone else?"

Jess: "*Kissing? Me? A boy?!*"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is in the living room. She is accused by Pinky that she kissed with her friend Joe, but that accusing is false. Therefore, when she is answering Pinky's question, she delivers statement that as same as question with question intonation.

When the speaker delivers the statement, she uses she uses the statement "*Kissing? Me? A boy?*" that are as if rhetoric question signifies. Thus, those are classified as rhetoric question signify that those are not sincere question. Those mean that the speaker asking questions with no intention of obtaining an answer and those tend to break sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answers are. In this case, these utterances are classified into rhetorical question because questions are only to gain affect and not affecting any answers, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition. Therefore, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is "*do not say what you believe to be false*".

Data 24:

Jess: "*You're bloody mad!*"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is stating her opinion that she is not a naughty girl who Pinky said.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement which makes the information too or more informative than what is required by saying “*You’re bloody mad!*” to emphasize his statement being conveyed. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”. In this case, it also can be categorized as metaphor because she states “*You’re bloody mad!*”. The speaker does not state the real condition. She uses metaphor to indicate something different from the literal meaning. In sum, the speaker, the examples above are classified as metaphor because are not the real condition but it use symbolic.

Data 25:

Joe: “We’ve been invited to play in Germany this Saturday”. “*It’s a shame you’ll miss it*”.

Jess: “Wow!” “Germany!”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Joe when he is giving an information to Jeminder about the tournament that is held in Germany. Besides, he asks to Jess to join and follow that tournament.

When the speaker states the utterance, he uses an ambiguity sentence. The sentence “*It’s a shame you’ll miss it*” invites an implicature that it is hedged by the speaker because this utterance is not totally accurate which make the information is less informative than what is required because it makes the listeners don’t understand what is the sentence “*It’s a shame you’ll miss it*” means, without knowing the context. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly stated and make an ambiguity without knowing the context.

Data 26:

Jess: “Your dad can’t be as mad as her”

Joe: “*You’re mum’s a barrel of laughs*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Joe when he is talking to Jess about Jess’s mum.

He says that her mum is funny and likes joke much.

When the speaker states the utterance, he uses an exaggerated statement which makes the information too or more informative than what is required by saying “*You’re mum’s a barrel of laughs*” to emphasize his statement being conveyed. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”. In this case, it also can be categorized as metaphor because she states “*You’re mum’s a barrel*

of laughs". The speaker does not state the real condition. She uses metaphor to indicate something different from the literal meaning. In sum, the speaker, the examples above are classified as metaphor because are not the real condition but it use symbolic.

Data 27:

Jess: "Pinks, *do you think Mum and Dad would still speak to me if I ever brought home a gora?*"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is stating and asking do their parents allow Jess playing football on big tournament in spite of prohibited.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses rhetoric question signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition. Therefore, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is "*do not say what you believe to be false*". The statement *do you think Mum and Dad would still speak to me* is hedged by the speaker because it is found that the

maxims are hedged when the utterance produced is not totally accurate but it seems informative, well founded and relevant. In this case, the maxim of the quality that is “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” is hedged when the speaker produces his opinion being conveyed is less informative.

Data 28:

Jess: “you should be proud of what you’ve given all of us”

Joe: “*Then why are you giving up?*” “*Jesmin-dah, isn’t it?*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Joe when he is delivering the question to Jeminder not to give up playing football because she has a bent to bend the ball likes Beckham.

When the speaker states the utterance, he states “*Then why are you giving up?*” “*Jesmin-dah, isn’t it?*”. Therefore, he uses rhetoric question signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, he already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition. Therefore, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “*do not say what you believe to be false*”.

In addition, when the speaker he also uses irony. She says “*Jesmin-dah, isn’t it?*”. He says one thing but wants you to understand something different. By saying the opposite of what she means, again violation of quality maxims, speaker can directly convey her intended meaning. Based on the definition of irony, so this statement is classified as irony because the speakers said the opposite not the real condition.

Data 29:

Jess: “Look, I feel really bad about what happened”

Jules: “*Yeah, well, you should.*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jules when she is speaking to Jess to solve their problem clearly after some days ago they did not say each other. Their problem is related with their coach, Joe.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement which makes the information too or more informative than what is required by saying “*Yeah, well, you should.*” to emphasize his statement being conveyed. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”.

Besides, the speaker uttering the statement, she uses ambiguous. The word “*Cheeky madam!*” invites an implicature that it is hedged by the speaker because

this utterance is not totally accurate which make the information is less informative than what is required because it makes the listeners don't understand what is the word "*you should*" means after she says "*yeah, well...*", without knowing the context. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly statement and make an ambiguity without knowing the context.

Data 30:

Jules: "*You don't know the meaning of love!*" "*You've really hurt me, Jess!*"
"*That's all there is to it!*" "*You've betrayed me!*"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jules when she is speaking to Jess about Joe in Jules' room. She says that Jess is a girl who disturbs Jules connection with Joe.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement which makes the information too or more informative than what is required by saying "*You don't know the meaning of love! You've really hurt me, Jess! That's all there is to it! You've betrayed me!*" to emphasize her statement being conveyed. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are "*make your contribution as informative as is required*" and "*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*".

Moreover, it also invites an implicature that it is hedged by the speaker because this utterance is not totally accurate which make the information is less informative than what is required because it makes the listeners don't understand what is the word "*That's all there is to it!*" means, without knowing the context. Therefore, this utterance is also categorized as hedging maxim of manner because it is not clearly stating and make an ambiguity without knowing the context.

Data 31:

Jess: "*Well, Beckham's the best*". "*No one can cross a ball or bend it like Beckham*"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is speaking to Tony about Beckham who is a professional football player in the world. Tony says to Jess about his feeling, so he states something to Jess in order to his feeling is received.

When the speaker utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement, which makes the information too or more informative than what is required by saying "*Well, Beckham's the best*". "*No one can cross a ball or bend it like Beckham*" to emphasize his statement being conveyed. Actually, she is enough to state the first statement "*Well, Beckham's the best*"; however, she also states the second statement "*No one can cross a ball or bend it like Beckham*" to emphasize the second speaker to believe what her stating. Therefore, the information is more

informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”.

Data 32:

Jules: “*You’ve already lied about the American scout*”. “*He’s not coming, is he?*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jules when she is speaking to her coach, Joe about football tournament that will be held in America. Jules disbelief with Joe’s statement, therefore she states the utterances that make Joe is confused.

When the speaker uses irony, she says, “*You’ve already lied about the American scout*”. “*He’s not coming, is he?*”. She says one thing but wants you to understand something different. By saying the opposite of what she means, again violation of quality maxims, speaker can directly convey her intended meaning. As the result, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “*do not say what you believe to be false*”. Based on the definition of irony, so this statement is classified as irony because the speakers said the opposite not the real condition.

Moreover, when the speaker also states the utterance that signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide her with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement to convey his opinion which is too strong and appears worse than he really is. The speaker also states different statement that the first statement "*You've already lied about the American scout*" and second statement "*He's not coming, is he?*" have similar purpose. Both are conveying one each other. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are "*make your contribution as informative as is required*" and "*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*".

Data 33:

Jules: "Look... I came here 'cause Joe was worried about you"

Jess: "*I'll tell him he's wasting his bloody time!*"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is speaking to Jules about Joe.

She does not want if Joe wastes his time to thinking and paying attention to her.

When the speaker states, she uses exaggerated statement to convey her opinion which is too strong and appears worse than she really is. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”. In this case, it also can be categorized as metaphor because she states “*he’s wasting his bloody time*”. The speaker does not state the real condition. She uses metaphor to indicate something different from the literal meaning. In sum, the speaker, the examples above are classified as metaphor because are not the real condition but it use symbolic.

Data 34:

Joe: “Go on!” “***Kick the ball, kick the ball!***”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Joe when he has Jess and her friends to make a goal. Furthermore, he gives support and spirit to them by saying that statement.

When the speaker states the utterance, he uses an exaggerated statement to convey his opinion which is too strong and appears worse than he really is, and

the speaker also repeating the word more than twice, that is the word "*Kick the ball, kick the ball!*". Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are "*make your contribution as informative as is required*" and "*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*". In this case,

Data 35:

Jules: "Me and Jess were fighting because we both fancied *our coach –Joe!*"
"Joe, our coach! Joe, man, Joe!"

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jules when she is trying to make her mother to believe that she is not as her mum guessed, she is not a lesbian like her mum thinks. Therefore, she states the utterance by saying Joe as her coach repeatedly, even more than twice.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement to convey her opinion which is too strong and appears worse than she really is, and the speaker also repeating the sentence which has similar meaning in order to convey the utterance, that is "*our coach –Joe!*" "*Joe, our coach! Joe, man, Joe!*". Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are "*make your contribution as informative as is required*" and "*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*". In this case, it also can be

classified as tautology because there is repetition of the meaning of both words; those are “*our coach –Joe!*” “*Joe, our coach! Joe, man, Joe!*””. Although each sentence is different but both of them are has similar purpose.

Data 36:

Joe: “*Your dad’s not here, is he?*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Joe when he is stating to Jess to convey that her father is not as close as Joe thinks. Thus, he is doubt and states the utterance.

When the speaker states, he uses irony, she says, “*Your dad’s not here, is he?*”. He says one thing but wants you to understand something different. By saying the opposite of what she means, again violation of quality maxims, speaker can directly convey his intended meaning. Based on the definition of irony, so this statement is classified as irony because the speakers said the opposite not the real condition.

Moreover, when the speaker also states the utterance that signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, she already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an

affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition. As the result, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “do not say what you believe to be false”.

Data 37:

Jess: “*Letting me go is a really big step for my mum and dad*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Jess when she is speaking with Joe in airport before she will go to Santa Carla to join the big competition there. She and Joe make an agreement how their relationship will be done in the future.

When the speaker states the utterance, she uses an exaggerated statement to convey her opinion which is too strong and appears worse than she really is, and the speaker also repeating the sentence which has similar meaning in order to convey the utterance, that is “*Letting me go is a really big step for mum and dad*”. Therefore, the information is more informative than what is required. As the result, the speaker overtly flouts the first and the second maxims of quantity, those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*”. Moreover it is also categorized as metaphor to indicate something different from the literal meaning. In sum, the speaker, the examples above are classified as metaphor because are not the real condition but it use symbolic.

Data 38:

Joe: *“I guess there’s not much point with you going to America anyway, is there?”*

Context:

The utterance is stated when he is asking to Jess to clarify Jess’s problem that makes her cannot be allowed by her parents, and Joe hopes Jess has an opportunity to join her new team without any problems and hindrance.

When the speaker states, he uses irony, she says, *“I guess there’s not much point with you going to America anyway, is there?”*. He says one thing but wants you to understand something different. By saying the opposite of what he means, again violation of quality maxims, speaker can directly convey his intended meaning. Based on the definition of irony, so this statement is classified as irony because the speakers said the opposite not the real condition.

Moreover, when the speaker also states the utterance that signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, he already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity

condition. As the result, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “do not say what you believe to be false”.

Data 39:

Joe: “*Can’t keep losing my best players to the Yanks, can I?*”

Context:

The utterance is stated by Joe when he is speaking to Jess is he able to be best player and keep his best because he will coach girl’s football team.

When the speaker states, he uses irony, she says, “*Can’t keep losing my best players to the Yanks, can I?*”. He says one thing but wants you to understand something different. By saying the opposite of what he means, again violation of quality maxims, speaker can directly convey his intended meaning. Based on the definition of irony, so this statement is classified as irony because the speakers said the opposite not the real condition.

Moreover, when the speaker also states the utterance that signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, he already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity

condition. As the result, she flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “*do not say what you believe to be false*”.

Data 40:

Joe: “That even with the distance and concerns of your family, we might still have something”. “*What do you think?*”

Context:

This utterance is stated by Joe when he is stating and asking Jess about their relationship during both Jess and Joe are in long distance and different country. He asks to Jess about her commitment and her feeling too as long as there are separated.

When the speaker states the utterance that signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. Meanwhile, he already knows the answer. In this case, this utterance “*What do you think?*” is classified into rhetorical question because question asked is only to gain an affect and not affecting any answer, but also the speaker breaks the sincerity condition. As the result, he flouts the truth maxim called maxim of quality that is “*do not say what you believe to be false*”.

4.1 Discussion

After obtaining the data, the writer needs to discuss the findings in order to clarify the answers of research questions.

Based on the first problem “How are the maxims flouted by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”, it is found that the maxims are flouted by the main characters when they are delivering and maintaining their opinions, such as by producing the utterance in the form of rhetorical strategies, namely; tautology, metaphor, overstatement, rhetorical question and irony. When the utterance is produced by using tautology, the maxim of quantity those are “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” and “*do not make your contribution more informative than is required*” are broken because in tautology the utterances produced are more informative than what is required.

Besides, the maxim of quality can also be flouted when the speaker produces the utterance in the form of metaphor. In this case, the speaker uses the word *not* in the real condition but uses symbolic or what is literally said is different from what is implied. For example: “*I’m a right sob story*”. Furthermore, the maxim of quantity is also flouted when the speaker produces the utterance in the form of overstatement. In this case, the speaker uses exaggerated statement or utterances to convey his statement which is too strong and appear worse than he really is.

Therefore, the information became more or too informative than what is required.

For examples: “*You don’t know the meaning of love!*” “*You’ve really hurt me, Jess!*” “*That’s all there is to it!*” “*You’ve betrayed me!*”. Besides, the speaker also produces the utterance to convey the statement as informative as is required

by repeating his statement more than twice. For example: “..... *The skill, the skill!, The skill!*”

Moreover, the maxim of quality that is “*do not say what you believe to be false*” is also flouted when the speaker produces the utterance in the form of rhetorical question. In this case, the speaker signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asking a question with no intention of obtaining an answer and it tends to break a sincerity condition on question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide his with the indicate information. For examples: “*Mum, do I have to go shopping again?*”, “*You think so?*”, ..., “*do you think Mum and Dad would still speak to me if I ever brought home a gora?*”, and so on. Besides, the first point of maxim of quality “*do not say what you believe to be false*” is also flouted when the speaker produces the utterance in the form of irony. In this case, what is spoken by the speaker expresses one’s meaning by saying something which is direct opposite of one’s thoughts, in order to make one’s remark is forceful. For example: “*I guess there’s not much point with you going to America anyway, is there?*”

In addition, based on the second problem “How are the maxims hedged by the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”, it is found that the maxims are hedged when the utterance produced is not totally accurate but it seems informative, well founded and relevant. In this case, the maxim of the quantity that is “*make your contribution as informative as is required*” is hedged when the speaker produces his opinion being conveyed is less informative. For example: “*Yeah, well, you should*”. Moreover, the maxim of manner is also hedged when

the utterance is not clearly stated and ambiguity without knowing the context. For examples: “*You’re so full of it*” and “*Probably*”. The maxim of relation is hedged when the utterance must be relevant which the topic being discussed. Speakers’ contribution should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange, it should be relevant or “*Be relevant at the time of the utterance*”. For example: “*For ages, but just in the park*”.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

After obtaining and analyzing the data in the previous chapter, the writer presents the conclusion and suggestion at the last part of this writing. The conclusion is drawn based on the formulated research questions while suggestion is intended to give information to the next researchers who are interested in doing future research in this area.

5.1 Conclusion

Dealing with the previous chapter, the conclusion of the writing can be formulated as follows:

The maxims are flouted when there are overtly broken by the speakers in the utterances when they are producing the statements of the main characters in “Bend It Like Beckham”, such as by producing the utterance in the form of rhetorical strategies, namely; tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rhetorical question and irony.

Furthermore, the maxims are hedged when the utterances produced are not totally accurate but it seems informative, well founded and relevant. The maxim of quantity is hedged when the speaker’s opinion being conveyed is less informative. Besides, the maxims of manner is also hedged when the utterance is not clearly stated and ambiguity without knowing the context. For examples: “...you should” , “Cheeky madam!” and “You know he’s just my mate”

From the findings, the maxims are not obeyed by the speakers, moreover the maxims are flouted and hedged by the speakers when they are delivering and maintaining their statement. However, although it is very difficult to obey and use all of the maxims in producing utterances especially in main characters' utterance, it is essential and efficiently in communication, therefore, communication can go on smoothly.

5.2 Suggestion

According to the findings of this research, it is suggested that the findings will be one of the additional references in the field of discourse. Moreover, it is also recommended that the next researchers can use Grice's maxims to conduct the research on the other areas. Furthermore, it is also suggested to the next researcher use other relevance theories to investigate different topics in the same area of the research, especially relevance theory proposed by Speaber and Winston.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alvesson, M. and Kaj. Scoldberg. 2000. *Reflexive Methodology; New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. London, California, New Delhi: SAGE Publication Inc.
- Berg, L.B. 1989. *Qualitative Research Method; for the social sciences*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brown, G. and George Yule. 1983, *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. 1989. *Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cummings, L. 2005. *Pragmatics: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fairlough, N. 1989. *Language and Power (Language in Social Life Series)*. Harlow: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Finegan, E. 2004. *Language its structure and Use Fourth Edition*. Massachusetts: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Geylukens, R. 1994. *The Pragmatics of Discourse Anaphora in English: Evidence from Conversational Repair*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Grundy, P. 2000. *Doing pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Hanifa. 2001. *Flouting of the Felicity Conditions of Conversational Maxim in Oliver Goldsmith's "She stops the Conquer"*. Unpublished thesis: UIN Malang.
- Hariyanto, B. 2003. *Conversational maxims on the special terms used by Indonesian chatters in IRC Malang*. Unpublished thesis: UIN Malang.
- Hartmann. 1973. *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London: Applied Science Publisher Ltd.
- Hikmah, R. 2006. *Hedging and Flouting Used by Syaikh Ahmed Deedat and Pastor Stanley in Great Open Debate "Is Jesus is God?"*. Unpublished thesis: UIN Malang.
- Hornby, A. 1995. *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University

- Kenney, W. 1966. *How To Analyze Fiction*. New York: Monarch Press.
- Leech, G. 1997. *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Levinson, S. 1992. *Pragmatics*. Crambridge: C.U.P.
- Renkema, J. 1993. *Discourse Analysis Studies: An Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Rohman, S. 2005. *Hedging and Flouting Maxims of Utterance at Traditional Market Prnojiwo Lumajang*. Unpublished thesis: UIN Malang.
- Rosdiana, S. 2004. *Flouting and Hedging on Comic Strip "Born Loser" in the Jakarta Post Newspaper*. Unpublished thesis: UIN Malang.
- Schiffirin, D. 1994. *Approach to discourse*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Silverman, D.1993. *Interpretating Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text, and Interaction*. London, California and New Delhi: SAGE Publication.
- Sobur, A. 2001. *Analisis Text Media*. Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya.
- Stainback, S. and William Stainback.1988. *Understanding & Conducting Qualitative Research*. Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Stubbs, M. 1983. *Discourse Analysis: the Socilolinguistics Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Yule, G. 1985. *The Study of Language: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yousuf, A.. *The Glorious Kur'an Translation & Commentary*. Beirut: Daarul Fikri