

A Socio-Pragmatics Study: Flouting of Conversational Maxims Found in Bence Traditional Market

Mohammad Muhyidin
muhyidinmoh@gmail.com

Abstract

The study focuses on the flouting of conversational maxims in one of the traditional markets in Kediri. This study focuses on the types of flouted maxims, and the situations where the flouted maxims cause misunderstanding between the sellers and the buyers in the trade of interaction.

This research is conducted by using a descriptive qualitative approach. The data are utterances between sellers and buyers. The theory which the writer used is based on the theory of Cooperative Principles, proposed by Grice (1975), which establishes four maxims, those are the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation and maxim of manner. The data is collected by recording the conversation in the trade transaction. The data is also collected by noting the conversation and transcript it.

The finding shows that there are many flouted maxims found in interaction practices between the seller and buyer. The writer's analysis show that all kinds of maxims are flouted mostly buy the seller. Those are maxim of quantity, maxima of quality, maxims of relevance and maxim of manner. Thus, it may happen because between the seller and the buyer do not fulfil the rules of cooperative principles. The writer concludes there are some condition which make the participants in the trade interaction have to flout the maxims. Due to the fact that the conversation still run well without any misunderstanding.

Keywords: *Socio-Pragmatics, flouting, maxims, traditional markets*

Introduction

Levinson (2000) stated that utterance types matter of preferred interpretations. Getting the message delivered by the speaker is one goal of a conversation. But people do not only need to get the message or understand what others talk about (p.1). The conversation needs the effectiveness and efficiency of delivering the contribution of information. Grundy (2000) said that the conversational maxim is a way to explain the link between the utterances and what understood by the listener (p.71). The message of conversation itself will be successfully delivered if the speaker and the listener can build a cooperation with one to another.

According to (Grice, 1975 as cited in Yule, 1996), in order to have success conversation will focus on the cooperative principle. It needs a set of rules. If the speaker says, then the conversation will run smoothly. Further, the rule is defined as the maxim (p.37).

Flouting maxim happens in such a habit to some people when they are involved in the conversation. This case also can be seen in conversations in trade of traditional market. Both sellers and buyers do violate maxims during their conversation which means that they break the cooperative principle. Thomas (1995) stated that violation of the maxim may occur when the speakers disobey the maxim at the level of what is said, with the intention of generating implicature (p.65).

This study chooses Bence traditional market as the object of the analysis. Bence traditional market is located on Kapten Tendean Street, Ngronggo Kota Kediri. It is one of place where so many conversations may happen in the same time. It is because there are many sellers that offer their daily needs every day and also many buyers who come and even do bargain what they need to buy. The conversation that usually happens in the market is mostly by using Indonesia and Java language.

Flouting maxim is being such a habit to some people when they are involved in conversation. This case also can be seen from conversations in Bence traditional market Kediri. Both speakers and buyers do flout maxims during their conversation which means that they do break the cooperative principle.

In this case, the writer tries to analyze what types of flouting maxims and what situations because misunderstanding occur in trade transactions at one of the traditional markets in Kediri named Bence market. The writer chooses this traditional market because it has a very strategic place, where is surrounded by many educational institutions. The trade interaction may come from people which are coming from various cities and region with many different backgrounds of knowledge, culture and education. Thus, many backgrounds factors which may influence the communication practices.

Literature Review

Sociolinguistics

Holmes (1992) explains that Sociolinguistics studies the relationship between language and society (p.1). Sociolinguistics is interested in explaining why people speak differently in different social contexts, and it concerns identifying the social functions of language and the ways they are used to convey social meaning. Examining the way people use language in different social contexts provides a wealth of information about the way language works, as well as about the social relationship in a community.

Pragmatics

Renkema (1993) states that the field of discourse study, which investigates the relationship between form and function in verbal communication, is a branch of pragmatics, the study of using signs. Fraser (1983) explains that the pragmatics should be seen the theory of linguistic communication providing an account of sentence meaning. It concerns with the way in which people use language in context. Leech (1983) states that pragmatics concerns the principles of language use, and meaning in pragmatics is defined relative to a speaker or user of the language. It means that language is only meaningful in its situational context. Levinson (1983) states that pragmatic theory concerns with the inference of presupposition, implicature, and participant's entire knowledge of the world and a general principle of language usage.

Context of Situation

An utterance does not only relate to the physical context but it also relates to context of situation. Some of utterances will interweave to context of situation that more complex to interpret. There are several factors that involved in speaking according to context of situation. Hymes (as cited in Wardhaugh, 2006) states that setting and scene, participants, ends, act

sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms, and genre as the parts of the context of situation and relevant factors in order to understand the purpose of particular communication. These factors called as SPEAKING model.

Setting refers to the time and place. Meanwhile, *scene* is psychological setting, such as range of formality (Hymes, 1974). Setting and scene are recognized by the where utterance takes place and the abstract physiological setting that surrounds the conversation or utterance. *Participants* include to a speaker, hearer, and overhear (Hymes, 1974). This factor involves the sender and receiver. End or purpose is the goal or outcome of the conversation (Hymes, 1974). *Act sequence* includes to the actual form and content of what is said “the precise words used and the relationship of what is said and the actual topic at hand” (Wardhaugh, 2006). *Key* is the use of tone, manner, or spirit in which particular message conveyed. Key is also described as several nonverbal signals such as gesture or style dress, etc. (Hymes, 1974). This term refers to the way of message conveyed, such as mocking, sarcastic, serious, and so on. *Instrumentalities* refer to channel form of speech (Hymes, 1974). *Norm* is divided into two. There are norm of interaction and norm of interpretation. Norms refer to specific behavior and properties that attach to speaking such as loudness, silence, gaze return, and so on when speaking. Norms also refer to how someone viewed an utterance (Wardhaugh, 2006). Norms relate to the social structure or social relationship that will affect specific norm of interaction, norms also refer to the view of the other party, such as give ‘support’ or ‘against’ to someone speech. *Genre* is the type of utterance, such as poems, proverbs, riddles, sermons, prayers, lecturer and so on (Hymes, 1974).

Flouting Maxims

According to Grice’s theory, interlocutors operate on the assumption that as a rule, the maxims will be observed. But when speakers appear not follow the maxims but expect hearers to appreciate the meaning implied. Grice was well aware, however, that there are

many occasions when people fail to observe the maxims. Grice (1975) stated that a speaker may flout a maxim when s/he blatantly fail to fulfill it, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because the speaker wishes to prompt the addressee to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning (p.49). He called this additional meaning as “conversational implicature.” Thomas (1995) stated that a flout occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature (p.64).

A. Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

When a speaker flouts the maxims under the category of Quantity, s/he blatantly gives either more or less information than the situation demands. For an example of how the maxims flouted, imagine this scenario. A married couple has just had a quarrel. The husband puts on his hat and coat and stomps to the door. The following exchange takes place:

(1) Wife : Where are you going?

Husband: *Out*

B. Flouting the Maxim of Quality

Flouts which exploit the maxims under the category of quality occur when the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue or for which he or she lacks adequate evidence. Often an individual will try to deflect unwelcome attention by giving an improbable or obviously untrue response. B was a long train journey and wanted to read her book. A was a fellow passenger who wanted to talk to her.

(2) A: What do you do?

B: I'm a teacher.

A: Where do you teach?

B: *Outer Mongolia.*

A: Sorry I asked.

C. Flouting the Maxim of Relation/Relevant

The maxim of relation (Be Relevant) is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand (e.g. by abruptly changing the subject, or by overtly failing to address the other person's goal in asking a question). Examples of flouting the maxim of relation by changing the subject or by failing to address the topic directly are encountered very frequently, and the example which follows is typical.

(4) A: There is somebody at the door.

B: *I'm in the bath.*

D. Flouting Maxim of Manner

The maxim under the category of manner is exploited by giving ambiguity and obscure expressions, failure to be brief and orderly. It is often trying to exclude a third party, as in this sort of exchange between husband and wife.

(5) Husband : Where are you off to?

Wife : *I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.*

Husband : OK, but don't be long – dinner is nearly ready

Method

The writer conducts the observation by using a descriptive qualitative approach. Further, the theory used is based on the theory of cooperative principle, proposed by Paul Grice (1975), which establishes four maxims, those are the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation/relevance, and the maxim of manner. In this case, the writer wants to observe kinds of flouted maxims which are occurred in trade interaction between the sellers and buyers and also what situations cause the flouted maxims. In order to have the

evidence, the writer collects the data in this observation by listening to the conversations in trade transaction using recording/tape. Not only that, the data is also collected by noting the conversation in papers, the writer will transcript and type it in the computer. There are many data which had been collected, but then the writer will choose some data which represent and show how the sellers or the buyers flout maxims.

Result and Discussion

I. Discussion

After analyzing the data, the writer found there were many maxims which were flouted in the trade interaction between the sellers and the buyers in Bence traditional market in Kediri. Furthermore, the findings revealed the conversations which occurred between the sellers and the buyers were still able to run smoothly even though there were some maxims which were flouted. In addition, the writer chooses some data which are obtained to be observed. Even though the conversations are chosen, but inside those conversations consist of the analysis and findings, the data are presented in the discussion below.

Context 1: The conversation take place in the trade. It occurred between Seller and Seller; in this case the Seller had some kidding with the Seller in order to make familiarity.

- Seller** : Nyapo mbak?
(what are you doing?)
- Researcher** : Niki damel penelitian//Ohh, nggeh! (sambil milih tomat). Kulo nyuwun seng abang-abang mawon.
(*It is for doing research*) (*All right, I want the red ones*)
- Seller** : Seng abang-abang? //enggeh.
(*The red ones! All right*)
- Seller** : Kuliah nyang ndi mbak?
(*Where are you studying now?*)
- Researcher** : STAIN
- Seller** : Oh, teng mriku// mburi ngriki to? (sambil melayani)
(*Oh, I see, it's near here*) (*while serve the buyer*)
- Seller** : Jurusan nopo?
(*what is your department?*)
- Researcher** : Jurusane bahasa inggris.
(*English department*)

- Seller** : Wadoh iki, bakul tomat genah bahasa inggris gak ngene ki?
Tomato...tomato..."
(*wow, Tomato Seller doesn't understand English at all, don't I?*
(*tomato ,..tomato*)
- Seller** : Wes, prei prei ngeneki.
(*Ok, stop to think this*)

In the first context, there were situation where the seller and the buyer do communication in the trade interaction. However, the conversation was not effective because there were two maxims which were flouted in this conversation. The first is maxim of relation or relevant. In this case, the seller asked, " *what are you doing?* And the buyer answered by " *It is for doing research*) (*Al right, I want the red ones*), in this point, the response is irrelevant with the situation. The situation was in trade of market where the bargain happened. The buyer and the seller already know what the situation but the seller asked " *what are you doing?*". The second flouting is maxim of quality. In this case, the seller asked about buyer's private business. The seller responses by saying" *wow, Tomato Seller doesn't understand English at all, don't I? (tomato ,.. tomato...)*. It is not important to response about the buyer's condition.

Context 2: The conversation takes place in the trade. It occurred between Seller and Seller; in this case the Seller arranged the tomatoes and the seller came and bought ten kilos.

- Buyer:** "Samean dadekne loro"
(*you divide two*)
- Seller:** "Nggeh, dadekne kaleh niki. Niku jane teng andap niku nggeh wonten, tapi mboten podo. Rodok nganu.. lhaaa niku loh, mboten podo nggeh to?"
(*oke, devide two, will you? There are others but It is different, it is rather it is different, isn't it?*)
- Buyer:** "Gak podo. Nopo setunggal ewu ngeten niki?"
(*it is different, how is about a thousandlike this?*)
- Seller:** "Mboten. Nggeh sami regine, tapi jenise mboton podo to, pak"
(*No, it is not,*)
- Buyer:** "Woo tahan kuat seng ngisor iki?"
(*wow, this is strong hold down*)
- Seller:** "Nggeh,... kaleh niku..niku kaleh doso kilo nggehan.... Pripun? Kaleh niku nopo niki sedoyo?"
(*Yes, I want those twenty kilos, How?*)
- Seller:** "Nggeh marai tawur kaleh Lombok nganjuk loh ngeten niki. Lombok Nganjuk murah, seketan. Lek niki tasek punjul."

- (Yes, because it competes with chili from Nganjuk, Nganjuk's chili is cheap, fifty, if it is more than that)
- Buyer:** “Seketan?”
(Fifty?)
- Seller:** “Nggeh Nganjuk an seket.” “...”
(Yes, Ngajuk is fifty)
- Seller:** “Pripun? Diketokne niku?”
(How is it?)
- buyer:** “Keciliken loh pak iki. Pitulas setengah yo niki?”
(it is too small, seventy and half, is it)
- buyer:** “Pundi? Niku?”
(Where is ...Is that?)
- Seller:** “Nggeh (Yes)
- Buyer:** “Nggeh pun, niku kaleh doso kilo ngoten.”
(All right, that is twenty kilos)

In the second context, there was also situation where the seller and the buyer had communication in the trade interaction. In this conversation, the seller flouted three maxims in the same time. Thus, it is started when the buyer tried to get the seller to do something by asking” *you divide two*” and the seller answer by” *oke, divide two, will you? There are others but It is different, it is rather it is different, isn't it?*). It is flouted maxim of quality when the seller says something which is blatantly lacks adequate evidence. The situation when the buyer asked the seller to divide tomatoes into two but the seller answer more than what seller asked to.

Context 3: The Conversation occurred between the seller and the buyer. In this case the seller had kidding with buyer in order to pursue the buyers to buy his products. (oranges)

- ...
- Seller** : 15 ribu 2 kg/silahkan dicicipin/ monggo di cicipin, ini jeruknya uenak,.. langsung sangking unduhan... monggo
(fifteen thousand for two kilos, please just taste it. These oranges are really nice, the oranges are well-ripped from the tree)
- Buyer** : Mblenyek iki bos e.
(this is ripeness boss) (*calling the seller by using word boss*)
- Seller** : (penjual mengalihkan perhatian dengan basa basi dan bercanda), yang kuning manis lho, seng ijo tambah muaniss. Wes kari milih manis opo muaniss ... ayo. (*the seller shifts the conversation, in order to avoid the complaint from the buyer*), the yellow ones are sweet and the green ones are very sweet. Ok. You just choose what you like, c'mon)
- Buyer** : lek seng iki lek
(what about this ones)
- Seller** : podo boss, tinggal milih wae

(that is just the same, you just choose them all)
Buyer : piroan seng iki?
 (how much is this?)
Seller : wes, sekilo 6 ewu wae, 2 kilo 10 ewu, murah to
 (ok, a six thousand per kilo, two kilos are ten thousand)
Buyer : pas ye. (is that fix price?)
Seller : pas, murah iki, koyo jeruk luar lho
 (fixed, that is very cheap, it is like west orange, isn't it) (smile)

In this context, there was a situation where the seller and buyer do interactions in the trade. However, the conversation was not effective because there were three flouted maxims. The first is maxim quality. It happened when the seller telling a lie. He told to the buyer that the oranges were sweets and healthy by saying” *fifteen thousand for two kilos, please just taste it. These oranges are really nice, the oranges are well-ripped from the tree*” but in the fact, not all the oranges were sweet. The buyer complained that there were the oranges that ripeness. The second is flouted maxim of relevance. It happened when the seller tried to change the topic in the middle of conversation and don't answer the buyer's question. It is started when the buyer asked the complained,” *this is ripeness boss,*” however the seller answered,” *the yellow ones are sweet and the green ones are very sweet. Ok. You just choose what you like, c'mon.* the seller shifted the conversation in order to avoid the buyers complain. The third, it also happened on flouted maxim of quantity. The seller answered the buyer's question more than what being asked. It happened when the buyer asked,” *how much is this?*’. The seller answered by saying,” *ok, a six thousand per kilo, two kilos are ten thousand,*”. In this situation, the seller wants to emphasize that if the buyer wants to buy two kilos, the buyer get discount. It also happened when the seller makes a joke by saying,” *the yellow ones are sweet and the green ones are very sweet. Ok. You just choose what you like, c'mon,* it is because of the seller gave the information too much as what the seller wants.

Context 4: the conversation occurred between the seller and the buyer. The seller praised and pursued the buyer, in order to make the buyer would come to buy some products from her again.

.....

Buyer : matur nuwun nggih buk.
(*thank you ma'am*)

Seller : nggeh nak, sami sami//laris manis, bar di tuku arek ayu tenan. (penjual memukul mukul daganganya dengan uang yang di bayarkan oleh pembeli)// sesok tuku kene mane hyo (sambal tersenyum)
(*yes miss, you are welcome, what a great selling, it has just been bought by beautiful girl*) (***the seller drubbing her product with money that has gotten from the buyer***) (*smiles*)

Buyer : Nggeh buk (tersenyum)
(*yes ma'am*) (*smiling*)

In this context, there were another situation where the seller and the buyer had a conversation in the trade interaction. In this moment, the seller was intentionally flouted the maxim, in order to praise the buyer. The seller hoped that the buyer would come again to buy her product. The flouted maxim was occurred when the buyer said " *thank you ma'am,* ". She said after she bought the product from the seller. The seller answered correctly at the beginning but then the seller added some information which is not really relevance. The seller said, " *yes miss, you are welcome, what a great selling, it has just been bought by beautiful girl.* " In this case, the seller flouted the maxim of quantity and relevance. The seller answered too much information. The seller did it because she wants to praise the buyer. It is common in trade interaction in the market. It is like the tradition in traditional market, especially in Java.

Context 5: The conversation take place in the trade. It occurred between Seller and Seller; in this case the Seller and Seller bargain about things.)

Buyer : "Pinten niki? Sedoso?"
(*How much is it? Is it ten thousand?*)

Seller : "Sedoso."
(*Ten thousand, is it?*)

Buyer: "Sedoso mbak nggeh."
(*is it ten thousand, it is? mbak*) (*she is calling Mbak*)

Seller: "(setunggale) kalehewuan."
(*the other ones*) *two thousand each*)

Buyer: "Lah endi tunggal eneh?"

- (*oh, ... where is the other?*)
- Seller:** “Nggeh kanton niki.”
(*yes, just this ones*)
- Buyer:** “Niki pinten? Kulo pendet seng abang-abang. Sewu lima ngatus (setunggale). kabeh.”
(*How much is it, I take the red ones, a thousand and five, one for all*)
- Seller:** “Ngapunten nggeh.”
(*Sorry*) (*while the Seller smiles*)
- Buyer:** “Ora milihyo?”
(*Don't choose, will you*)
- Seller:** “Nggeh ngapunten, barange nggeh ngeten niki. Ora eneks eng liyane.”
(*I am sorry, the things are like this, there is no others*)
- Buyer:** “Nggeh sedoso ewu pun.”
(*ok, ten thousand*) “Pilih ono, seng ngajeng.” (*please, choose the front ones*)
- Seller:** “Samean adahi.”
(*you wrapped it*)
- Buyer:** “Nggeh.” (*ok*)

In the third context, this conversation between seller and buyer were bargaining. There are three maxims in the conversation above at the same situation. For the first maxim is the seller flouted a maxim of quantity and rational/relevant. In the conversation the buyer asked “*How much is it? Is it ten thousand?*” then seller was only answered “*Ten thousand, is it?*”. There is less information about it because no more responded by the seller, for maxim rational/relevant when buyer gives a question but then the seller also gives question too. For the next maxim is maxim of quantity it happened when seller was talking to the buyer by giving more information of the product but the respond was in the end of conversation was only indicate of agreement such as “*yes,*” by the buyer, because he was choosing the others product. There were situations where the seller and buyer made interaction to bargain each other in the market.

Context 6: It occurred between Seller and Seller; in this case, the seller tried to bargain the Chinese cabbage. The seller was in hurry because the time was too evening.

- Buyer:** (Memegang barang dagangan)
(*holding the cabbage*)
- Seller** : Rong puluh

(it's twenty thousand rupiahs)
Buyer: Kok jek rong puluh men
 (why it's still twenty thousand anyway)
Seller : butuhe piro to mbak?
 (How many (cabbage) do you need?)
Buyer: gak limolas ae?
 (How about fifteen thousand?)
Seller: butuhe pirang kilo? Njenengan wolulas wes
 (how many do you need? Just Eighteen thousand for you)
Buyer: telu ae, limolas
 (three (kilogram) only, fifteen thousand)
Seller : piye?
 (What?)
Buyer: telung kilo ae lo
 (three kilograms only)
Seller : lek limolas yo rung oleh. Wolu laslek gelem mbalek tuku wi
 (fifteen thousand is still not allowed. Eighteen only to turnover of you want)
Buyer: seket? (How about five thousand?)
Seller : he?
 (What did you say?)
Buyer: telung kilo seket?
 (Five thousand for three kilograms (cabbage))
Seller : butuhe telung kilo tok to?
 (It is only three kilograms you need, isn't it?)
Buyer: ya.. karek nambahi o
 (yes, it is. It's only for addition)
Seller : yo sek tak adahane
 (okay, I will put it in plastic for a while)
Buyer: oleh pora iki?
 (Can I take it?)
Seller : oleh, sek (yes, you may. Wait for a while)

In the fourth context, there was bargaining between teller and buyer of Chinese cabbage. There are some maxims flouted in this conversation. In the beginning of the conversation there is maxim of quality, when buyer said “*why it's still twenty thousand anyway*” it indicates flouted that giving irony. For the next maxim is rational/relevant one, it happens when buyer asked “*How many (cabbage) do you need?*” the seller answer “*How about fifteen thousand?*” there is irrelevant respond that given by the seller. And the last is there is a maxim of quantity, when seller said “*fifteen thousand is still not allowed. Eighteen only to turnover of you want*” but then buyer only gave short respond “*five thousand?*” then seller asked additional informational because it was unclear what the meaning of her

statement like “*what did you say?*” then buyer gave explanation “*five thousand for three kilograms (cabbage)*” to make it clear.

Context 7: This trade happens between chili’s seller and the seller. In this case the seller wants to buy five kilos but the chili was less than it.

- Buyer :** Lombok Garing seng India?
(*Is it dry chili from India?*)
- Seller :** ho oh
(*Yes, it is*)
- Buyer :** sekilo Piro?
(*How much per kilos?*)
- Seller:** Papat pitu, Tak adahane kene mas, tak adah ane
(*Forty seven, come here I will package it sir, come here*)
- Buyer :** Lha lek limang kilo Piro mas?
(*So, how much for 5 kilos sir?*)
- Seller :** Limang kilo gak enek mas, gur enek pirang kilo iki.
(*No more for 5kilos sir, only less than 5 kilos.*)
- Buyer :** gak papat limo ta?
(*How about forty-five*)
- Seller :** yo wes
(*Yes, here you are*)
- Buyer :** Iku seng pedes to
(*Is it the spicy one right?*)
- Seller :** Iyo pedes iki
(*Yes, it is*)
- buyer :** seng impor to
(*The import one?*)
- Seller :** Iyo, (*Yes*)
- Buyer :** Pinten
(*How much?*)
- Seller :** satus sewidak telu
(*One hundred and sixty-three*)
- Buyer :** niki (*This one*)

In the fifth context, at beginning there was maxim of manner it showed when seller said “*Forty seven, come here I will package it sir, come here*” then buyer answered “*So, how much for 5kilos sir?*” in here the statement given by buyer is not necessary yet because the buyer has not already decided whether he wants to buy the chili or not.

Context 8: It happened in the trade of transaction in market. It occurred between seller and seller, in this case seller compared the price of melon between now and yesterday.

- Buyer :** pinten?
(*How much?*)
- Seller :** sedanten?
(*All of this?*)
- Buyer :** piro?
(*How much?*)
- Seller :** perbiji ne 6 ribu
(*Every slice is six thousand*)
- Buyer :** hahaha petang ewu ngono ya?
(*how if four thousand?*)
- Seller :** wes wes limang ewu wes gak popo yo..?
(*Is it oke for five thousand, how?*)
- Buyer :** ndek ingi aku petang ewu kabeh yo?
(*Yeserday, I bought it four thousand for all, did it?*)
- Seller :** Yo limang ewu kui lahh..
(*That is five thousand*)
- Buyer :** petang ewu gak entok?
(*Is it oke for four thousand?*)
- Seller :** limang ewu guran mas
(*Only five thousand sir*)
- Buyer :** ngko Ben oleh opah seng gowo, aku lo wingi malah piro? Telung ewu.
(*It will be paid for laborer, because yesterday it was only three thousand*)
- Seller :** wingi? (*Yesterday?*)
- Buyer :** Iyo. (*Yes*)
- Seller :** TapiYo rodok cilik
(*But, that is little bit smaller*)
- Buyer :** lek angsal petang ewu kulo pendet
(*If it is allowed for four thousand, I will take it*)
- Seller :** ditambahi to ben dadi
(*Please give it more, for a deal*)
- Buyer :** katese gak nggowo to? Katese pinten?
(*Do you bring pepaya? How much?*)
- Seller :** lek katese telu setengah tapi, iki katese kalifornia
(*For papaya is three a half, but it is the California one*)
- buyer :** Niki mawon, Piro jumlah e?
(*I take this one, how much is it?*)
- Seller :** pitula, katese gak?
(*Seventeen, how about papaya?*)
- Buyer :** gak (*No*)
- Seller :** dibeto ten pundi to mas?
(*Where do you bring it*)
- Buyer :** pondok
(*Islamic Boarding*)
- Seller :** pondok mriki?
(*is it here?*)
- Buyer :** nggeh (*Yes, it is*)
- Seller :** Iki gedang e iki

- (*This one is banana.*)
- Buyer :** pinten, nam lapan?
(*Pardon me, is it sixty-eight, right?*)
- Seller :** nggeh. (*Yes it is*)
- Buyer :** Kulo rien nggeh (*Ok, I go then*)
- Seller :** nggeh. (*Yes*)

In the sixth context, there is rational/relevant maxim in three statement at the same time in the beginning, it proven by statement “*how much?*” “*all of this?*” “*how much?*” the respond given by buyer and seller were in question forms and it is not irrelevant. Second maxim is also rational/relevant maxim it showed when buyer said “*Yesterday, I have bought four thousand, all of it, right*” the seller answered “*That is five thousand*” it implied that there is irrelevant respond given by seller because statement by buyer refers to the product that he bought yesterday but the seller refers to his product. However, both of them know the meaning of those statements. The next maxim is quantity maxim at the same time flouted by seller. When buyer asked “*Do you bring papaya? How much?*” then the buyer answered “*For papaya is three a half, but it is the California one*”, that answer is not relevant with the question of the buyer, moreover seller gave additional information about the type of papaya which not necessarily needed by the buyer. It can be seen by the respond of the buyer “*Niki mawon, Piro jumlah e?*”

Context 9: It was occurred between seller and seller; seller wants to buy chili he had some kidding even though he looks likes little bit angry. But seller felt ok for it.

- Buyer :** Iki gak bolong ye?
(*Is it not perforated right?*)
- Seller :** heee ogak wes buntet ae, Buntet wes, gak popo ben ndang entek kono ae. Wes..barang e istimentul.
(*No, it is dead end, it is ok for the rest, so that it runs out soon, the product is the special one*)
- Buyer :** Abang iki mas ? Apik pak iki? Wes telong kelo ae
(*Is it the red one? Is it good, sir? I take three kilos*)
- Seller :** woke. (*Ok*)
- Buyer :** Koe iki pie to le, nimbang kok mok kelang Kelongi, telung kilo ae
(*How do you do son, you always decrease the number, I bought only for three kilos*)

- Seller :** wehh diseneni aku..
(Oh no, you scold me)
 Wes Iki papat limo. Ijo ne ogak
(This is forty-five. The green ones are not?)
- Buyer :** wes ogak *(No)*

In the seventh context, there was maxim of manner. It showed by the statement of buyer who was little bit angry of the seller because she saw the seller decrease the chili in the scale. The buyer said “*How do you do son, you always decrease the number, only for three kilos*”. It is indicated the sarcasm statement by the buyer. In another context, the seller also flouted the maxim of relevance. The buyer said, “*Is it not perforated right.*” and the seller answered by, “*No, it is dead end, it is ok for the rest, so that it runs out soon, the product is the special one.*” It means that the interaction is lack of quality. It is because of the buyer doesn’t make the topics clear and the seller also answer unclear information. The interaction is lack of evidence.

Context 10: The conversation took place in trade. It occurred between Seller and Buyer; in this case, the buyer cleans up his stall because the cabbage just came. The buyer chooses the cabbage to get the good and fresh one.

- Buyer :** gubismu karek iki pak de? *(Is this all your cabbage left?)*
- Seller 1 :** kae jek okeh kae. *(there are still many over there)*
- Buyer :** piro hargane? *(How much is the price?)*
- Seller 1 :** gubis tiga lima, hargae ecer pak. *(cabbage, Thirty-five. It’s retail.)*
- Buyer :** leksepuluh kilo? *(What if Ten kilograms?)*
- Seller 1:** sepuluh kilo... yo wes tiga dua ngono ae *(Ten kilograms. Okay thirty-two)*
- Buyer :** yo tiga tok ae to *(thirty only)*
- Seller 1 :** yo wes roger.. roger.. roger (it's okay.) (He said, Roger . .Roger.. Roger..)
- Buyer :** ndang sepuluh kilo ae. Lombok lombok... tenanan iki. *(Hurry up, it is only Ten kilograms. Where is chili... I’m serious)*
- Seller 2:** Lombok sekilo papat limo *(forty-five thousand rupiahs per kilogram for Chili.)*
- Buyer :** lha nyapo kok papat limo. *(why is that forty- five thousand rupiahs?)*
- Seller 2 :** mergo gong wayahe. *(because it is not the time yet)*
- Buyer :** yang benar... rong puluh kilo ae pak de (berbicara dengan penjual) *(are you sure... Twenty kilograms please)*
- Seller 1 :** ki pak puh, adahono pak puh. Sek tak..... *(Here you are sir, put it in plastic. Wait I need to)*
- Buyer :** abang gak enek abang? *(Is there any red?) (*It refers to the color of chili)*
Seller 1: he? *(What?)*
- Buyer :** abang gak enek? *(Where is the red)*
- Seller 1 :** oh ada abang, kosek... ki.. sek tak bersihane sek. *(Oh, i have the red ones, wait. I need to clean it up) (sedang membersihkan dan menimbang kubis)*
- Buyer :** kurang satu *(one more please)*

- Seller 1** : ya oke. (*okay*)
Buyer: kurang pak de (*it needs more*)
Seller 1 : pas iki. (*it's exact already*)
Buyer : hehehe (tertawa) (hehehe) (*laughing*)
Seller 1 : sepuluh. (*Ten kilograms*)
Buyer : kurang anget maksude. (*it's still not enough*)
Seller 1 : wes ngono ae, kurang anget ngko bengi angetane. Tiga puluh. (*that's enough*). (*he made kidding,* "You can warm it later in the night. Thirty")
Buyer : amit (*excuse me*)
Seller 1 : uang pas gak enek pak? Uang pas ae (*do you have exact money for it? The exact one*)
Buyer : nggak ada pak de (*I don't have sir*)
Seller 1 : oh nggak ada. (*oh, you don't have*)

In the eighth context, the conversation between buyer and seller there was maxim of rational/relevant it showed when the buyer said "are you sure... Twenty kilograms please" but then seller offered irrelevant respond by saying "Here you are sir, put it in plastic. Wait I need to" this respond indicates that the seller lets the buyer to take it by himself. And second maxim is manner maxim by saying "(*thats enough*). (*he made kidding,* "You can warm it later in the night. Thirty" buyer did not understand what joke offered by seller, that is why he did not give respond.

Context 11: The conversation took place in trade. It occurred between Seller and Buyer.

- Seller** : 19 ya? pirang kilo butuh e?
(*19 right ? how many kilos do yo need ?*)
Buyer : 16 ya
(*16 right ?*)
Seller : mendet pirang kilo to?
(*how many kilos do you need?*)
Buyer : mendet 2 kilo mawon. (*only 2 kilos*)
Seller : la... 17 setengah. Pas niku ! pas penak !
(*oh, 17.5k. that's right ! that's good.*)

In the ninth context, there was a quantity and relevant maxims in a same time. The buyer only answered "16 right?" however the seller asked 2 questions "19 right? how many kilos do you need?". it showed that the buyer only gave less information without completing those 2 questions. Moreover, it also indicated relevant maxim because the buyer did not explain weather the "16" refers to the price or amount. it showed when seller asked "how

many kilos do you need?" to the buyer, it indicated that seller agree to the bid of buyer without said it explicitly.

Context 12: The conversation occurred between the seller and the buyer. The seller praised the buyer in order to make the buyer bought the products more.

- Seller** : monggo buk monggo dipilih
(*please choose ma'am, please choose!*)
- Buyer** : nggeh buk, tomate anyar anyar niki buk, seger seger.
(*yea ma'am, are tomatoes still fresh, ma'am*)
- Seller** : nggeh to buk, tomate seger seger, seger koyo seng tuku. (tersenyum)
(*of course, the tomattoes are fresh as well as the buyer*) (*smiles*)
- Buyer** : walah iso wae pean iku buk, enggih buk, tomat e petang ewu nggih.
(*you are really something ma'am*) (*oke, I buy four thousand rupiahs for tomatoes*).
- Seller** : gak mesisan 5 ribu mumpung tomate seger seger ki lho
(*what about five thousand, the tomatoes are really fresh*)
- Buyer** : nggeh buk mesisan 5 ewu dari pada ilang duwet e haaa
(*oke ma'am, five thousand rupiahs*) (*smiles*)
- Seller** : enggih buk sekedap niki (memasukan tomat kedalam kresek palstik)
(*Ok ma'am, wait minutes*) (*putting tomatoes in plastic*)

In this context, there was another situation where the seller and the buyer having communication in the trade interaction. From the conversation above, there were two maxims which were flouted in the same time. Those maxims are maxim of quantity and maxim of relevance. It was happened when the buyer asked," *yea ma'am, are tomatoes still fresh, ma'am,*" then, the seller answered it too much and add some information which is actually not being asked by the buyer. She said," *of course, the tomatoes are fresh as well as the buyer*) (*smiles*). She was flouted the maxim of quantity due to some additional information. She was also flouted maxim of relevance by changing the topic in the middle of the interaction by saying," *of course, the tomatoes are fresh as well as the buyer,*". Of course, the goal is to make the buyer happy and they will come to buy products at the same places.

Conclusion

In this study, the writer has already done to analyze on how the interaction occurs between the seller and the buyer in interaction at traditional market namely Bence Traditional Market. The finding shows that there are many flouted maxims found in interaction practices between the seller and buyer. The writer's analysis show that all kinds of maxims are flouted mostly buy the seller. Those are maxim of quantity, maxima of quality, maxims of relevance and maxim of manner. Thus, it may happen because between the seller and the buyer do not fulfil the rules of cooperative principles. As stated by Lavinson (1983) that in order to achieve efficient and effective use of language in conversation to further cooperative end, the speaker and the hearer are suggested to fulfil the cooperative principle in managing their conversation. Event many flouted maxims happened in the market but there were not misunderstanding. The seller also makes some jokes to the buyer, in order to make the situations more comfortable and friendly. The writer finds that Grice's theory of conversational maxim is very helpful and applicable in this study. The writer concludes there are some condition which make the participants in the trade interaction have to flout the maxims. Due to the fact that the conversation still run well without any misunderstanding.

About the Writer

Mohammad Muhyidin obtained his master's degree from Islamic University of Malang and is currently a lecturer at the State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Kediri. He has previously taught at other institutions such as Kadiri Islamic University (UNISKA), University of Kadiri (Unik), and MTsN 2 Kediri. He ha staught various areas of ELT including the language skills (listening, speaking, and writing), English Phonology, English Morphology, and IELTS.

References

- Bedraoui, M. (2012). *Pragmatics: Implicature*. Retrieved from SlideShare.net.pdf
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse*. London: Longman.
- Grundy, Peter. (2005). *Doing pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Horn, L.R. (2004). *Implicature*. In: L. R. Horn and G. Ward (eds). *The handbook of pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hymes, D. (1977). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. London: Tivstock Publications Limited.
- John, W.B. (1981). *Research in education, (4th Edition)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc Englewood Clifts.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman Group.
- Levinson, S C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Levinson, S.C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Miles, & Hubberman. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis*. Deverly Hills, California: SAGE Publications.
- Nasr, R.T. (1984). *The essential of linguistic science. Language: An introduction*. England: Longman Group Limited.
- O'Grady, W. (1993). *Semantics. Study of meaning*. In Catherine Pusateri (ed.), *Contemporary Linguistics: An introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Renkema, J. (1993). *D A. An introductory*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company
- Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction, an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman
- Wardhough, R. (1997). *Introduction to linguistics (2nd Edition)*. New York: Oxford Basil Blackwell.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.