

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY ON GRICEAN MAXIMS FLOUTING AND HEDGING IN SASAK COMMUNITY, NGENO NGENE DIALECT AT KELAYU

¹Rini Marliana

¹Institut Studi Islam Sunan Doe

Corresponding Email: marliantarini205@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is aimed at finding out the kinds of Gricean maxims that are flouted and hedged, the reason why Gricean maxims are flouted and hedged, finding out the kinds of strategies that are used to flout and the kinds of hedges that are used to hedge the Gricean maxims by *ngeno-ngene* speakers at Kelayu. It is descriptive qualitative research. The data are collected using four techniques, observation, interview, recording and note taking. The data analyzed through four steps, namely, identification, classification, interpretation and reporting.

The results found that *ngeno ngene* speakers at Kelayu flout the four kinds of maxims (quality, quantity, relation and manner) and hedge the three kinds of maxims (quality, quantity and relation). The reasons for maxim of quality is flouted by speakers are to convince the addressee, to cover something and to hide something. The reasons for maxim of quantity is flouted by *ngeno ngene* speakers are to explain more about something, to stress something and to expect something. The reasons for maxim of relation is flouted by *ngeno ngene* speakers are to change the conversation topic, to give unnecessary information and to avoid talking about something. The reasons for the maxim of manner is flouted by *ngeno ngene* speakers are to get attention and to be clear. The reasons why *ngeno ngene* speakers at Kelayu hedge the maxims are to avoid absolute statement, to accurately reflect the certainty of knowledge and to negotiate. The kinds of strategies that are used by *ngeno ngene* speakers to flout the maxim are overstatement, understatement, metaphor, irony, banter, sarcasm, irrelevant statement, ambiguous statement, tautology, and rhetorical question. The last is the kinds of hedges that are commonly used by *ngeno ngene* speakers to hedge the maxim are eleven. They are *ndi?*, *gane/jegane*, *terang*, *badeq*, *ruane*, *rua-ruane jaq*, *baa+(verb repeating twice)+ so/ho*, *sang/sang+gane*, and *ongkatne/paranne jaq/ngene*, *menurutku/badeqku*, and *angkaq*.

Keywords: *Cooperative Principle, Grice's Maxims, Flouting, Hedging, Implicature, and Ngeno Ngene Dialect.*

INTRODUCTION

In a process of communication, the exchange of information occurs. The information is transferred from speakers to hearers. In transferring the information, the message is not always received successfully by the hearer. In other words, the hearer might not catch the meaning of the speaker well. In this case, misunderstanding or misinterpretation between speaker and hearer may occur. For example in Sasak language, A said to B "*epe ongakatde bruk?*" and B replied "*no langit bedah*". In this conversation, A might misunderstand to B's reply because the reply is not true and not related to the topic.

To avoid such misunderstanding and misinterpretation, Grice (1975) proposed a theory that suggests speakers and hearers to be cooperative in conversation. The theory is known as Cooperative

Principle. Grice cited in Saeed (2009: 213) stated that cooperative principle is a kind of tacit agreement by speakers and hearers to cooperate in communication. A conversation is cooperative if the participants make their conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange (Grice, 1975:45).

Subsequently, Cooperative Principle is broken down into four maxims called Gricean maxims. The first maxim is maxim of quality in which people must say something as it is or say the truth. The second is maxim of quantity in which people are suggested to say something as it is required. The third is maxim of relation in which people must say something in accordance with the topic. The last is maxim of manner in which people must say something as clear as possible. These four maxims should be fulfilled by participants in conversation to expedite the communication.

Nonetheless, in daily communication, people especially Sasak community who have politeness culture do not always obey these four maxims. There must be an occasion where they may violate the maxims either by talking more or less than is required, telling lie, saying something out of topic, or stating something ambiguously. The way the maxims are disobeyed is called flouting and hedging. When the maxims are violated blatantly is called flouting and when the maxims are violated using a special word or phrase that indicates the lack of commitment to the truth such as, perhaps, may be, likely, etc., is called hedging.

Since this research is aimed at finding out the kinds of Gricean maxims that are flouted and hedged, the reason why Gricean maxims are flouted and hedged, and the kinds of strategies that are used to flout and the kinds of hedges that are used to hedge the Gricean maxims by ngeno-ngene speakers at Kelayu, they are analyzed based on some theories, namely, the theory of conversational implicature from Grice (1975) and Levinson (1983, 1992); the theory of Cooperative Principle including the four maxims from Richards and Schmidt (2010), Grice (1975), Finegan (2004) and Grundy (2000); the theory of flouting maxims from Grice (1975), Grundy (2000), Cutting (2002) and Hornby (1974); the theory of hedging maxims from Schmidt (1974), Brown and Levinson (1987), Yule (1996) and Grundy (2000).

Conducting the research on flouting and hedging of Gricean maxim in real life spoken is said to be important since it can give better understanding on how the community of a language communicates in their daily life. By having good understanding on how they communicate, we may know how to speak appropriately to them and thus it can minimize social destruction and even can make us to be welcomed easily. Since the research of Gricean maxims flouting and hedging in Sasak especially ngeno ngene

dialect is still lack attention, this leads the researcher to conduct a study on Grice's maxims flouting and hedging used by Sasak community, ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is categorized as descriptive qualitative research since the obtained data are in the form of utterances and analyzed using words. The location of this research was at Kelayu, a village located between Selong and Tanjung of east Lombok. The population of this research was all native speakers of ngeno ngene dialect who live in Kelayu that were around 11,712 inhabitants. The technique that is used to take the sample of the research is cluster sampling while the number of the sample was not determined since it focused on the quality of the information. The data of this research were collected using four techniques, namely, observation, interview, recording, and note taking. In observing the object, the researcher was involved directly in the field since she is the native speaker of the language. In interview process, two informants were used. They were thirty five years old woman and fifty one years old man. Both were asked some questions related to the unclear utterances or statements produced by participants. MP3 recorder was used to record the data. There were twenty two recording that were gained in which contains of seventy one conversations with thirty three speakers. Meanwhile, a note book was used to write down what were not covered by recorder, such as setting of conversation, facial expression, gesture, and so on. The collected data were analyzed through four steps, namely, identification, classification, interpretation, and reporting. Firstly, the data were transcribed verbatim along with the result of interview and note taking were re-written to complete the data. After that the data were selected and classified based on the category of flouting and hedging of each maxims and using one table. The selected data then were interpreted. And the last step is that they were presented in the section of data description and analysis.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

From the data that have been collected, it is found that there are eighty-four occurrences of maxim flouting and forty-four occurrences of maxims hedging produced by ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu. Based on the data analysis on the kinds of Gricean maxims flouting and hedging, it is found that the speakers of ngeno ngene dialect at Kelayu flout all kinds of maxims (quality, quantity, relation and manner) and hedge the three kinds of maxims namely quality, quantity and relation. The data that show the frequency of the occurrences of Gricean maxims flouting are presented on the table below.

Table 1. The Data for Gricean Maxim Flouting Produced by Ngeno Ngene Speakers at Kelayu

Maxim Flouted	Occurrence	Percentage
Quality	12	14.286 %
Quantity	34	40.476 %
Relation	14	16.667 %
Manner	24	28.571 %
Total	84	100 %

The table 1 shows that the highest number of flouting occurrence is the maxim of quantity with thirty four occurrences (40.5%) followed by the maxim of manner with twenty four occurrences (28.5%), maxim of relation with fourteen occurrences (16.7%), and the last is maxim of quality with twelve occurrences (14.3%).

Furthermore, there are forty four occurrences of maxim hedging found on the data. Below is the data that shows the frequency of maxim hedging occurrences.

Table 2. The Data for Gricean Maxim Hedging Produced by Ngeno Ngene Speakers at Kelayu

Maxim Hedged	Occurrence	Frequency (%)
Quality	27	61.364
Quantity	15	34.091
Relation	2	4.545
Manner	0	0
Total	44	100

As the table above shows, the highest number of hedging occurrence is the maxim of quality with twenty seven occurrences (61.364%), followed by maxim of quantity with fifteen occurrences (34.091%), maxim of relation with two occurrences (4.545%), and zero occurrence in maxim of manner.

The second finding is concerned with the reason why ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu flout and hedge the Gricean maxims. Based on the findings on the number of each maxim flouting occurrence, the numbers of occurrences for the three reasons why ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu flout the maxim of quality are two occurrences for the reason to convince the addressee, four occurrences for the reason to cover something and six occurrences for the reason to hide something. Meanwhile, the numbers of occurrences for the three reasons why ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu flout the maxim of quantity are twenty occurrences for the reason to explain more about something, eight occurrences for the reason to stress something, and six occurrences for the reason to expect something. Besides, the numbers of occurrences for the three reasons why ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu flout the maxim of relation are three occurrences for the reason to change the conversation topic, six occurrences for the reason to give unnecessary additional information, and five occurrences for the reason to avoid talking about something. Furthermore, the numbers of occurrences for the two reasons why ngeno ngene speakers at

Kelayu flout the maxim of manner are thirteen occurrences for the reason to get attention and eleven occurrences for the reason to be clear. To make it clearer, the data sheet that shows the frequency of the occurrences of the reasons for flouting maxims produced by ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu can be seen below.

Table 3. The Frequency of the Reasons for Flouting Maxims

Maxim Flouted	Reason	Occurrence	(%)
Quality	- to convince the addressee	2	16.7
	- to cover something	4	33.3
	- to hide something	6	50
	Total	12	100
Quantity	- to explain more about something	20	58.8
	- to stress something	8	23.5
	- to expect something	6	17.7
	Total	34	100
Relation	- to change the conversation topic	3	21.4
	- to give unnecessary information	6	42.9
	- to avoid talking about something	5	35.7
	Total	14	100
Manner	- to get attention	13	54.2
	- to be clear	11	45.8
	Total	24	100

As the table above shows, the highest reason for flouting the maxim of quality is to hide something with six occurrences (50%), the highest reason for flouting the maxim of quantity is to explain more about something with twenty occurrences (58.8%), the highest reason for flouting the maxim of relation is to give unnecessary additional information with six occurrences (42.9%), and the highest reason for flouting the maxim of manner is to get attention with thirteen occurrences (54.2%).

Subsequently, based on the data of forty four occurrences of maxim hedging, it was found that there are twenty three occurrences that have the reason to avoid absolute statement. This reason is found in hedging maxim of quality with eleven occurrences, in hedging maxim of quantity with ten occurrences, and in hedging maxim of relation with two occurrences. There are twelve occurrences that have the reason to accurately reflect the certainty of knowledge which consisted of eight occurrences found in hedging maxim of quality and four occurrences found in hedging maxim of quantity. The reason to negotiate only found in hedging maxim of quality with nine occurrences. The table that shows the frequency of the reason for hedging maxim is presented below.

Table 4. The Frequency of the Reasons for Hedging Maxims

Reason	Maxim hedged	Occurrence	%
To avoid absolute statement	- quality	11	47.8
	- quantity	10	43.5
	- relation	2	8.7
Total		23	100

To accurately reflect the certainty of knowledge	- quality	8	66.7
	- quantity	4	33.3
	- relation	0	0
Total		12	100
To negotiate	- quality	9	100
	- quantity	0	0
	- relation	0	0
Total		9	100

The last research question is about the kinds of strategies that are used to flout and the kinds of hedges that are used to hedge the Gricean maxims by ngeno-ngene speakers at Kelayu. Based on the obtained data, it is found that ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu use all strategies (ten strategies that are stated in chapter two) to flout the maxims. The data finding that shows the frequency of rhetorical strategies used by ngeno ngene speakers to flout the maxims is below.

Table 5. The Frequency of the Strategies for Flouting Maxims

No	Rhetorical Strategies	Occurrence	Percentage (%)
1	Overstatement	10	30.3
2	Metaphor	9	27.3
3	Sarcasm	2	6.1
4	Irony	2	6.1
5	Banter	2	6.1
6	Understatement	2	6.1
7	Tautology	2	6.1
8	Rhetorical question	2	6.1
9	Irrelevant statement	1	3.0
10	Ambiguous statement	1	3.0
Total		33	100

As table above shows, the highest frequency of occurrences of maxim flouting is overstatement with ten occurrences followed by metaphor with nine occurrences that has only one frequency difference with overstatement. The third is maxim flouting using sarcasm, irony, banter, understatement, tautology, and rhetorical question, which have two occurrences. The last is irrelevant statement and ambiguous statement that have only one occurrence.

Furthermore, the kinds of hedges that are used by ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu to hedge the Gricean maxims are eleven. They are *ndi?*, *gane/jegane*, *terang*, *badeq*, *ruane*, *rua-ruane jaq*, *baa+(verb repeating twice)+ so/ho*, *sang/ sang+gane*, *ongkatne/ paranne jaq/ ngene*, *menurutku/ badeqku*, and *badeq*. Below is the data that show the frequency of ngeno ngene speakers at Kelayu use those hedges in their daily communication.

Table 6. The Frequency of the Hedges for Hedging Maxims

Maxim	Hedges	Occurrence	(%)
Quality	<i>Ndi?</i>	2	7.4
	<i>gane/jegane</i>	4	14.8
	<i>terang,</i>	4	14.8
	<i>Badeq</i>	3	11.1
	<i>Ruane</i>	3	11.1
	<i>sang/sang+gane</i>	5	18.5
	<i>ongkatne/paranne jaq/ngene</i>	3	11.1
	<i>menurutku/badeqku</i>	3	11.1
	Total	27	100
Quantity	<i>rua-ruane jaq</i>	8	53.3
	<i>baa+(verb repeating twice)+ so/ho</i>	7	46.7
	Total	15	100
Relation	<i>Angkaq</i>	2	100
	Total	2	100

Based on the table above, *sang/sang+gane* is used frequently by *ngeno ngene* speakers at Kelayu to hedge the maxim of quality with five occurrences (18.5%) followed by, *gane/jegane* and *terang* with four occurrences (14.8%), *ongkatne/paranne jaq/ngene*, *menurutku/badeqku*, and *ruane* with three occurrences (11.1), and *ndi?* with two occurrences (7.4). The hedges *rua-ruane jaq* and *baa+(verb repeating twice)+ so/ho* are used by *ngeno ngene* speakers at Kelayu to hedge the maxim of quantity with eight and seven occurrences. Finally the hedge *badeq* is used by *ngeno ngene* speakers at Kelayu to hedge the maxim of relation with two occurrences.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the analysis are *Ngeno ngene* speakers at Kelayu flouted all kinds of Gricean maxim including maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation and maxim of manner, and hedge the three kinds of maxim, namely, maxim of quality, maxim of quantity and maxim of relation. The maxim of quantity is the most frequent maxim flouted by *ngeno ngene* speakers, followed by the maxim of manner, the maxim of relation and the maxim of quality. Furthermore, the maxim of quality is the most frequent maxim hedged by *ngeno ngene* speakers, followed by the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation and the maxim of manner.

Based on the result of the data analysis, the maxim of quality is flouted by *ngeno ngene* speakers because of three reasons. They are to convince the addressee, to cover something and to hide something. The maxim of quantity is flouted by *ngeno ngene* speakers because of three reasons too, namely, to explain more about something, to stress something and to expect something. And for maxim of relation, is flouted by *ngeno ngene* speakers because of three reasons, namely, to change the

conversation topic, to give unnecessary information and to avoid talking about something. Meanwhile the maxim of manner is flouted because of two reasons, namely, to get attention and to be clear. Furthermore, the reasons why *ngeno ngene* speakers hedge the maxims are because they want to avoid absolute statement, to accurately reflect the certainty of knowledge and to negotiate.

The strategies that are used by *ngeno ngene* speakers to flout the maxims are overstatement, understatement, metaphor, irony, banter, sarcasm, irrelevant statement, ambiguous statement, tautology, and rhetorical question. Furthermore, the hedges that are commonly used by *ngeno ngene* speakers to hedge the maxim are eleven. They are *ndi?*, *gane/jegane*, *terang*, *badeq*, *ruane*, *rua-ruane jaq*, *baa+(verb repeating twice)+ so/ho*, *sang/sang+gane*, and *ongkatne/paranne jaq/ngene*, *menurutku/badeqku*, and *angkaq*.

REFERENCES

- Brown, G. and S. C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse, A Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge
- Finegan, E. 2004. *Language its structure and Use Fourth Edition*. Massachusetts: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Grice, P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts*, ed. by Peter, C. and Jerry L. M., 41–58. New York: Academic Press.
- Grundy, P. 2000. *Doing pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Hornby, A. 1974. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. 1983. Activity Types and Language, in P. Drew and J Heritage (ed.), *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R. 2010. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Saeed, J. I. 2009. *Semantics*. Malaysia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schmidt, C. 1974. The Relevance to Semantics Theory of a Study of Vagueness in Papers From the Eight Regional Meeting. Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.