

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the novel ideas of the researcher in interpreting the research findings. This part is especially interpreting the relations among patterns found in data analysis. Moreover, it also explains the position of findings in this study to the existing theory by comparing or contrasting them with the previous findings and current theories which is relevant. It will be elaborated into two subclasses, the types of non-observance maxims and the hidden meaning of non-observance maxims performed by the Barden Bellas in *Pitch Perfect 2* movie.

A. The Types of Non-observance Maxims Performed by the Barden Bellas

In overall analysis of non-observance maxims found in this study, there are some common features that should be underlined. The first common characteristic of all non-observance maxims is the most frequently used of flouting maxim in order to create humor, followed by opting out maxim and violating maxim in that order. Second, the use of figure of speech to flout the maxims. And the last, some expressions used by the addressor to signal the addressee that s/he will fail to fulfill the maxims.

First, the maxim which is the most frequently flouted in this movie is quality maxim. According to Grice (1975:83), the characteristic of flouting quality maxim can be seen from the use of figure of speech, such as irony, metaphor, and hyperbole. In line with his theory, most of utterances performed by Bellas used the figure of speech to flout the quality maxim. They are,

metaphor, overstatement, irony, and banter. The use of this figure of speech has blatantly exploited the principle of quality maxims; i.e. do not say what is believed to be false, and do not say something with lack adequate evidence. In metaphor, the addressor referred a person or an object into something else which has the similar characteristics. Overstatement found in the utterances which is said is more or stronger than the actual state of affairs, while banter and irony, happened when the way of delivering the statements is contradictory with the meaning.

In addition to strategy of flouting the quality maxim, there are some utterances which used the rhetorical question figure of speech. In this case, Bellas did not raise a question in order to gain an answer rather they used the rhetorical question to convey an implicit statement. The questions here left their answer hanging in the air. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:223), when a speaker asked a question with no intention of obtaining an answer, it has broken sincerity condition on question. They added, this sincerity condition has an injunction 'be sincere', i.e. principle in quality maxim. Moreover, to know whether it belongs to rhetorical question or not, it can be analyzed from the response of the addressee(s) where they did not answer the question that is raised.

The maxim which is frequently used after flouting quality maxim is maxim of quantity. This kind of non-observance maxim can be analyzed from the quantity of information being uttered by Bellas where they gave less or too much information than is required or asked by another participant. It means

that they have deliberately flouted the quantity maxim. Furthermore, as Grice (1975:52) explanation, the example of flouting quantity maxim is provided by utterances of patent tautology. It is also found in this study. There is an utterance which used tautology to flout the quantity maxim.

The last two maxims which flouted are relation and manner maxim. The flouting maxim of relation can be identified from the utterances delivered by the speaker which is irrelevant with the topic being discussed. While flouting the manner maxim, it can be analyzed from the use of ambiguous terms. Besides, in some occasions, there is one of personnel of the Barden Bellas who said something in obscure way. Hence, it made her addressees felt confused in interpreting her intended meaning. In this situation, the obscure utterance has flouted the maxim of manner since she has failed to observe the principle of manner maxim; to say in perspicuous way (Grice, 1975:4).

Second, the utterances which classified into opting out maxim. The quantity maxim becomes the most opted out maxim found in the utterances performed by the Barden Bellas followed by the relation and quality maxims. They used the expression; i.e. *you know* in order to signal their addressee(s) that they want to limit the amount of the data they are going to deliver. In this case, it has opted out the quantity maxim. Based on Brown and Levinson (1987:167), the use of this expression notices that the utterances do not give as much or not as precise information is provided as might be expected.

The opting out maxim of relation can be seen from the used of some expressions such as *well*, *okay*, or *um*. According to Grice (1975), these

expressions are used by an addressor to signal the addressee that s/he wants to change the topic. Finegan (2008:300) added, typically such pre-closing sequences are accompanied by a series of pauses between and within turns that decelerate the exchange and prepare for closing down the interaction. Furthermore, sometimes after a pre-closing exchange, speakers refer to the original motivation for the conversation. At this moment, the maxim of relation has been opted out.

It was found 1 opting out maxim of quality that can be identified from the use of a prefacing statement; i.e. *I don't know, I have many, many doubts*. It indicates that speaker wanted to signal her addressees in which she did not have strong evidence of the statement she was going to say.

Third, violating maxim of CP is the least kind of non-observance maxims found in this study where maxim of quantity became the most frequently violated than others. The violating maxim was the hardest to be identified since it was hard to distinguish between violations and flouts in this particular case. This is in line with Thomas (1995:90) explanation that one of the problems with theory of Cooperative Principle is where there are many examples are less clear-cut and how we know which type of non-observance is involved. He then added, that Grice in this case, did not explain how an addressee was supposed to distinguish between a flout, a violation, and opting out.

In addition to the findings of overall kind of non-observance maxims, the utterances which failed to fulfil the relation and manner maxim were fairly easy to identify. Grice in Levinson (1987) noted, flouting of relation maxim is little

harder to find since it requires that the character says something irrelevant to a conversation at hand, but the researcher still found that the maxim of relation failed to observe although it is not as frequently as the maxims of quality and quantity. Moreover, based on these findings, it reveals that the use of non-observance maxims in daily communication increases the language varieties applied by the people.

B. The Hidden Meaning of Non-observance Maxims Performed by the Barden Bellas in *Pitch Perfect 2* Movie

The hidden meaning behind an utterance can be analyzed from some aspects. According to Grice (1975), the intention of an implicature can be seen from the context. However, according to Davies (2007), Grice's work had major limitation, in which it is based on introspection rather than data. Moreover, he also claimed that it takes no account of interpersonal factors. Hadi (2012) also mentioned that Cooperative Principle is flawed since it does not take the social context into account, only considers the speaker-listener interaction in an ideal context, and applies universally (regardless of social elements such as sex, power relationships, social class, and age. He then suggests that it would be better to study CP in the context of Grice's work as a whole rather than in isolation. However, Thomas (1995:58) argued that many linguists which use the term of implicature and inference in an appropriate way so that becomes the root of misunderstanding of Cooperative Principle. Hence, in discussing the finding of this study, the researcher also considered the

situational or social context of the utterances. Besides, she also used the theory of Illocutionary act by Searle to classify the intention behind the utterance.

First, regarding to the social context, flouting maxims became the dominance data for the consideration that the relation among participants was socially equal. Because of this reason, personnel of the Barden Bellas felt free to express what in their minds were by deliberately failed to fulfill the maxim. Biber and Conrad (2009) said that the more interactive, the closer relation among participants will be. It supports the data since the relation among personnel of the Barden Bellas was very close for they have lived in the same roof for almost 4 years.

Besides, to show the intimacy among participants, the flouting quality maxim which commonly found in this study was assumed to create a sense of humor since *Pitch Perfect 2* movie belongs to musical comedy film. Based on Prasetyo (2013), the maxims of CP are often flouted to produce humor which is used by the comics to elicit laughter from the audience. Cook (2010) added, comedy is full of opposite and contradictions. This is in line with the finding of this study where the dominance data are flouting maxim of quality. Thus, personnel of the Barden Bellas in this movie failed to observe the maxim of quality in which they say something that is believed to be false or with lack adequate evidence in order to create a humor.

Flouting quantity maxim, in this occasion, someone may give more information than is required since s/he wants to explain something in detail in order to avoid misunderstanding among participants, or to convey a strong

argument in order to convince the addressor. Moreover, based on Huda (2013:83), the reason of addressor to flout the maxim of quantity is the speaker wants to trigger the hearer to be responsive and sensitive about the situation which is happened. This is true while the speaker gives less information than is required. However, in this study, it is found that the utterances are not only flout the quantity maxim which gives less information, but some of them also give too much information than is required.

The intended meanings of utterances performed by the Barden Bellas which flout the quality and quantity maxims are varied. They flouted maxim of quality and quantity in order to give assertion, to claim, to make a conclusion, to give advice, to ask for help, to insult, and to express personal feeling. Furthermore, the intended meaning of flouting manner maxim which is found in this study is to make the participants confused. It is supported by the explanation of Nick (2010:120): the reason of someone in flouting manner maxim is to confuse or to bore.

Second, although the relation among Bellas is very close, it was also found that there were some awkward situations which influenced them to opt-out the maxims of CP. One reason of opting out maxim is to repair. Finegan (2008:301) stated that repair takes place in conversation when a participant feels the need to correct herself or another speaker, to edit a previous utterance, or simply to restate something. Moreover, to initiate a repair is to signal that one has not understood or has misheard an utterance that a piece of information is incorrect, or that one is having trouble finding a word. The way to resolve a

repair, someone may use particles and expression like *uh*, *I mean*, or *that is*. These expressions were found in the utterances that opted out the maxims of CP.

Different from flouting maxim and violating maxim (will be discussed in the next paragraph), the opting out maxim has no significance hidden meaning rather it is only the strategy of an addressor in order to signal her addressee(s) of how much or how far she will observe the maxim of CP. The prefacing utterance found in this study is used in order to be polite in talking with the other people. Based on Finegan (2008), the Indirect Speech Act, just like in non-observance maxims, conveys more than one message and are commonly used for politeness or humor. Based on Thomas (1995:74), opting out indicates the unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. Bellas when in public life, cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reasons, reply in the way normally expected. On the other hand, they wished to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative. Another reason frequently given for opting out is that giving the requested information might hurt a third party or put them in danger. The intention of the utterances which classified into opting out maxims are asserting, recommending, warning, and pardoning.

Third, the least data of non-observance maxim performed by Bellas is violating the maxim. This is happened when Bellas faced an awkward or jittery situation. According to Finegan (2008:288), when someone produces an apparently irrelevant utterance, hearers typically strive to understand how it might be relevant (as a joke, perhaps, or an indication of displeasure with the

direction of the conversation). However, in this study, it is closely related to pardoning, asserting, advising, and promising.

In conclusion, related to the types of illocutionary act behind non-observance maxims performed by the Barden Bellas, it shows that indirect speech act is the most frequently used in the flouting maxims rather than opting out and violating. Based on this finding, it strengthens that the degree of failure in flouting maxims is the highest than the other types of non-observance maxims. Besides, it also reveals that the meaning of an utterance is beyond what is said.