

# THE COOPERATIVE AND POLITENESS PRINCIPLES IN RADIO BROADCASTING CONVERSATIONS

Suko Winarsih

Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang

**Abstract:** The present study aims at describing what exists in the interactive telephone conversation program run by *Radio MAS FM*. The research subjects were the radio presenters, invited guests, and audiences joining the program. The conversations were recorded using a tape recorder. The results of the data analysis show that generally the ten maxims of Cooperative Principle (CP) and Politeness Principle (PP) are applied by the subjects. However, conflictive function did not appear in the data.

**Key words:** Cooperative Principle (CP), Politeness Principle (PP), Illocutionary Acts (IA), Conversations, Radio Broadcasting Program

Edmondson (1981:69) states that a verbal conversation refers to any interactional talks involving at least two participants, a speaker and a listener, and they change roles. The conversation takes place in a non-formalized setting, with no special rules or conventions. This means that a verbal conversation requires at least two participants, the speaker and the listener. Besides, the participants converse about a certain topic in a natural situation. In short, the study of conversation raises two aspects: the topic and the manner of the conversation.

A verbal conversation is a particular type of multiple-source spoken discourse. Edmondson (1981:5) states there are two kinds of verbal conversation based on how the speaker and the listener are carrying out the conversation. They are *face-to-face verbal conversations* and *non face-to-face*

*verbal conversation*.. The first refers to a conversation in which the participants, the speaker and the listener, meet. In such a situation, information is also passed along through posture, hand gestures, kinesics, mimics, intonation, etc. Moreover, the speaker can quickly react to nonverbal reactions on the part of the listener. The second refers to a verbal conversation in which the participants, namely the speaker and the listener do not meet in discussing a certain topic directly but through certain equipments, for example by phone.

This research concerns the second kind of verbal conversation, namely the *non face-to-face verbal conversations*, specifically conversations over the telephone. Phone conversations are interesting to investigate since they happen without the participants' attendance in a certain place or conversation location, so that the turn-

taking role is very important. Each participant should be patient in waiting for an appropriate time to talk. Nevertheless, there will be scrambled conversations, in which the participants talk together at the same time. In addition, the participants in *non face-to-face verbal conversations* should cooperate with each other in their roles as the speaker and the listener or vice versa because the conversation goes on without the help of gestures, mimics, and kinesics. In summary, it is important to apply the Cooperative and Politeness Principles in conducting the *non face-to-face verbal conversations*, especially the conversations over the telephone.

This research is a kind of Pragmatics study. Pragmatics deals with the aspects of language structure and language principles. It studies the relation between language and context that are encoded in the structure of language (Levinson, 1983:9). A pragmatist can analyze the discourse by means of implicature or conversational principles of the kind illustrated by Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) and Leech's Politeness Principle (PP). Leech (1983:5) states that Pragmatics relates the sense of the utterance to its pragmatic force. This force may be relatively direct and indirect. In other words, the conversational implicature clarifies the distinction between literal meaning and use of the utterance contextually.

The maxims stand for a normative concept, like rule, norm, principle and others. The CP has four maxims: (1) quantity, (2) quality, (3) relation, and (4) manner. The PP has six maxims: (5) tact, (6) generosity, (7) approbation, (8) modesty, (9) agreement and (10) sympathy.

The speakers' purposes in their conversations contain Illocutionary Acts (IA). Leech (1983:104) categorizes the IA based on the functions (1) competitive, (2) convivial, (3) collaborative and (4) conflictive. Edmondson (1981:30) describes IA

as utterances by means of which a speaker communicates his feelings, attitudes, belief, or intention with respect to some events of state of affairs. In summary, illocutionary acts are performances or utterances of which a speaker communicates something toward listeners as what the speaker expects of the utterances, which have some effect to the listeners.

In the CP and PP, it is assumed that in communicative events a speaker tries to communicate his needs, feelings, and thoughts to his interlocutors and expects them to understand his talk as easily as possible. Hence, a speaker always tries to make his utterance easily comprehensible, relevant with the context, indicating that he does not spend and waste a lot of time during the conversation. There are some agreed guidelines for talk or guiding principles or conversational maxims, which govern cooperative talk. The listeners can catch the meaning of the utterances only if the speakers and the listeners cooperate. To capture this notion, Grice (in Renkema, 1993:10) proposes the CP. On the other hand, in conversations, politeness as proposed by Leech as the PP is also important.

Those maxims of both CP and PP can be used to describe how participants in conversations derive implicature. Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics concern the CP and PP referring to a description of how listeners get information from utterances even though the information has not been mentioned outright. It is interesting to investigate the CP and PP in the radio broadcasting conversations for the following six reasons.

Firstly, a verbal conversation is a kind of talk most frequently and normally found in real life which covers many casual and actual topics. Secondly, it is interesting to investigate how the participants cooperate and apply politeness as proposed by Grice and Leech in carrying out the conversations

over telephone on air in a radio broadcasting program. Thirdly, being curious about the dynamics revealed in the conversations about the topics, which are seemingly casual, the researcher is interested to investigate them. Fourthly, it is very interesting to investigate: (1) how the participants apply the CP and PP, (2) whether they observe or violate the CP and PP, (3) in what case and condition they observe or violate the CP and PP in their conversations, and (4) what the reasons of observing and violating the CP and PP are. Fifthly, the conversations can be observed in terms of applying the CP and PP, as well as the IA. Sixthly, *Radio Mas FM* is chosen because it is the only radio station in Malang, which conducts English conversations over the telephone for those who want to practice English through real English conversations.

The verbal conversations over the telephone in a radio program can be analyzed using the pragmatic approach since pragmatics studies language use in real life. Some pragmaticists give their definition of pragmatics in different terms but they have the same concept, i.e. it concerns the way in which people use language in context. In other words, pragmatics deals with the meaning of utterances produced by participants, speakers and listeners, in a certain contextual representation related to the general principle of the language use.

The focus of investigation in this research is the CP and PP. The Cooperative Principles (CP) consists of four maxims (Grice in Brown and Yule, 1986:31): Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Leech (1983:132) mentions six maxims dealing with the Politeness Principles (PP): Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement, and Sympathy. The reason for investigating the CP and PP is that it is not enough for us to understand a conversation only from the side of pure linguistics.

Utterances do not only consist of phrases, clauses, or sentences. What intentions behind their utterances are and how they cooperate with each other in a conversation, so that the conversation proceeds successfully are the more important, interesting, and challenging ones.

This study means to answer the general question: How is the CP and PP applied in radio broadcasting conversations? More specifically, the research problems fall into the following two questions: (1) to what extent are the CP and PP maxims applied in the *Mas FM* radio broadcasting conversations? And (2) what are the speakers' purposes in applying the CP and PP maxims in their conversations in terms of illocutionary acts (IA)?

In line with the research problems, the objective of the study is to describe the use of CP in radio broadcasting conversations. Particularly, the study aims at describing (1) the extent of the CP and PP maxims applied in the *Mas FM* radio broadcasting conversations, and (2) the speakers' purposes in applying the CP and PP maxims in their conversations in terms of Illocutionary Acts (IA).

## METHOD

*Research Design.* The study belongs to a qualitative design. The study is in accordance with the descriptive qualitative and case study design based on several reasons. Firstly, the characteristic of the descriptive qualitative research design is shown at the purpose of the study in describing the observance of the CP and PP, the violation of the CP and PP, and the reasons of applying them. Secondly, the characteristic of the qualitative study is indicated by the principle methods and the results of the study, which focuses on the process rather than the product. Besides, it focuses on description or words rather than on numbers. Lastly, the study focuses on

data interpretation based on the research problems and concentrates on the recorded spoken discourse in terms of dialogues among the participants.

*Data and Source of Data.* Data in this research are the utterances produced by the participants in the English conversations program at *Mas FM* radio broadcast. The sources of data are the presenters, the invited guests and the audience when they are discussing certain topics forwarded on air. The participants to be the data sources of the study vary, for example they are English department students in some universities at Malang, senior high school students at Malang, English teachers or lecturers, bank clerks, civil clerks, employees, house wives, etc who most of them are not English native speakers.

*Instrument.* The key instrument is the researcher herself since she observes the relationship between the subjects, learns the preliminary study, obtains the data and analyzes them. Moreover, the researcher interprets the observance and the violation of the CP and PP, and the purposes of applying them based on her experiences and background knowledge. She is supported by other instruments for performing the behaviors and attributes to be studied. They are a radio, a tape recorder and some cassette recorders.

*Data Collection.* The data are obtained by recording the conversations over telephone at *Mas FM* radio broadcast. The researcher collects the data taken from *Mas FM* radio broadcast, which has English conversations program from Monday up to Friday at 7.00 up to 8.00 p.m. Before

coming to the recording phase, the schedule of the recording is determined. In getting enough data for the research analyses, the data collection phase is conducted four times in four days, divided into four different topics. The duration of each topic discussed more or less an hour. To collect the data the researcher does two steps: (1) recording the conversation conducted in the *Radio Mas FM*, and (3) transcribing the utterances produced by all presenters, invited guests and audience as the participants of the English conversations over the telephone in the *Radio Mas FM*. The transcription is divided into four parts based on the days and topics they discuss.

*Data Analysis.* Data analysis consists of data transcription, data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusion. Along with the data collection, the researcher transcribes all of the utterances produced by the participants as the subjects of the study. They are the radio presenters, the invited guests and the audience. Data reduction aims at processing the raw data in order to be analyzed. The process, as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994) might be in the form of selecting, simplifying, focusing, summarizing, coding, sorting, or even making cluster of themes. In terms of this study, data reduction refers to the process of coding the subjects' names, transcribing the recorded conversations, clustering the utterances to determine the existence of the topic choice, and sorting the irrelevant data. In terms of applying the CP and PP, some indicators are limited to the observance and violation. It is shown in the Table 1.

Table 1: Indicators of the Maxims Observance and Violation of the CP and PP

Principles	Maxims	Indicators	
		Observance	Violation
CP	Quantity	1. Not excessive 2. Not repeated 3. Informative (Adequate information)	1. Excessive 2. Repeated 3. Less informative (Inadequate information)
CP	Quality	Truthful (Supported by adequate evidence)	Untruthful (Unsupported by adequate evidence)
CP	Relation	Based on topic	Out of topic
CP	Manner	1. Perspicuous 2. Brief 3. Orderly	1. Ambiguous 2. Prolix 3. Disorderly
PP	Tact	1. Minimize cost to <i>other (h)</i> 2. Maximize benefit to <i>other (h)</i>	1. Maximize cost to <i>other (h)</i> 2. Minimize benefit to <i>other (h)</i>
PP	Generosity	1. Minimize benefit to <i>self (s)</i> 2. Maximize cost to <i>self (s)</i>	1. Maximize benefit to <i>self (s)</i> 2. Minimize cost to <i>self (s)</i>
PP	Approbation	1. Minimize dispraise of <i>other (h)</i> 2. Maximize praise of <i>other (h)</i>	1. Maximize dispraise of <i>other (h)</i> 2. Minimize praise of <i>other (h)</i>
PP	Modesty	1. Minimize praise of <i>self (s)</i> 2. Maximize dispraise of <i>self (s)</i>	1. Maximize praise of <i>self (s)</i> 2. Minimize dispraise of <i>self (s)</i>
PP	Agreement	1. Minimize disagreement between <i>self (s)</i> and <i>other (h)</i> 2. Maximize agreement between <i>self (s)</i> and <i>other (h)</i>	1. Maximize disagreement between <i>self (s)</i> and <i>other (h)</i> 2. Minimize agreement between <i>self (s)</i> and <i>other (h)</i>
PP	Sympathy	1. Minimize antipathy between <i>self (s)</i> and <i>other (h)</i> 2. Maximize sympathy between <i>self (s)</i> and <i>other (h)</i>	1. Maximize antipathy between <i>self (s)</i> and <i>other (h)</i> 2. Minimize sympathy between <i>self (s)</i> and <i>other (h)</i>

s: speaker

h: listener

Data display, as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994) is the process of demonstrating the data either in the forms of narrative spoken texts, matrices, graphs,

network, and charts. The displayed data are expected to the completely understanding in the field and conclusion. In this study, the

data are displayed in the forms of conversations excerpts.

*Triangulation.* The current study applies triangulation to check trustworthiness of the results of data analysis. It aims at avoiding the researcher's opinion and biases. Three kinds of triangulation are data triangulation, methodological triangulation, and theoretical triangulation.

Data triangulation is a process, in which various sources of data are collected. The variety of sources can refer to time, space, and person (Denzin, 1978). The validity of the data is consulted by the one of the Pragmatics experts: the researcher's advisor I. Methodological triangulation is a process, in which various methods are used to measure the same unit (Denzin, 1978). This type of triangulation uses either the same method on different occasion or the different methods on the same object of study. Triangulation is done by employing different methods of collecting data. The method used in this research is tape-recording.

## FINDINGS

The research findings answer of the two research problems. First, the data classification as to their implicatures, maxims and purposes contain: (1) the implicature of every utterance, (2) four maxims of the CP and six maxims of the PP proposed by Grice and Leech, including: quantity, quality, relation, manner, tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, sympathy, and (3) the speakers' purposes in terms of IA proposed by Leech's, including: Competitive, Convivial, Collaborative, Conflictive. Second, data frequency of occurrences deals with: (1) the numbers of utterances in every maxim in observance and violation, (2) the overlapping utterances in the extent of applying the CP and PP maxims and (3) the speaker's purpose in terms of IA.

## Data Classification as to Their Implicatures, Maxims, and Speakers' Purposes (Illocutionary Acts)

The data classification as to their implicatures, maxims and speakers's purposes in terms of illocutionary acts (IA) is a kind of data analysis based on the utterances in the English conversation among the participants in the *MAS FM* radio broadcast. They are the presenters, the radio conversation (invited) guests and the audiences. The utterances are recorded, transcribed, reduced, coded, interpreted, and analyzed based on the CP and PP maxims and the speakers's purposes in terms of the IA.

## Data Frequency of Occurrences

This section describes three parts related to the data frequency of occurrences; they are: (1) the extent of applying the CP and PP maxims, (2) the utterances with overlapping maxims, and (3) the speakers' purposes in terms of illocutionary acts (IA).

## The Extent of Applying the CP and PP Maxims

The research findings show that the ten maxims of the CP and PP are applied by the participants in the conversations in terms of observance and violation.

From 598 data analyzed, the most frequently observance maxims applied by the participants in *MAS FM* radio broadcasting conversations are: Quantity, Relation, Manner, Quality, and Sympathy. It means that the most frequently applied by the participants is the CP. The findings show 466 (77.93%) utterances observing of Quantity Maxim, 449 (75.08%) utterances observing of Relation Maxim, 325 (54.35%) utterances observing of Manner Maxim, 182 (30.43%) utterances observing of the Quality Maxim, and 122 (20.40%) utterances observing Sympathy Maxim. On the other hand, the least frequently observance maxims applied by the participants are 83 (13.88%) utterances observing of Agreement Maxim, 48 (8.03%) utterances

observing of Approbation Maxim, 35 (5.85%) utterances observing of Tact maxim, 18 (3.00%) utterances observing of Generosity Maxim, and 12 (2.01%) utterances observing of Modesty Maxim.

Those maxims, including in observance and violation are shown in the Table 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b.

Table 2a: The Extent of Applying the CP Maxims

NO	MAXIM	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1	2	3	4
1	QUANTITY	$\sqrt{}$ = 342	73.39%
		X = 124	25.61%
		$\Sigma$ = 466	
2	RELATION	$\sqrt{}$ = 292	65.03%
		X = 157	34.96%
		$\Sigma$ = 449	
3	MANNER	$\sqrt{}$ = 233	71.59%
		X = 92	
		$\Sigma$ = 325	

$\sqrt{}$  = Observance

X = Violation

$\Sigma$  = Number

Table 2b: The Examples of Applying the CP Maxims

NO	MAXIM	OBSERVANCE	VIOLATION
1	2	3	4
1	QUANTITY	Bless The Lord. It's a good weather today. I have no rain. This is kind to me. (VC34)	Betrayal? Oh, what's that? (ER3)
2	RELATION	I think, I have a phobia kind of cockroach. (RD9)	And, have you got a dinner? (VC21)
3	MANNER	Yes, this is on air. So, we are talking about love betrayal, actually. (VC2)	I hope you are not to be angry to me because I have some fried bugs and fried flies. (VC24)
4	QUALITY	Well, I feel exhausted actually today for many activities because my friends and me get any kind of information of flying ticket to every airlines. (SR15)	I'll try to kill her. (ER5)

VC: Vincent RD: Rudi

ER: Erik AD: Andi

SR: Sri TN: Trisna

D: IndraDewi

Table 3a: The Extent of Applying the PP Maxims

NO	MAXIM	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1	2	3	4
1	SYMPATHY	$\sqrt{\phantom{x}} = 113$	92.62%
		$X = 9$	7.38%
		$\Sigma = 122$	
2	AGREEMENT	$\sqrt{\phantom{x}} = 66$	79.52%
		$X = 17$	20.48%
		$\Sigma = 83$	
3	APPROBATION	$\sqrt{\phantom{x}} = 40$	83.33%
		$X = 8$	16.67%
		$\Sigma = 48$	
4	TACT	$\sqrt{\phantom{x}} = 30$	85.72%
		$X = 5$	14.28%
		$\Sigma = 35$	
5	GENEROSITY	$\sqrt{\phantom{x}} = 7$	38.88%
		$X = 11$	61.12%
		$\Sigma = 18$	
6	MODESTY	$\sqrt{\phantom{x}} = 6$	50%
		$X = 6$	50%
		$\Sigma = 12$	

$\sqrt{\phantom{x}}$  = Observance  
 $X$  = Violation  
 $\Sigma$  = Number



Table 3b: The Examples of Applying the PP Maxims

NO	MAXIM	OBSERVANCE	VIOLATION
1	2	3	4
1	SYMPATHY	Oh my dear Eka, how pity you are! It's like there is no other man in the world. Well, it must be hard, you know. (SR11)	Because you are the expert. You have so many....many girls. (AD12)
2	AGREEMENT	Ya, I agree with you. (TN10)	t's okay. I don't feel from your voice. I don't feel that you are nervous. I think that's no problem at all. (ID39)
3	APPROBATION	Keep on crazy! Keep on crazy! Be crazy! I like the way you are crazy. (ER30)	I hope you are not to be angry to me because I have some fried bugs and fried flies. (VC24)
4	TACT	Yeah, right. You are a typical person to make people feel happy. (AD28)	You must be out of your mind! (AD18)
5	GENEROSITY	Okay, congratulation. I should give the time for the listeners. Nice talking to you. Please, take care. Thank you bye! (AD30)	I'll try to kill her. (ER5)
6	MODESTY	No, actually just helping a friend. (S No, actually just helping a friend. (SR16)	It's not like that. It's... it's.. I just want to have good news that... We are not married, so common, what should I bring? We just let be a friend, let be a brother or a sister. I'm still loving you, you're still loving me. If I am married it can be different. (VC47)

VC: Vincent

RD: Rudi

ID: IndraDewi

ER: Erik

AD: Andi

SR: Sri

TN: Trisna

**Utterances with Overlapping Maxims**

terms of observance and violation. The examples are in the Table 4.

The research findings show there are 525 utterances applying several maxims in

Table 4: The Overlapping Utterances in the Extent of Applying the CP Maxims

NO	DATA	Code	MAXIMS									
			Q N	Q L	R L	M N	T C	G N	A P	M D	A G	S P
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Okay, congratulation. I should give the time for the other listeners. Nice talking to you. Please take care. Thank you bye!	AD 30	√				√		√			√
2	Okay, Aji thank you very much for sharing your experience, which is really nice to know.	ID 147	√		√		√		√		√	√
3	I just wanna to kill the time. Sometimes it's happy with this crazy. But it's okay, so anyway you have to giveeven me opinion about that we have to think first ... think first.	VC7 9	X		X			X		X		

AD: Andi      QN: Quantity    GN: Generosity      √: Observance  
 ID: Indra Dewi    QL: Quality      AP: Approbation      X: Violation  
 VC: Vincent      RL: Relation    MD: Modesty  
                      MN: Manner    AG: Agreement  
                      TC: Tact              SP: Sympathy

Example no.1 (AD12) shows an overlap of six maxims, one maxim in observance (Relation) and five maxims in violation (Quantity, Quality, Tact, Approbation and Sympathy). Example no. 2 (AD 30) shows an overlap of four maxims in observance: Quantity, Tact, Approbation, and Sympathy. In addition, utterance no.3 (ID147) shows an overlap of six maxims in observance: Quantity, Relation, Tact, Approbation, Agreement, and Sympathy. Example no. 4 (VC79) shows an overlap of four maxims: Quantity, Relation, Generosity, and Modesty.

### The Speakers' Purposes in Terms of Illocutionary Acts

Each utterance produced by the participant in the conversation has a purpose. Pragmatically, this purpose relates to the illocutionary acts. Leech (1983: 104) categorizes four types of illocutionary acts

based on its functions: Competitive, Convivial, Collaborative and Conflictive. In the Competitive Function, the illocutionary goal competes with the social goals; e.g. ordering, asking, demanding, and begging. In the Convivial Function, the illocutionary

goal coincides with the social goal; e.g. offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, making a joke, commenting and congratulating. In the Collaborative Function, the illocutionary goal makes indifferent to the social goal; e.g. asserting, informing, sharing opinions (ideas), announcing, asking a question, and instructing. Then, in the Conflictive Function, the illocutionary goal

conflicts with the social goal, i.e. threatening, accusing, cursing, and reprimanding.

The research findings show that Competitive, Convivial, Collaborative are applied by the participants. While the Conflictive Function is not used at all by the participant. The details are in the Table 4.

Table 4a: The Speakers' Purposes in Terms of Illocutionary Acts

Illocutionary Acts (IA)	Sub function of IA	Numbers	Percentage
1	2	3	4
Competitive	Ordering	9	1.50%
	Asking	0	
	Demanding	9	1.50%
	Begging	0	
	<b>Σ</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.00%</b>
Convivial	Inviting	2	0.33%
	Greeting	61	1.02%
	Thanking	13	2.17%
	Making a joke	40	6.69%
	Commenting	43	7.19%
	Congratulating	0	0%
	<b>Σ</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>28.76%</b>
Collaborative	Asserting	134	22.41%
	Informing	87	14.55%
	Sharing opinion	77	12.89%
	Asking a question	107	17.89%
	Announcing	0	0%
	Instructing	3	0.50%
	<b>Σ</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>68.24%</b>
Conflictive		<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
	<b>Σ</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 4b: The Examples of the Speakers' Purposes in Terms of Illocutionary Acts

Illocutionary Acts (IA)	Sub function of IA	Examples
1	2	3
Competitive	Ordering	By the way, can you help me to correct my English. (ST3)
	Asking	-
	Demanding	Aha, actually you should not bring that on air. (AD11)
	Begging	-
Convivial	Inviting	If you have some comments or questions to Aji, just go head.. or maybe you are one of them. (ID89)
	Greeting	One thing that maybe I can help you Dewa because <i>Mas</i> FM also has a community and next Sunday there will be a meeting. So, I invite you.... join us. (ID101)
	Thanking	Hi, Erik! (TN4)
	Making a joke	Okay, Aji thank you very much for sharing your experience, which is really nice to know. (ID147)
	Commenting	Haa... haaa Mr. Andi, yes, it's very Javanese person. Do you want to know his full name? It's perfect. Common tell me! Andi-andi Lumut, there is the truth. (VC53)
	Congratulating	Wow.. you have to master in English. No reason. (ID92)
Collaborative	Asserting	Of course, it is not their mind, you know. They are not normal persons, I think,. And they should be in the national graphic channel animal. Yaa, like the animals. You know the movie that they are not human beings. Animals like to kill their friends because they want to attract another.. another female but likewise another female, so, the national graphic. It's really out of the mind, you know. (SR19)
	Informing	<i>Mas</i> FM at Jl. Dr. Cipto.... Yaa....yaa... number 16... at nine. (ID102)
		Ya, seven days before the hiking our mind should be clear. So, we have to do a little bit jogging, running and try to make minimum

Illocutionary Acts (IA)	Sub function of IA	Examples
1	2	3
		depression. (AJ40)
	Sharing opinion	So, what do you thing about part time job for students? (TN9)
	Asking a question	-
	Announcing	Oh yeah... try to find another man. (SR21)
	Instructing	
Conflictive		-
VC: Vincent	RD: Rudi	
ER: Erik	AD: Andi	
SR: Sri	TN: Trisna	
	ID: IndraDewi	

## DISCUSSION

This section deals with the discussion referring to the research findings based on the two research problems. The first is the extent of the use of the CP and the PP in the English radio broadcasting conversations. The second is the speakers' purposes in applying the CP and the PP maxims in their conversations in terms of Illocutionary Acts (IA).

### The Extent of the Use of the CP and the PP in the English Radio Broadcasting Conversations

First, the most frequently used maxims as applied by the participants, respectively in terms of the CP: Quantity, Relation, Manner, Quality, and one maxim of the PP: Sympathy.

Leech (1983: 84) says that the Quantity and Quality Maxims can be considered together, since they frequently work in competition with one another; the amount of information *s* gives is limited by *s*'s wish to avoid telling untruth. For this reason, Harnish (1976 in Leech, 1983:85) proposes a combined maxims as *Make the strongest*

*relevant claim justifiable by your evidence*. Further, Leech (1983:85) explains that 'strength' refers to the amount of information communicated. He adds, by way of "Quantity-Quality Maxim" a large number of informal inferences can be accounted for.

The finding that the participants observe the Quantity Maxim most frequently is quite acceptable since the media used in carrying out their conversation is radio broadcast, in which they have to manage the time wisely. Therefore, the participants converse as is needed and as further information based on a topic. This is related to the principle of the Quantity Maxim that utterances produced by the speaker could not be more than he needs to say to the listener. It is related to the indicators of the maxim observance that the utterances are: (1) not excessive, (2) not repeated, and (3) informative (adequate information). While the maxim violation indicates that, the utterances are: (1) excessive, (2) repeated, and (3) less informative (inadequate information).

The utterance produced by the presenter, Vincent in the first topic 'Love Betrayal': *Bless the Lord. It's good weather*

today. *I have no rain. This is kind to me* (VC34) applies the Quantity Maxim. This utterance indicates the observance criteria. In other words, this utterance is not excessive and informative, especially the information about the weather. On the other hand, the utterance produced by one of the audience, Erik: *Betrayal? Oh. What's that?* (ER3) violates the maxim. Erik repeats what the presenter said. Besides, this utterance is excessive because what the presenter said, Vincent, is quite clear. However, Erik's repeated the word *betrayal* is acceptable because of two reasons. First, Erik is not familiar with the word, so he wants to make sure about the word uttered by the presenter. Second, Erik is surprised about the topic discussed because he does not follow the program from the beginning. When he wants to share his opinion, he does not exactly know the topic discussed.

Thus, the principle of Quality Maxim is that the utterances produced by the speaker contain the truth. The indicator of the maxim's observance is truthful (supported by adequate evidence). On the other hand, the indicator of the maxim violation is untruthful or unsupported by adequate evidence.

Sri's utterance *Well, I feel exhausted actually today for many active-ties because my friends and I get any kind of information of flying ticket to every airline* (SR15) fulfills of truthfulness. Sri tries to share her health condition that she is very tired. She explains why she is tired. Based on the Quality Maxim principle, Sri's utterance is truthful and supported by adequate information. The second example is the violation maxim, such as Erik's utterance: *I'll to` kill her* (ER5). This utterance is untruthful. Actually, Erik wants to make a joke through his utterance because he disagrees with a girl, who betrays his partner.

The Relation Maxim is also mostly used by the participants since the utter-ances produced by the participants in *Mas FM*

radio broadcasting conversations are relevant to its situation. The participants discuss the topic forwarded. Most of them uttered their ideas and opinion about a topic. This is related to the Relation Maxim. The indicator is that the utterance is on the topic (relevant).

Leech (1983:93) treats the Relation Maxim as "a special kind of information". It refers to a certain topic discussed. Rudi's utterance: *I think, I have a phobia kind of cockroach* (RD9) is relevant to the topic forwarded- Fear of Something. Rudi, the audience, has a certain kind of fear. He has a fear of cockroaches. In the next conversation, Rudi tells more and shares a lot of his experiences about 'why' and 'how' he fears the insect. Therefore, Rudi's utterance really indicates the observance of the Relation Maxim. He tries to give a special kind of information - fear of something. On the other hand, the maxim violation appears in Vincent's utterance: *And, have you got a dinner?* (VC21). As a presenter, he has to suggest the audience to discuss the topic – Love Betrayal but he has not. However, actually it is accepted since the way they converse indicates that they are old friends. The audience often seems to participate in this English conversation program in *Mas FM*. He is not a newcomer. He knows Vincent, the presenter, so that the conversation goes freely, containing several jokes, and even out of the topic. However, finally they return to the topic forwarded.

So far, Leech (1983; 94) acknowledges that the relevance of one utterance to another is as part of a broader conception of relevance, the relevance of an utterance to its speech situation. In this broader sense, Leech (1983: 99) defines relevance as "An utterance *U* is relevant to speech situation to the extent that *U* can be interpreted as contributing goal(s) of *s* and *h*".

Leech (1983:100) states the Manner Maxim rarely figures in explanation of conversational implicature. So far, Grice (

in Leech, 1983: 100) sees this maxim is less important than Quality Maxim, and as differing from the other in 'relating not to what is said but, rather, to how what is said to be said'. In this sense, it is obvious that both of Manner and Relation Maxims could favor the most direct communication of one's illocutionary point. In this way, the maxim of manner function is to support the maxim of relation.

In terms of the Manner Maxim, the research findings show that some of utterances are quite clear and easily understood. It is related to the maxim principle that the utterance is observed if it is perspicuous. The maxim observance indicates that the utterances are: (1) perspicuous, (2) unambiguous, (3) brief, and (4) orderly. In contrast, the maxim violation indicates that the utterances are: (1) not perspicuous, (2) ambiguous, (3) prolix, and (4) disorderly.

Vincent's utterance *Yes, this is on air. Therefore, we are talking about love betrayal; actually, (VC2)* fulfills those indicators. The utterances are clear and easily understood. Vincent asserts that the program is on air and the topic discussed is love betrayal. The utterances are perspicuous, clear, and brief. While Vincent's utterance: *I hope you are not to be angry to me because I have some fried bugs and fried flies (VC24)* indicates the maxim violation. This utterance is not clear and prolix. However, from the pragmatic view, it is accepted since Vincent, as a presenter is very kind to every audience. Therefore, he frequently makes a joke by saying something, which is a little bit rude and mocking because he knows the audience.

Beside, some participants express their condolences in carrying out their conversations. They apply the Sympathy Maxim. Leech (1983:138) says that Sympathy Maxim reveals congratulation and condolences as courteous speech acts, even though condolences express belief, which are sometimes negative with regard to the

listener. The maxim observance indicates that the utterances: (1) minimize antipathy between *self (s)* and *other (h)*, and (2) maximize sympathy between *s* and *h*. While the maxim's violation indicates that the utterance: (1) maximize antipathy between *s* and *h*, and (2) minimize sympathy between *s* and *h*.

Sri's comment, *Oh my dear Eka, how pity you are! It's like no other man in the world. Well, it must be hard; you know (SR11)* is the example of observing the Sympathy Maxim. Sri sympathizes with Eka about something discussed, love betrayal. Eka, the audience who sends the *sms* (short message service) to the presenter (Vincent) tells that she is betrayed by her boyfriend but she cannot leave him because her boyfriend seduces her frequently. Then, Sri comments something happened to Eka. The other example is Mr. Andi's utterance containing the maxim violation: *Because you are the expert. You have so many ... many girls (AD12)*. Explicitly, through the utterance, Mr. Andi tries to maximize antipathy to Vincent, the presenter. However, it is actually just a joke.

In conclusion, the four maxims observed, i.e., Quantity, Relation, Manner, and Quality Maxims enable one participant in a conversation to communicate on the assumption that the other participant is being cooperative. In this, as what Leech (1983:82) says that the four maxims have the function of regulating what it is said so that it contributes to some assumed illocutionary or discoursal goals. In addition, the other maxim observed – Sympathy Maxim – reveals that congratulations and condolences are courteous speech act.

Second, the least frequently used maxims Agreement, Approbation, Tact, Generosity, and Modesty. Those maxims rank as the least frequent since they do not actually emphasize the content in discussing a topic in a conversation as well as the previous maxims. In other words, not all of

the maxims are equally important. The research findings show that the maxims of quantity, relation, manner, quality and sympathy as discussed previously appear to be the more powerful constraints on conversational behavior than the maxims of agreement, approbation, tact, generosity and modesty. In Leech' view (1983:133), those maxims deal with polite behavior. According to Leech, the politeness concerns a relationship between two participants called *self* and *other*. In a conversation, *self* will normally be identified with *s*, and *other* will typically be identified with *h*. Therefore, Leech (1983:131-132) explains that speakers also show politeness to third parties, who may or may not be present in the speech situation. So far, he explains that the importance of showing politeness to the third parties varies. They are based on whether or not the third party is present as a bystander; and whether the third party is felt to belong to *s*'s or to *h*'s share of influence. The discussion of each maxim is explored as follows.

First, the Agreement Maxim is fulfilled when some participants in the conversation have tendencies to exaggerate agreement with others, and to mitigate disagreement by expressing regret, partial agreement, etc. The principle of the Agreement Maxim is formulated as "*minimize disagreement between s and h; maximize agreement between s and h*". The maxim observance indicates that the utterances: (1) minimize disagreement between *self* (*s*) and *other* (*h*), and (2) maximize agreement between *self* (*s*) and *other* (*h*). While the maxim violation indicates that the utterances: (1) maximize disagreement between *s* and *h*, and (2) minimize agreement between *s* and *h*. The examples taken from the research findings are as follows.

Trisna – the invited guest- agrees with the audience' opinion about what he said. She says, *Ya I agree with you* (TN10). Next, Indra Dewi, the presenter disagrees with the

audience's opinion when he says that his English is not good. It is shown by the presenter's comment: *It's okay. I don't feel from your voice. I don't feel that you are nervous. I think that is no problem at all* (ID39).

Second, the Approbation and the Agreement Maxim rank the least since they are "*other-centered*". In doing a conversation over the telephone in radio broadcasting program, the participants rarely talk about '*other*' instead of the to-pic forwarded. The explanation of the two maxims is as follows.

The Approbation Maxim is fulfilled when some participants in the radio broadcasting conversation try to avoid saying unpleasant things about others, more specifically about the listeners. The principle of the Approbation Maxim is formulated as "*minimize dispraise of other (h); maximize praise of other (h)*". The maxim observance indicates that the utterances: (1) minimize dispraise to *other* (*h*), and (2) maximize praise to *other* (*h*). In contrast, the maxim violation indicates that the utterances: (1) maximize dispraise to *other* (*h*), and (2) minimize praise to *other* (*h*). The examples are as follows.

The observed maxim is shown by Erik's utterance: *Keep on crazy! Keep on crazy! Be crazy! I like the way you are crazy* (ER30) toward the presenter (Vincent). The utterance shows that the audience actually praises to the presenter in being funny or crazy. Actually, Erik appreciates Vincent, who has many jokes. Next, the example of the maxim violation is the utterance produced by Vincent: *I hope you are not to be angry to me because I have some fried bugs and fried flies* (VC24). Explicitly, the utterance means that Vincent, the presenter, dispraises the listener or the audience. However, pragmatically it is just a joke. Vincent wants to make a joke with the listener. Probably he cannot say it to other listeners, who does not know him. In fact,



they are old friend, meaning the audience often joins this program.

Next, the Tact Maxim is applied by the participants in a certain condition. Although almost all of the participants know each other, some of them try to apply politeness. The principle of the Tact Maxim is that the utterance produced by the speaker could be polite or courteous in a merely formal way. It is formulated as “*being civil*”. The Tact Maxim observance indicates that the utterances: (1) minimize cost to *other (h)*, and (2) maximize benefit to *other (h)*. In contrast, the violated maxim indicates that the utterances: (1) maximize cost to *other (h)*, and (2) minimize benefit to *other (h)*. The examples are as follows.

The utterance produced by one of the audience, Mr. Andi: *Yeah, right. You are a typical person to make people feel happy* (AD28) is a kind of politeness. Mr. Andi says that Vincent, the presenter is a kind person because he likes to make other people feel happy with what he says. In contrast, Mr. Andi’s utterance: *You must be out of you mind!* (AD18) is a kind of the maxim violation since the utterance maximizes cost to other (the presenter). However, it is reasonable because both Mr. Andi and Vincent are close friends. They know each other although it might be just on air. Therefore, they make a joke freely.

Third, the two least maxims observed by the participants are Generosity Maxim and Modesty Maxim since they are “*self-centered*”. Basically, the participants try to avoid “*self-centered*” in their conversations. The explanation of the two maxims is as follows.

The Generosity Maxim applied when the speakers have willingness to give or to share with others, unselfishness. The principle of the maxim is formulated as “*minimize benefit to self, maximize cost to self*”. The maxim observance indicates that those utterances: (1) minimize benefit to *self (s)*, and (2) maximize cost to *self (s)*. On the

contrary, the maxim violation indicates that those utterances: (1) maximize benefit to *self (s)*, and (2) minimize cost to *self (s)*.

Mr. Andi’s utterance: *Okay, congratulation. I should give the tome for the listeners. Nice talking to you. Please, take care. Thank you, bye!* (AD30) observes the Generosity Maxim. Through the utterance, the speaker tries to minimize benefit to self. He gives the chance to other listeners to participate in the program. He is unselfish. The opposite, the Erik’s utterance: *I’ll try to kill her* (ER5), is the example of the maxim violation. The speaker minimizes cost to him. It seems that he is selfish. However, pragmatically the utterance is a kind of joke. The speaker does not mean to kill his partner if his girlfriend betrays him. In other words, it is not his real opinion. He might be offended if it happens to him.

The Modesty Maxim contains the utterance having or showing a moderate opinion of one’s value, not vain or boastful. The principle of the maxim is formulated as “*minimize praise of self, maximize dispraise of self*”. The maxim observance indicates that the utterances: (1) minimize praise of *self (s)*, and (2) maximize dispraise of *self (s)*. In contrast, the maxim violation indicates that the utterances: (1) maximize praise of *self (s)*, and (2) minimize dispraise of *self (s)*.

Sri’s utterance *No, actually just helping a friend* (SR16) is one example of the maxim observance. Sri tries to minimize praise of her herself by saying that she just wants to help her friend. She denies that she has a new job as what the presenter says before. In contrast, Vincent’s utterance: *It’s not like that. It’s ... it’s.... I just want to have good news that ... We are not married, so common, what should I bring? We just let be a brother or a sister. I’m still loving you, you’re still loving me. If I am married it can be different* (VC47) seems that

Vincent maximized praise of him himself. It violates the Modesty Maxim.

The research findings also show that there are many utterances applying more than one maxim. On the other hand, there are many utterances that violates more than one maxim. In other words, there are many utterances, which overlap. It means that the utterances contain more than one maxim in terms of observance and violation.

Mr. Andi's utterance: *Because you are the expert. You have so many ... many girls* (AD12) toward the presenter (Vincent) has some maxims overlapped. The utterance observes the Maxim of Relation because it is based on the context discussed – love betrayal. On the other hand, the utterance violates several maxims. It violates the maxim of quantity, generosity, modesty, and sympathy. The utterance is excessive. It is not as informative as required for the current purpose of the exchange, lack adequate evidence, maximize cost to *other*, maximize dispraise of *other*, and maximize antipathy between *self* and *other*.

Again, Mr. Andi's utterance: *Okay, congratulation. I should give the time for the other listeners. Nice talking to you. Please take care. Thank you bye!* (AD30) toward the presenter, has some maxims observance. It observes the Quantity Maxim in terms of the contribution as informative as it is required. It observes the Tact Maxim in terms of "maximize benefit to *other*". It observes the Approbation Maxim because the contribution tries to "maximize praise of *other*". It also observes the Sympathy Maxim in terms of "maximize sympathy between *self* and *other*".

The last example shows the violation of some maxims. Vincent's utterance *I just wanna to kill the time. Sometimes it's happy with this crazy. But it's okay. So, anyway, you have to give me opinion about that we have to think first... think first* (VC79) violates the Quantity, Relation, Generosity, and Modesty Maxim. The utterance is not

informative as it is required, out of the topic (while the topic discussed is love betrayal), maximize benefit to *self*, and maximizes praise of *self*.

To summarize, in carrying out a conversation over the telephone in *MAS FM* radio broadcasting program the politeness or "being civil" turns out not to be as powerful and a little bit not as important as "being cooperative" since the focus is on the topic and not so much on politeness.

### **The Speakers' Purposes in Terms of Illocutionary Acts (IA)**

Leech (1983:104) explains that illocutionary acts are performances or utterances of which a speaker communicates something, which have some effects to the listeners. Since Leech's category of illocutionary acts has appropriate basic – its functions, to determine the speakers' purposes, this study uses his category of illocutionary acts as the foundation of data analysis related to CP and PP applied. They are (1) competitive, (2) convivial, (3) collaborative, and (4) conflictive.

The research findings show that Collaborative Function dominates the purpose of the conversation (408 data or 68.24%). It is acceptable since in general the conversation needs collaboration between participants so that it flows comfortably and nice. Almost the entire Collaborative sub functions – asserting, informing, sharing opinion, asking a question, instructing - are applied by the participants except announcing. The announcing sub function is not applied by the participants since this program is not planned to announce something. The second rank is the Convivial Function (172 data or 28.76%). Almost all of the sub functions – offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, making a joke, commenting – are applied except congratulating. In fact, no participant congratulates others since this program is designed for sharing ideas about the topic

forwarded, not for sending something to congratulate someone. The congratulation sub function might be given in other programs, such as a birthday program. The third rank is Competitive Function (18 data or 3.00%). In the conversation, the participants rarely compete with the social goal. From the four sub functions, two of them are applied: ordering and demanding. The presenters order and demand the participants to give and to explore their ideas, opinions, or experiences toward the topic forwarded. On the other hand, asking and begging sub functions are not applied since they are not necessary for the participants to ask or to beg something to others. The last, the research findings do not show the Conflictive Function applied by the participants. It is acceptable since the participants do not want to conflict with others, such as threatening, accusing, cursing, and reprimanding. In other words, Conflictive Function is not applied at all in the conversation since each participant talks naturally, enjoy, comfortably, and fun. Therefore, every participant tries to avoid conflict with others but sometimes he makes a mocking joke. The examples are as follows.

First, one of Collaborative sub functions is asserting. The example is Sri's utterance: *Of course, it is not their mind, you know. They are not normal persons I think. And they should be in the national geographic channel animal. Ya, like the animals. You know that movie, that they are not human beings. Animals like to kill their friends because they want to attract another... another female but likewise another female, so, the national geographic. It's really out of the mind, you know* (SR19). The utterance applies asserting sub function. Sri asserts her belief by sharing her opinion about the topic – love betrayal.

Second, the example of applying the Convivial Function is Vincent's utterance: *Haa.. haaa... Mr. Andi, yes, it's a very*

*Javanese person Do you want to know his full name? It's perfect. Common tell me! Mr. Andi-Andi Lumut, there is the truth* (VC53). In this case, Vincent tries to coincide with the social goal by making a joke.

The last, as Leech (1983:104) says that Competitive is the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal, the research findings show there are some utterances containing Competitive Function. Sinta's utterance *By the way, can you help me to correct my English* (ST3) has Competitive Function in terms of the ordering. The utterance shows that Sinta orders the presenter, Indra Dewi to correct her mistake in speaking English.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### Conclusions

The conclusions are related to the two research problems: (1) the extent of the use of the CP and PP maxims in English radio broadcasting conversations, and (2) the speakers' purposes in terms of Illocutionary Acts (IA).

### *The Extent of the Use of the CP and the PP in the English Broadcasting Conversations*

The ten maxims of the CP and PP are applied in terms of the maxims observances. Their uses vary from the most to the least frequent used. It can be concluded that in carrying out conversations over telephone in MAS FM radio broadcast politeness or "being civil" turns out not to be as powerful and not as important as "being cooperative" since the focus is on the topic forwarded and not so much on politeness.

Besides, it shows that there are a lot of overlapping and violating of the maxims. The most frequent violated is the Relation Maxim. It is reasonable because some audiences know the presenters, meaning they are regular audiences in the program.

Since they are not newcomers in joining the program, they frequently make a mocking joke. Their conversations are even out of topic and prolix. Thus, an utterance could be analyzed based on various angles because it may contain several maxims based on various points of view.

### ***The Speakers' Purposes in Terms of Illocutionary Acts (IA)***

From the four function of IA, the only function, which is not applied at all by the participants, is the Conflictive. The all sub functions: threatening, accusing, cursing, and reprimanding cause conflicts among the participants in carrying out their conversations. In fact, the participants in the radio broadcasting conversations try to avoid conflicts with others because in carrying out a conversation over the telephone is a *non face-to-face conversation* which is conducted without facial expressions and gestures.

### **Suggestions**

The following research recommendations are addressed to (1) English teachers/lecturers, (2) other student researchers and (3) participants of the radio broadcasting conversations over telephone.

### ***Suggestions for English Teachers/Lecturers***

Pragmatics lecturers in English Department at a university could make use of the results of the study to develop the teaching of the Speech Acts, especially the Illocutionary Acts (IA), and the application of the CP and PP in a *non face-to-face conversation*. The Pragmatics lecturers had better pay more attention to the interlocutors' backgrounds, such as cultures, background knowledge, setting, etc in teaching the students, who are not English native speakers. Moreover, they should let the students know the application of pragmatic rules as the important part in

producing utterances. Each utterance contains a certain principle pragmatically, which is very much influenced by their cultures since the principles are applied variably in different topics.

They had better encourages students to produce a various type of form to show politeness and to avoid offences especially when they have to communicate their ideas over telephone in a radio broadcast. In addition, the lecturers should give many materials for discussion and exercises to the students to practice their verbal communicative competencies. It is expected that through those exercises the students develop their pragmatic competencies.

In view of the speaking class, English Department students should be given many exercises to apply the CP and PP in conveying their ideas in a spoken form. based on various aspects: setting, participants, ends, acts, key, instruments, norms, and genres concerning the CP and PP.

### ***Suggestions for Other Student Researchers***

There are several suggestions for the future researchers, including English Department students in carrying out their researches or theses related to Pragmatics, especially the application of the CP and PP as well as the illocutionary acts (IA).

1. The generalization is limited to the research problems. The limitation is put on the extent of the CP and PP in the English radio broadcasting conversations and the speakers' purposes in terms of illocutionary acts (IA). Therefore, the future researchers need to find other practical language uses, such as student-teacher interaction in classroom activity, master of ceremony, speakers, etc.
2. The future researchers could also do the replication of the research based on the differences of the problems, context, subject varieties, and research location.

***Suggestions for Participants in Radio Broadcasting Conversations***

Participants of the conversations over the telephone in *Radio Mas FM* should pay attention to the CP and PP, and apply the IA. In terms of applying the CP and PP, the participants should consider the topic discussed than other unrelated and unnecessary comments. Besides, they had better avoid to make many mocking jokes because it may cause conflict among them and waste of time. When some of them are offended, the conversation would go in stuffiness and threatens to come to an end. Considering conversations duration limitation, audience had better pay attention to available time on the program. They should give the chance to the other audience who want to join the program, too.

**REFERENCES**

- Brown, G. and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Edmondson, W. 1981. *Spoken Discourse: A Model of Analysis*. London and New York: Longman
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1992. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Miles, M and Huberman, M. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publication Inc
- Renkema, Jan. 1993. *Discourse Studies. An Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company