STUDENTS' ANALYSIS ON CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURES OF CIAYUMAJAKUNING DRAMA SCRIPTS

Jaufillaili

English Department University of Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon- Indonesia

Mahmud

English Department University of Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon- Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Pragmatics is added into the new curriculum of English Education Department. Pragmatics deals with hidden meaning (Wray et al, 1998). Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle and Maxims are a common study in Pragmatics. To relate the study of Pragmatics and other subject in English Education Department, the writers asked students to analyze the drama scripts they had performed. The analysis is about conversational implicatures in Ciayumajakuning drama scripts which involved Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle and Maxims. It is a qualitative study that applies a case study. The writers took students' analysis on four drama scripts of Ciayumajakuning as the data source. The aims of this research are: 1) to describe how students analyze the flouting of maxims in the drama script, and 2) to describe how students analyze conversational implicatures in the drama script. The research finding shows that 1) students analyzed the flouting of maxims based on Grice's theory of maxims. They are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner. 2) Students analyzed conversational implicatures in two ways, the first is through the relationship between the question and the answer of the target conversant. The second, some students provided some possible implicatures that might be derived by readers. Then, the students chose one implicature as the most appropriate one for some reasons.

Keywords: *Pragmatics, Flouting the Maxims, Conversational Implicatures*

SARI

Ilmu pragmatika masuk dalam kurikulum baru pada Program Studi Bahasa Inggris. pragmatika adalah ilmu yang berhubungan dengan makna tersembunyi(Wray et al, 1998). Teori Grice tentang maksim dan prinsip kerjasama adalah kajian yang umum dalam dunia pragmatik. untuk menghubungkan antara kajian pragmatik dengan sabjek lain dalam Program Studi Bahasa Inggris, penulis meminta mahasiwa untuk melakukan analisa terhadap naskah drama yang mereka buat. Analisisnya adalah mengenai "implikatur percakapan" dalam naskah drama Ciayumajakuning dengan menggunakan Teori "maksim dan prinsip kerjasama". Ini merupakan penelitian kualitatif yang

menerapkan sebuah studi kasus. Penulis mengambil hasil analisis mahasiswa terhadap empat naskah drama Ciayumajakuning sebagai sumber data. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah: 1) untuk mendeskripsikan bagaimana manashiwa menganalisis floting-maksim pada naskah drama, dan 2) untuk mendeskripsikan bagaimana mahasisawa menganalisis implikatur percakapan pada naskah drama. hasil temuan menunjukna bahwa 1) mahsasiswa menganalisis floting-maxim berdasakan teori maxim Grice. yaitu They are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner. 2) mahsisawa menganalisis conversational implicature dalam dua cara, pertama adalah melalui hubungan antara pertanyaan dan jawaban pada target komunikan, dan kedua bebrapa mahasiswa menyajikan beberapa kemungkinan implikatur yang didapat oleh pembaca. kemudain, mahsisawa memilih salah satu implikatursebagai satu yang paling tepat dengan beberapa alasan.

Kata kunci: *Pragmatik, Flouting Maksim, implikatur percakapan*

Introduction

Drama as one of the lectures taught at English Education Department of Teaching and Educational Sciences Faculty (FKIP) of UNSWAGATI Cirebon has a certain program for the students' final examination. The students are asked to work in a group and perform a drama performance at the end of the odd semester. It might be called as students' masterpiece work, since they have to work cooperatively with other members of the class. The members of one group of drama are the members of two classes consist of around fifty students. It is a big class where all students have to work cooperatively with all members of the class who involve in drama performance.

Drama performance is not a sudden activity. It needs to be arranged and practiced at the beginning of odd semester. Therefore, the writers, who are the drama lecturers, tell and explain about the drama activity since the very first beginning she meets students in the class. She explained the aims, the rule, the function, the mid and final examination projects of this drama class.

Studying drama in English as a Foreign Language class cannot be separated from understanding the drama script written in English. In academic year of 2016/2017, the writers asked her students to find and or to arrange a drama script telling about the stories, legends or folktales from CIAYUMAJAKUNING (Cirebon, Indramayu,

Majalengka and Kuningan). Each class should find one story or drama script from one of the cities mentioned above. The students should analyze the script before they perform the drama for their final project.

The writers are interested to know the students ability in how they comprehend the script of drama. As we know that, dialogues in drama usually have implied meanings. The readers who read the script are demanded to interpret the implied meaning shown in the dialogues of the characters to get the messages and to understand the whole story of the drama. In line with Trenholm (1991: 16) that everything we do, intentionally or not, is thought to communicate some hidden meaning (Trenholm, 1991: 16). To find out and to understand implied meaning in literary works is one of the challenging tasks, especially in studying drama in an EFL class. The writers are interested to know how English students of UNSWAGATI analyze the conversational implicatures in the drama script that they are going to perform as their final project in drama class. How they arrange the implicatures and what reasons do they choose certain implicature instead of others. Those questions are then formulated by the writers as the research questions as follow:

1. How do students analyze the flouting of maxims in the drama script?
2. How do students analyze conversational implicatures in the drama script?

By determining the research question above the writes are expected to how students analyze the flouting of maxims in the drama script and how they analyze conversational implicatures in the drama script. In the other side, the writers limit the research only on conversational implicatures which were proposed by Grice. The drama scripts are limited to the story from the folk story CIAYUMAJAKUNING. The writers choose some data from drama script of class 3A, 3B, 3C and 3D students of English Education Department of Unswagati which entitled: *Simbar Kencana Males Pati, Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", Baridin and Ratminah and Nyi Mas Gandasari.* Besides the aims of the research above, the writers also consider to promote some significances of the study that viewed from three aspects; 1). Linguistically, it will give a model of expressions that commonly appear in local drama scripts that contained conversational implicatures, 2). Pedagogically, the findings can give a contribution to the development

of communication skills in public or on the stage. This means that students and other people who speak can use the various kinds of expressions contained conversational implicatures to deliver the message of their conversation, and 3). Theoretically, it will show a modification of flouting maxims and conversational implicatures rules for the expression of conversation on the stage.

Literature Review

People do not always or even usually say what they mean. Speakers frequently mean much more than their words actually say. For example, I might say: *It's hot in here!* , but what I mean is: *Please open the window!* or *Is it alright if I open the window?* or *You're wasting electricity!* People can mean something quite different from what their words say, or even just the opposite. For instance, to someone who has borrowed my car for the weekend and returned it with no petrol in the tank, I might say: *It was nice of you to fill the car up!* or *What a shame you couldn't find the petrol tank!* (Thomas, 1995: 1)

In line with the explanation above, Thomas (1995: 1) says that there are several interesting questions arise from these observations: if speakers regularly mean something other than what they say, how is it that people manage (as on the whole they do) to understand one another? If a single group of words such as *It's hot in here!* could mean so many different things at different times, how do we work out what it actually does mean on one specific occasion? And why don't people just say what they mean? These, and many other issues, are addressed within the area of linguistics known as pragmatics. Wray et al. say that pragmatics deals with the hidden messages (1998: 115).

The Cooperative Principle and Maxims

The philosopher H.P. Grice developed a co-operative principle (1967/1987) which, he considers, underlies successful verbal communication. That is, we assume, in normal circumstances, that these are the ground rules that we observe when speaking and interpreting utterances. The co-operative principle states: *Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted*

purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. To this he appends four maxims, which clarify how the co-operative principle works (Black, 2006: 23):

Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicatures arise from a combination of language and situation: the same utterance on different occasions might not generate an implicature, or might suggest a different one. They are rooted in the situation in which they occur, and must be interpreted taking the context into account (Black, 2006: 25).

To understand someone's utterance, we have to interpret what he/she says. In our daily conversations, we often find or make ourselves an utterance as a response of others, which seems inadequate. In other words, we do not talk cooperatively on the surface of it. However, sometimes we still understand what the utterance or the speaker means and being engaged to bona-fide mode of communication while sometimes we often make the wrong interpretations and finally create misunderstanding. To get what the speaker means implicitly by an utterance is about to understand the implicature of the utterance. In short, an implicature can be simply defined as any assumption, which is implicitly communicated.

Mey defines implicature is the word that derived from the verb 'to imply', as is its cognate 'implication'. Etymologically, 'to imply' means 'to fold something into something else' (from the Latin verb *plicare* 'to fold'); hence, that which is implied, is 'folded in', and has to be 'unfolded' in order to be understood (2001: 45). Mey (2001: 45) also defines a conversational implicature as something, which is implied in conversation, that is, something that is left implicit in actual language use. It could be also said that conversational implicature concerns the way we understand an utterance in conversation in accordance with what we expect to hear (Mey, 2001: 46). According to Grice, conversational implicature covers any meaning that is implied, for instance, conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated (ctd. in Grundy, 2000: 73)

Grice claimed that there were two types of implicature: *conventional* and *conversational* (ctd. in Gazdar, 1979: 38). The former arise solely because of conventional features of

the words employed in an utterance. Grice's second class of implicatures comprises the conversational one and this class is itself divided into *particularized* conversational implicatures and *generalized* conversational implicatures. The former are those that arise because of some special factors inherent in the context of utterance and are not normally carried by the sentence used. Thus the second utterance in the following dialogue may well carry a particularized conversational implicature to the effect that the referent is a homosexual:

> A: *What does Julian do when he's not at the hairdresser's?*
> B: *He waits for boys in the restroom of Y.M.C.A.*
> (Gazdar, 1979: 39)

On other occasions of use, say when we already know that the referent is a school truancy officer, this sentence will not carry this particular implicature. The second subclass is that of *generalized* conversational implicatures and Grice states that:

Generalized conversational implicatures arise when one can say that the use of a certain form of words in an utterance would normally (in the Absence of special circumstances) carry such-and-such an implicature or type of implicature. It is all too easy to treat a generalized conversational implicature as if it were a conventional implicature (qtd.in Gazdar, 1979: 39).

Implicatures are the property of utterances, not of sentences and therefore the same words carry different implicatures on different occasions (Thomas, 1995). In each case the semantic meaning of *how old are you?* is the same, but the implicature is different. In example 1 it is a straightforward request for information; in example 2 the father is implying that the son's behavior is inappropriate for a person of that age (more precisely, he is implying that it is time his son got a job) and the psychiatrist in example 3 is probably trying to prompt the patient to consider whether, at thirty-nine, she isn't old enough to make up her own mind about whether or not to work.

Methods

Research Procedures

The research procedure of qualitative research is shorter and simpler compared to that of quantitative research. Huda (1999: 41-42) cited in Fauziati (2009: 244) summarizes it as follows:

1. The writers selected a topic for the study and a research site;
2. The research visited the field and the collects the data, tries to analyze the data, and then formulates a research problem;
3. Data collection was focused on the attempt to find the answer to the formulated question. During the process, new research questions may emerge to that new data need to be collected and recorded;
4. Data were categorized and analyzed; and
5. Research report was written.

Techniques of Collecting the Data

The data of this research were taken from the third grade students' analysis on drama script entitled Simbar Kencana Males Pati, The Immortal Spirit Of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", Baridin & Ratminah, Nyi Mas Gandasari. To get the data, the writers did the following steps:

1. The writers asked the students to read the drama script of Ciayumajakuning stories thoroughly.
2. The writers asked students to write the list of expressions or dialogues in the script that contained conversational implicatures.
3. The writers asked students to analyze those expressions or dialogues using Grice's theory of Maxims and conversational implicatures.
4. The writers asked students to write the report of their analysis.

Techniques of Analyzing the Data

The analysis system used in this research is interpretive analysis (Dornyei, 2008, cited in Fauziati, 2009: 244). In general, the writers use listing, classifying, and interpreting the data. For more details, the steps are described below:

1. The writers read the students' reports.
2. The writers interpreted the data by listing the expression or dialogues that flout the maxims analyzed by the students.
3. The writer interpreted the data by listing the expression or dialogues that contained conversational implicatures.

4. The writers wrote the reasons why students choose such maxim and conversational implicatures to be drawn.

5. The writers interviewed students related to their analysis to strengthen the writers' answer on research question number 3.

6. The writers wrote the result and discussion of the research findings.

Results and Discussion

The following data are samples of students' analysis about flouting the maxims and conversational implicatures in drama scripts of Ciayumajakuning stories.

The Flouting of Maxim of Quantity and Its Implicature

Data 1:

> Daendels : *Good! What do you want?*
> Kong Li Hwa : <u>*Mr. Albertus said that you wanted to rent a land in north area.*</u>

The students analyzed that Kong Li Hwa's answer flouted *maxim of quantity* since he did not give answer directly about what he wanted. He stated Mr.Albertus' statement instead of giving the exact answer of Daendels' question. Kong Li Hwa's statement flouted maxim of quantity in which his answer is not as informative as is required. The implicature of Kong Li Hwa's statement is he wanted to offer his land in north area to be rented by Daendels (The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War",YNS, 3B).

Data 2:

> Ki Bagus Rangin : *Where do you come from?*
> Mang Irsyad : <u>*We have destroyed the field in north area, Ki.*</u>

One of the students' analysis told that *Mang Irsyad* did not answer directly where he came from. He answered Ki Bagus Rangin's question by explaining what he had done in north area, which is actually giving information about where had gone indirectly. Based on the maxim of quantity, Mang Irsyad's answer is more informative than what is being asked by *Ki Bagus Rangin*. Therefore it *flouted maxim of quantity*. The implicature that is shown through Mang Irsyad's utterances is He had done an important mission (The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", LLD, 3B).

Data 3

Ruben   : Lazy men! You all work very slowly. You will always become a poor man if you work like this. You all are useless!!

Ratinah: What are you saying? We are useless? Don't you think that all of fields here are ours? Don't you think?.....Listen! We won't suffer if the evil Netherlanders don't take forcefully what we have!!!

The student's analysis told that this dialogue breaks *maxim of quantity* because ratinah's response are more informative than what the statement said by Ruben. Ruben said that they are useless and Ratinah's response is about the cause why they became suffer and hunger. The implicature that Ratinah wanted to say is they were rich before Netherlanders took all of their wealth (The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", WYW, 3B).

Data 4

Centangbarang   : What if I don't want? You will kill my family? Then what if I tell Princess Simbar kencana? Does she know that her husband is an evil.

Palembang Gunung   : Do not make a fuss!!! Listen, I got hundreds of troops that is ready to scorched the threshold of the hill along with its content. But now I know I only need one person who knows how to defeat my father. I had no choice, but wait, so do you. If you care about your family, you know what you must do.

The student analyzed as follows.

Palembang Gunung's statement is not informative. He gave too much information than what Centangbarang needed. Thus Palembang Gunung's answer flouted *maxim of quantity. The implicature* of Palembang Gunung's statement is Palembang Gunung asked Centangbarang to kill his father in-law, Talaga Manggung.

(Simbar Kencana Males Pati, ARP, 3A).

Data 5

Simbar Kencana   : But brother, who will replace father's place later? Can you just fulfill what our father want and become the successor in the Talaga Kingdom?

Price Panglurah   : You are here, my sister. You're smarter and cleverer than me. The ministers and other royal officials like you very much.

The student analyzed as follow

In the dialogue above, Prince Panglurah's answer is too convoluted not to the point. Raden Panglurah's answer is flouting *maxim of quantity*. The implicature of Prince

Panglurah's statement above is Prince Panglurah wanted Simbar Kencana lead Talaga kingdom because she is better than him.

(Simbar Kencana Males Pati, AF, 3A).

Data 6

Fatimah	: Oh, ya, is Pakungwati home?
Sunan Gunung Djati	: <u>Yes, she is at home. Now, I want to meet your father. Wassalammualaikum.</u>

The student analyzed as follows.

If we look at Sunan Gunung Djati's answer, it is clear that he did the flouting of *maxim of quantity* because he answered unnecessary answer. Fatimah just asked him whether Pakungwati is at home, but he answered it by also giving the information where he will go that is not asked by Fatimah. The implicature shown by Sunan Gunung Djati's is he is in a hurry to meet Fatimah's father.(Nyimas Ayu Gandasari, YIN, 3D)

Data 7

Ratminah (crazy) : Baridin, let's go! Get married! Married! Married! Married! Baridin!
Baridin : What? Married? Ratminah doesn't suit marry Baridin. Baridin is Mbok wangsih's son, poor person. No, Rat! You had been said that a man who loves you is someone who is rich.

The student's analysis is as follows.

In the dialogue above, *Baridin's* statement is flouting the *maxim of quantity*. Baridin's answer is more informative. He gave a lot of information that is not needed. Some implicatures that might arise from baridin's answer are:

(a)   *Baridin* did not love *Ratminah* anymore

(b)   *Baridin* was hurt by *Ratminah* but he still loved her

(c)   *Baridin* did not want to marry *Ratminah*

The most appropriate implicature is point *(b) Baridin was hurt by Ratminah but he still loved her*. From *Baridin's* dialogue, readers could observe that *Baridin* expressed his sadness because *Ratminah* and his father had rejected him when his mother proposed her to be his wife. The only reason why they rejected him is because *Baridin* is poor. Though Baridin loved Ratminah so much, but he could not marry her.

(Baridin & Ratminah, DI, 3C)

The Flouting of Maxim of Quality and Its Implicature

Data 8

Ruben	: Mr. Nicolas, that mutiny happened because of you. That party was your idea. Mr.Daendels will be very angry.
Nicolas	: Shut up Ruben!

The student analyzes as follows.

Nicolas' statement is flouting the *maxim of quality*. He asked Ruben to keep silent because he does not have any adequate evidence about his answer. The implicature is Nicolas was actually afraid of Daendels's anger to him. Therefore he tried to hide his fear in front of Ruben. Nicolas did not tell the truth about his fear to Daendels.

(The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", AM, 3B).

Data 9

Daendels	: How do you resist us?
Ki Bagus Rangin	: Are you scared, Daendels?
Daendels	: Shut up!

The student's analysis is as follows.

Daendels' statement is *flouting the maxim of quality* since he did not give any adequate evidence about his answer. He covered his fear by shouting to Ki Bagus Rangin to keep silent. The implicature is Daendels is afraid of what Ki Bagus Rangin's said that his followers would continue his struggle to fight Daendels.(The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", AM, 3B).

Data 10

Simbar Kencana	: Then why did you kill my father?
Palembang Gunung	: Me? You know yourself the culprit is Centangbarang, he was never found until now.

The student's analysis is as follows.

Palembang Gunung said wrong statement. He lied to Simbar kencana about who had killed her father. He did not admit his crime to Simbar Kencana. His statement is flouting *maxim of quality* since he did not tell the truth. The implicature is Palembang

Gunung hid his crime by saying that Centanngbarang is the one who had kill Simbar Kencana's father. (Simbar Kencana Males Pati, ARP, 3A).

Data 11

Bapak Dam	: Hey! Hey! Hey! My guests are very important persons who come from rich families. Who are you that is really brave to propose my daughter? Hahaha....augh...augh... and your smell is bad.
Ratminah	: Bad smell....!
Bapak Dam	: Mesy hair, too...!
Ratminah	: Dirty cloth....!

The student analyzed as follows:

In the conversation above, Bapak Dam's statement is flouting the *maxim of quality* because Bapak Dam is lack of evidence about Mbok Wangsih's hair. In fact, he did not know exactly how Mbok Wangsih's hair looked like because Mbok Wangsih was wearing mantila (a kind of veil) at that time. But he said that Mbok wangsih's hair is messy. Some implicatures that readers may derive are as follows:

a. Bapak Dam did not like a woman with messy hair

b. Bapak Dam dislikes Mbok Wangsih because she is poor

c. Bapak Dam loved something clean

The most appropriate implicature is point (b) Bapak Dam dislikes Mbok Wangsih because she is poor. Bapak Dam is quite angry because such poor person like Mbok Wanngsih is dare to propose her daughter for her poor son. He thought that only a rich man is appropriate to marry his daughter, Ratminah.

(Baridin & Ratminah, DI, 3C).

The Flouting of Maxim of Relation and Its Implicature

Data 12

Nicolas	: Trust me, I'm serious.... I could see that there were an additional power in their side....... I.......I mean I saw an abstract troop which was flying in the sky.
Daendels	: Nicolas, just take a rest, please.

The student's analysis is as follows.

Daendels' statement is flouting the *maxim of relation* because it is not related to what Nicolas said. Nicolas said about the power and the troops in his imagination, but

Daendels responsed it by asking Nicolas to take a rest. The implicature is Daendels did not believe in Nicolas' words since it happened only in Nicolas' mind.

(The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", FAD, 3B).

Data 13

Daendels	: Who gave you all the foods this morning, inladers?
Ratinah	: It's not your business!!

In this conversation, Ratinah's answer is *irrelevant*. Daendels asked about who gave them food, but Ratinah did not mention any name as the answer. The implicature is Ratinah protected the person who helped them by giving them some foods.

(The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", MK, 3B).

Data 14

Ruben   : Who teaches you to say like that????
Ratinah : I'm not as stupid as you think!

The student analyzed as follows:

The example above is flouting the maxim of relation, because Ruben asked who taught her saying those provocative words, but Ratinah's answer is not answering Ruben's question. Instead of giving the name who had taught her, Ratinah saying that she is not as stupid as what Ruben think about her. Her answer flouted maxim of Relation, in which it is not relevant wint the question asked by Ruben. The implicature of Ratinah's words is she would not give Ruben any information about the man who had made her brave to say those words.

(The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", EAP, 3B).

Data 15

Palembang Gunung	: You don't want anything bad happen to them, do you?
Centangbarang	: What do you mean, Duke?

The student's analysis is as follows:

From the dialogue we can see that Centangbarang flouted the *maxim of relation* because he said something which was not relevant to what Palembang Gunung had said in previous utterance. Palembang Gunung asked Centangbarang 'you do not want anything

bad happen to them, do you?' but Centangbarang replied by asking Palembang Gunung another question. Based on Centangbarang utterance, readers may derive some implicit meanings as follows:

a. Centanngbarang did not believe in Palembang Gunung's words

b. Cenntangbarang did not want to do Palembang Gunung's instruction

The most appropriate implicature is point (b) Centangbarang did not want to do Palembang Guning's instruction to kill his king, Talaga Manggung. (Simbar Kencana Males Pati, AE, 3A).

Data 16

> Pakungwati: Yuhuuuu, what's up, Fatimah?
> Fatimah   : Uh, no, no, no. Started from now, you have to call me 'Nyimas Ayu Gandasari, okay**?**

The student's analysis is as follows:

Gandasari did the flouting of *maxim of relation***.** She did not answer Pakungwati's question. She answered it with another statement which is not related to the question. She wanted to be called 'Nyimas Ayu Gandasari', not Fatimah anymore. The implicature is Fatimah wanted to tell Pakungwati that she has already got a new name.

(Nyimas Ayu Gandasari, YIN, 3D)

Data 17

> Bapak Dam   : Hey! Where have you been? What time is it?
> Ratminah   : Dad...... I had an obstacle.

The student's analysis is as follows.

We can see that Ratminah's answer is not relevant with the question. Therefore, it is flouting the maxim of relation. The question is asking about place and time, but she answers it by giving information about what happened to her. It is not related to the question. The implicature is Ratminah hopes that his father will not get angry because of her coming home late.

(Baridin & Ratminah, D.I, 3C).

The Flouting of Maxim of Manner and Its Implicature

Data 18

Daendels : Albert, don't you feel that the inlanders are very different right now?
Albertus : <u>Emmmm..........</u>

The student's analysis is as follows.

Albertus' answer is not clear and ambiguous. The word "emmmm..." could have various meaning when it is interpreted. Therefore Daendels' answer is flouting the *maxim of manner. The implicature* is Albertus did not know what is meant by Daendels' question. He did not know what is the difference meant by Daendels about the inlanders.(The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", FAD, 3B).

Data 19

Talaga manggung: I am going to the bathroom
Guard 2 : Haah.....bathroom? Are you going there, too?
Guard 1 : <u>Ishh.....</u>

The student analyzed as follows:

In the dialogue above, the answer of Guard 1 is ambiguous. The words spoken by Guard 1 did not have an exact and clear meaning. Therefore, it is flouting the *maxim of manner. The implicature* of the conversation above is Guard 1 asked Guard 2 to stop talking or acting stupid in front of the king. (Simbar Kencana Males Pati, AF, 3A).

Data 20

Mbok Wangsih : What happened, Din? What obstacle was it?
Baridin : Kind of big obstacle......

The student's analysis is as follows.

In the conversation above, baridin's answer is flouting the *maxim of manner* since he did not give an exact answer to his mother about what kind of obstacle that he had. His answer is not clear. The implicature we may derive from Baridin's statement is Baridin did not want to tell the obstacle to her mother. (Baridin & Ratminah, DI, 3C)

Flouts Necessitated By a Clash Between Maxims

Flouts necessitated by a clash between maxims happen when the jokes flout more than one maxim, it could be two, three, or even four maxims at once.

There are students who analyzed the same data with different maxims. The students categorized them into the data which flouts two maxims or more at once. It is called flouts necessitated by a clash between maxims. They are as follows:

Data 21

> Ruben   : Who teaches you to say like that????
> Ratinah : I'm not as stupid as you think!

The student analyzed as follows:

Ruben asks Ratinah about somebody who teaches her become a rebel, but Ratinah does not answer Ruben's question. So, Ratinah does not give information honestly about somebody who teaches her. It is flouting *maxim of quality*. Furthermore, Ratinah's answer is not relevant toward Ruben's question. So, it is flouting maxims of relation. Conversational implicature in this conversation means that Ratinah wants to hide this information, defends herself and shows that she is brave and strong.

(The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", DAS, 3B).

Data 22

> Daendels   : Who gave you all the foods this morning, inlander?
> Ratinah   : It's not your business.

The student analyzed as follows.

In this dialogue, Ratinah does 2 floutings. The first she does the flouting *maxim of relation* because her answer is not relevant with daendels' question. The second one is flouting *maxim of manner*. With that answer, it makes daendels feel curious about it and also it makes daendels want to dig up what ratinah means and why Ratinah hides someone that gives her food.(The Immortal Spirit of Ki Bagus Rangin "Kedondong War", LLD, 3B).

Data 23

> Guard 1   : Then, how do we know the murderer?
> Talaga Manggung   : Look, after this, there will be a terrible thing that happen to him. Lives
>   paid by lives.

The student analyzed as follows.

Talaga Manggung did not answer directly who the murderer was. It is flouting the *maxim of quantity*. Besides, Talaga Manggung's answer is not to the point and it is not relevant to the question. Therefore it also flouted the *maxim of relation. The implicature* of the conversation above is although Talaga Manggung did not know exactly who the murderer was, the person who killed him would get terrible thing before his death because the murderer would get a curse. It is as the result because the person had violated his promise to Talaga manggung as his king. (Simbar Kencana Males Pati, AF, 3A).

Data 24

Prince Kusumalaya	: Who are you suddenly dare to talk like that? Don't you see that I had managed to beat all the contestants.
Palembang Gunung	: My Lord, allow me to introduce myself. My name is Palembang Gunung. I come from the other side of this country. I was wandering and accidentally saw a crowd of people who were attending the contest. Hearing that if I could win this match, I can marry the Crown Princess. By only seeing her face, I want to marry the Crown Princess. I know it is late. But please, give me a chance to finish the challenges before the last challenge.

The student analyzed as follows.

Palembang Gunung's answer flouts two maxims at once. The first, it is flouting the *maxim of quantity* since he gave too much information that what was being asked by Prince Kusumalaya. The second, it is flouting the maxim of relation because his answer is not related to the question. Besides, he gave the answer to the King, who did not ask anything to him. It was, Prince Kusumalaya who asked him a question. The implicature is Palembang Gunung wanted the king to give him a permit to join the contest which has been closed.(Simbar Kencana Males Pati, DT, 3A).

Data 25

Golis	: Yaa...what happened, Kakanda? What is going on? You are surprising me... Oh, My! Whose baby is this, Kakanda?
Ki Kuwu	: You have to know, Golis. I found this baby when I was walking around the garden. And how strange, he came out from the flower.

The student analyzed as follows.

Ki Kuwu's statement is flouting the *maxim of quantity* and *maxim of relation* at once. Ki Kuwu's answer was more informative than what was being asked. And the answer

was not related at all to the question. Since the question is whose baby it is. The answer did not provide any name and even Ki Kuwu explaind how he got the baby which was not asked by Golis. The implicature is the baby does not belong to Ki Kuwu, it was found by Ki Kuwu.(Nyimas Ayu Gandasari, YIN, 3D).

Data 26

Mang Bunawas	: Eh, Din! It's afternoon and you still sleep here. Are you serious about the job?
Baridin	: Sorry, Mang Bunawas. Last night, I watched wayanng, so I was late to wake up.

The student analyzed as follows.

From the conversation above, we know that Baridin's answer is flouting the *maxim of quantity* and also maxim of relation. Baridin answered Mang Bunawas' question more informative than is needed. Besides, Baridin's answer is not relevant with the question. Mang Bunawas asked whether Baridin is serious about the job Mang Bunawas gave him, but Baridin answered the question by giving the information about what he did last night. There are some conversational implicatures from Baridin's answer. They are:

a. Baridin is lazy to do the job

b. Baridin likes wayang kulit

c. Baridin wanted to make Mang Bunawas angry

The most appropriate implicature from the conversation above is point *(a) Barididn is lazy to do the job.* We can see from the dialogue that Baridin is not serious about the job given to him. Although he knew that tomorrow he would work in Mang Bunawas' field, but he watched wayang until late at night. If he is serious about the job, he will not do that.(Baridin & Ratminah, DI, 3C).

Based on the research findings above, we can see that all students analyzed the data based on Grice's theory of maxims. Students analyzed the data to be categorized into the FLOUTING OF MAXIM OF QUALITY when the speaker is lack of evidence and he/she lies to his/her conversation participant. When the speaker is giving too much or less information that is needed, the students categorized the data into the flouting the maxim of quantity. The data that are not relevant or related to the questions being asked are categorized into the flouting of maxim of relation. There are only limited data categorized into the flouting of maxim of manner. All conversations that are not clear,

ambiguous and do not have exact meaning are to be in this category of flouting maxim of manner.

The interesting thing is students also found the data that flouted two maxims at once. Most of them are categorized into the data that flouted maxim of relation and quantity at once. The data in this category showed that the speakers' answers or statements are not related to the question and more informative as well. The speaker added much information that is neither related nor needed to the question.

The students analyzed the conversational implicatures from two ways. The first, through the relationship between the question and the answer of the target conversant. The second, some students provided some possible implicatures may be derived by readers. Then, the students chose one implicature as the most appropriate one. Students also wrote the reasons why he/she chose certain implicature. The reasons are related to the dialogues between the conversant. Besides, students also analyzed the conversational implicatures through situation or atmosphere created by the conversant in the drama script based on what they plausibly assume or observe.

Conclusion & Recommendation

Based on the research findings above, we can see that all students analyzed the data based on Grice's theory of maxims. Students analyzed the data to be categorized into the flouting of maxim of quality when the speaker is lack of evidence and he/she lies to his/her conversation participant. When the speaker is giving too much or less information that is needed, the students categorized the data into the flouting the maxim of quantity. The data that are not relevant or related to the questions being asked are categorized into the flouting of maxim of relation. There are only limited data categorized into the flouting of maxim of manner. All conversations that are not clear, ambiguous and do not have exact meaning are to be in this category of flouting maxim of manner. The interesting thing is students also found the data that flouted two maxims at once. Most of them are categorized into the data that flouted maxim of relation and quantity at once. The data in this category showed that the speakers' answers or

statements are not related to the question and more informative as well. The speaker added much information that is neither related nor needed to the question.

This research is limited to the conversational implicatures analyzed by students of English Department. The object of the research is in the form of english drama script. This research has contribution and implications to the students' understanding about how to analyze conversational implicatures in pragmatic study. There are still a lot of things that could be explored more in this study related to the conversational implicatures. Such questions for further research as how conversational implicatures related to politeness, how students' gender influence the way they draw the implicatures and how conversational implicatures analyzed from other points of view such as sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. Future researchers could also analyzed conversational implicatures from different objects such as: talkshow, movie scripts, students-students talks, and teacher-students talks. Hopefully those questions could be explored in another future research theme.

The students analyzed the conversational implicatures from two ways. The first, through the relationship between the question and the answer of the target conversants. The second, some students provided some possible implicatures may be derived by readers. Then, the students chose one implicature as the most appropriate one. Students also wrote the reasons why he/she chose certain implicature. The reasons are related to the dialogues between the conversants. Besides, students also analyzed the conversational implicatures through situation or atmosphere created by the conversants in the drama script based on what they plausibly assume or observe.

References

Brown, H. D. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* New York: Longman.

Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Currie, Karen L. 2003. "Multiple Intelligence Theory and the ESL Classroom – Preliminary Considerations". *The Internet TESL Journal,* Vol. IX, No. 4, April 2003.

Dornyei, Zoltan. 2008. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford U.P.

Fauziati, Endang. 2009. *Reading on Applied Linguistics: A Handbook for Language Teacher and Teacher Researcher.* Surakarta: Era Pustaka Utama.

Fauziati, Endang. 2010. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language.* Surakarta: Era Pustaka Utama.

Gardner, Howard. 1983. *Frames of Mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, Howard.1993. *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice.* NY: Basic Books.

Gardner, Howard. 2000. *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st Century.* New York: Basic Book.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2005. *How to Teach English: An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching.* Essex: Longman.

Huda, Nuril. 1990. *Language Learning and Teaching: Issues and Trends.* Malang: IKIP Malang.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. et al. 1999. *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers.* Toronto: Health and Company.

Nation Paul. 1996. "Group work and language learning", In Kral, Thomas (Ed.). *Teacher Development: Making the Right Moves.* Washington, D.C.: English Language Program Division United States Information Agency.

Wilheim, Jeffrey D., Ph.D. 2002. *Action Strategies for Deepening Comprehension.* New York: NY: Scholastic Professional Books.

Wray, Alison, et al.1998. *Projects in Linguistics.* London: Arnold.

Biography

Jaufillaili is an English Lecturer of English Department University of Swadaya Gunung Jati. Her research interests and expertise are the study of Linguistics and language teaching. She is currently at the post Graduate of Padjajaran University. Her Address is jaufillaili@yahoo.co.id

Mahmud is an English Lecturer of English Department University of Swadaya Gunung Jati. His research interests and expertise are: The study of Linguistics, curriculum and teaching management, and language teaching. His address is Kalentengah, Sumueradem, Sukra Indramayu. He is available at mahmood.cliff@gmail.com