

e-Journal of Linguistics

VIOLATION OF CONVERSATION MAXIM ON TV ADVERTISEMENTS

Desak Putu Eka Pratiwi

e-mail: eka_mambal@yahoo.co.id

STIBA Saraswati Denpasar

N.L. Sutjiati Bertaha, M.A.

e-mail: sutjiati58@gmail.com

**Study Program of Linguistics, School of Graduate Studies,
Udayana University**

I Nengah Sudipa

e-mail: nengahsudipa@yahoo.co.id

**Study Program of Linguistics, School of Graduate Studies,
Udayana University**

I Ketut Darma Laksana

e-mail: darmalaksana27@yahoo.com

**Study Program of Linguistics, School of Graduate Studies,
Udayana University**

Abstract

Maxim is a principle that must be obeyed by all participants textually and interpersonally in order to have a smooth communication process. Conversation maxim is divided into four namely maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner of speaking. Violation of the maxim may occur in a conversation in which the information the speaker has is not delivered well to his speaking partner. Violation of the maxim in a conversation will result in an awkward impression. The example of violation is the given information that is redundant, untrue, irrelevant, or convoluted. Advertisers often deliberately violate the maxim to create unique and controversial advertisements. This study aims to examine the violation of maxims in conversations of TV ads. The source of data in this research is food advertisements aired on TV media. Documentation and observation methods are applied to obtain qualitative data. The theory used in this study is a maxim theory proposed by Grice (1975). The results of the data analysis are presented with informal method. The results of this study show an interesting fact that the violation of maxim in a conversation found in the advertisement exactly makes the advertisements very attractive and have a high value.

Keywords: violation, maxim, advertisement

Introduction

Advertisement uses language as the main tool to give a description of a reality. Language is used, in this matter, for two purposes. First, language is used as a means to describe the reality of goods (products) that are advertised. Secondly, after the description of the goods is given, language is also used to form an image of the product.

Language of advertisement is a very rich language, both its style and its words. Attracting attention, triggering imagination, and making something easy to remember are the main functions of the language of advertisement. Unusual words and simple sentences are easy to remember. This causes the mind of many people to be filled with brands, slogans, mottos, rhythms and rhymes, alliterations, a fragment of a song or poem, and of course no-ending repetitions. Advertisers really make use of the language because there are more advantages from making strange and controversial statements than from simple statements. Advertisement producers like to play with words and manipulate or change the actual meaning of the words. They violate grammatical rules to get a certain effect, use out-of-context words, and even create new words.

Advertisers often use conversations to deliver messages of advertisement in order to make it more interesting and interactive. Due to limited duration the conversation in advertisement is sometimes brief but has many messages to convey. This makes the messages in advertisement unclear. In advertisement, some conversations are easy to understand while some others are difficult to understand, or even confusing and very provocative. The most important thing in a conversation is conversational coherence, relevance and meaningfulness of a conversation. A conversation is coherent when it is in a good order and makes sense to its speakers. Creating coherence in a conversation may sound easy but in fact it is very difficult and can not be understood simultaneously by the speakers. Conversational maxims developed by Grice are often used in examining a conversation in order to understand the relationship in the conversation.

Maxim is a principle that must be obeyed by the participants when interacting, both textually and interpersonally, in order to make communication process go well.

Advertisement is also one of communication media between advertisers and the public (potential buyers). But the fact is that the conversational maxims are often neglected by advertisers. Violation of the maxims of conversation will result in awkward impressions. The example of violation is the given information that is redundant, untrue, irrelevant, or convoluted. Advertisers often deliberately violate the maxims to create unique and controversial advertisements. This phenomenon is very interesting to deeply examine. This study aims to examine the violation of conversational maxims on TV advertisements.

Theoretical Background

The main principle of Grice (1975), which is to understand the relationship in a conversation is cooperation. Cooperation is a fundamental assumption in constructing a meaning or a purpose the speaker and the listener wish to indicate. Grice stated that in the principle of cooperation, a speaker must obey the four maxims. Maxim is a principle that must be obeyed by the participants when interacting, both textually and interpersonally, in order to make communication process go well. The four maxims of conversation are:

- 1) Maxim of quality: in a conversation, try your best to state facts.
- 2) Maxim of quantity: give sufficient information and do not give anything that is not necessary.
- 3) Maxim of relevance: state what is useful or relevant only.
- 4) Maxim of manner: do not state anything that is not clear, do not state anything that is ambiguous, speak briefly and specifically.

In his book "Logic and Conversation" Grice (1975), regarding cooperative principle, states that violation of the cooperative principle can occur in a conversation when the information to be conveyed by the speaker to the listener is not delivered properly. Violation of the maxim of conversation can result in an awkward impression. The example of violation is the given information that is redundant, untrue, irrelevant, or convoluted. Advertisers often deliberately violate the maxims to create unique and controversial advertisements. This awkwardness is usually used by the advertisers to create persuasive, controversial, and

bombastic statements to show their products' excellence. According to Grice, there are four types of violations of the maxim in cooperative principle. The violations are:

(1) Violation of Maxim of Quality

This violation occurs when a speaker tries to give information, which is likely to be untrue or a lie, to his speaking partner.

(2) Violation of Maxim of Quantity

This violation occurs when a speaker gives unclear or exaggerated information to his speaking partner.

(3) Violation of Maxim of Relevance

This violation occurs when a speaker gives an answer that is not related to the previous topic or tries to change the topic being discussed in a conversation.

(4) Violation of Maxim of Manner

This violation occurs when a speaker gives information to his speaking partner in a disorganized way and unclearly.

Methodology

The data in this study were taken from TV commercials. There are 10 commercial advertisements used in this study and they are all food advertisement. The advertisements are; *Sedaap Cup Noodle*, *Tango Wafer*, *Fitbar*, *Energen Cereals*, *Sambal ABC*, *Special Chicken Noodle Sedaap*, *Sasa*, *Magic Delicious*, *Jacob's Crackers*, and *Bango soy sauce*. Food ads are selected as the source of data in this study because they have the largest market segmentation of all products. Food products advertisement can reach the most people. They are different from such advertisement as cosmetics and sanitary napkin whose targets are women, cigarettes and condoms whose target are adult males, or cars whose target are limited to middle and upper class. Based on this, food advertisement is considered the most representative to see the language phenomenon, especially the violation of maxims. The method used to collect the data was observation method conducted with recording, listening and note-taking techniques. The data were, then, analyzed based on the theory of Grice's

maxims (1975). The results of data analysis are presented with informal method through sentence compositions, phrases and technical terms in order to provide explanation.

Discussion

Violation of Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality is the maxim which obliges the participants to give factual formation. By implementing the maxim of quality in cooperative principle the participants is expected to give a completely true information. This violation occurs when a speaker tries to give information, which is likely to be untrue or a lie, to his speaking partner. A speech that is not based on reality and not supported by clear and concrete data, and cannot be accounted for, violates the maxim of quality. There are four advertisements that violate the maxim of quality, they are advertisement of *Wafer Tango*, *Fitbar*, *Sasa*, and *Jacob's Crackers*. Below are the analysis of violation of the maxim of quality in food advertisement.

Data A1:

“(1) Dulu hidup gue basi banget. (2) Kalo kata kucing gue ‘*kudate-kudate*’. (3) Tapi sekarang gue *cup date*. (4) Makan Mie Sedaap Cup baru. (5) Pertama kali ni, mie *cup* dengan rasa yang *up to date*. (6) *Cup date* itu mie *cup* yang isinya banyak. (7) Ada bal-balnya. (8) Hmmm pingin gue pacarin. (9) Rasanya sensasinya *up to date*. (10) Pecah enaknyanya. (11) Ini baru mie cup berkualitas, rasanya berkelas. (12) *So update* rasa lu. (13) Cuma Mie Sedaap Cup baru.”

(Sumber: Trans 7, Oktober 2013)

In the speech above the speaker violates the maxim of quality because the speaker tries to provide information that is not true. This can be seen in the second speech, “Kalo kata kucing gue ‘*kudate-kudate*’” and “Hmmm pingin gue pacarin”. In the second speech the speaker says that the cat said, “*kudate-kudate*”. This information is definitely not true and contradicts with the reality because the cat cannot speak like human. In speech (8), the speaker says that he wants to date with Sedaap Cup Noodle. This cannot happen in reality and does not make sense at all because it is impossible for a human to date with inanimate objects.

Data A2:

“(1) Tango disukai selera lokal dan internasional. (2) Tango juga kenalkan bebek dan Blackberry. (3) Astronot dan asongan pun akrab karenanya. (4) Tango satukan *shuffling* dan *siskamling*. (5) Nikmatnya tango satukan semua perbedaan. (6) Tango... (7) Berapa lapis? (8) Ratusan...”

(Sumber: Trans 7, Oktober 2013)

There is a violation of the maxim of quality in the advertisement above. This can be seen in speech 2, 3, and 4. In these speeches the speaker says that Tango introduces Duck to Blackberry, astronaut to peddler, and *shuffling* to *siskamling*. How could duck be acquainted with Blackberry, astronauts with peddlers, and *shuffling* with *siskamling*? These speeches violate the maxim of quality because there is no truth in each of them. They are not based on reality and do not have supporting data that prove the information stated in them. The information is not only untrue but also does not relate to each other.

Data A3:

P1: “(1) Biasanya jam segini ni jamnya ngemil. (2) Dulu suka *worry* nimbun kalori dan kolesterol. (3) Untung sekarang ada Fitbar. (4) Nggak bikin *worry*, enak lagi.”

P2: “(5) Habis bakar kalori masak nimbun kalori lagi? (6) Sejak ada Fitbar nggak perlu *worry*. ”

N: “(7) Fitbar, kalori terjaga nol kolesterol.”

P1: “(8) Ganti cemilanmu dengan Fitbar.”

N: “(9) Fitbar, *snacking with no worry*.”

(Sumber: SCTV, Oktober 2013)

The Advertisement above violates the maxim of quality because some utterances are not supported by concrete evidence that can prove what is stated in the speech. This can be seen in speech 7, “*Fitbar, kalori terjaga nol kolesterol*”. The advertiser does not provide supporting data to prove the product free from cholesterol.

Data A7:

“(1) Indonesia negeri seribu satu kuliner tapi hanya Sasa yang menyatukannya jadi satu kelezatan. (2) Satu nusa satu Sasa, semua pakai Sasa. (3) Maknyus. (4) Bagaimana dengan anda?”

(Sumber: SCTV, Oktober 2013)

Violation of the maxim of quality is also found in the advertisement above. The violation can be seen in the speech 2, “*Satu nusa satu Sasa, semua pakai Sasa*”. In the speech the speaker provides information whose accuracy cannot be accounted for. The speaker claims that all Indonesian people consume *Sasa*, but the information is not based on clear evidence and it is, therefore, not verified.

Data A8:

P1: “(1) Bang... Cakue...!!! Bang... Siomay...!!!”

P2: “(2) Masakan ibu nggak kalah enak.”

N: “(3) Saatnya beraksi. (4) Magic Lezat lebih komplit. (5) Ayam, bawang, dan bumbu-bumbu semua ada di sini. (6) Nggak perlu nambahin mecin. (7) Kaldu gurihnya terasa banget. (8) Masakan biasa jadi luar biasa.”

P3: (9) “Nasi goreng...”

P1: (10) “Wahhhh...”

P4: (11) “Siomay...”

P1: (12) “Huhhh...”

P2: (13) “Enak masakan ibu kan?”

P1: (14) “Masakan ibu *magic!*”

N: (15) “Magic Lezat, lezatnya manggil...”

(Sumber: Trans TV, Oktober 2013)

The violation of the maxim of quality is also found in the advertisement above. It is seen in speech 8, “*Masakan biasa jadi luar biasa*”. The speech is not based on concrete evidence. There are no data that can prove *Magic Lezat* able to make an ordinary cooking into an extraordinary one. Besides, what is meant by “*luar biasa*” in the speech is also not clear. Another example can also be seen in speech 15, “*Magic Lezat, lezatnya manggil...*”. This speech violates the maxim of quality because the speaker provides information that cannot be proven. In reality, it is not possible for inanimate objects (*Magic Lezat*) to be able to literally “call” someone.

Data A9:

L: “(1) Ikan belum makan, PR anak kebanyakan, beban! (2) Baru ingat beras habis, kulkas bocor, bos sadis, pembantu pulang, mertua datang. (3) Aduh beban-beban!”

N: “(4) Beban nggak terasa kalo badan fit. (5) Baru Jacob’s crackers lezat. (6) Kaya nutrisi gandum asli, susu, dan sayuran. (7) Jacob’s pilihan sehat nikmatmu.”

(Sumber: RCTI, Oktober 2013)

At the beginning while humming the speaker is saying “*Ikan belum makan, PR anak kebanyakan, beban! Baru ingat beras habis, kulkas bocor, bos sadis, pembantu pulang, mertua datang.* Then the speaker implicitly says that by eating Jacob's all the burdens can be alleviated. This violates the maxim of quality because the speaker provides information that is not based on the facts. How can a single cookie can provide sufficient energy intake to cope with all the burdens of a housewife who is also a career woman. In fact, a man needs a wide variety of food intake in order to get enough energy to do all his activities.

Data A10:

“(1) Ini anak kami. (2) Ada juga yang di kebun, namanya Malika. (3) Malika itu kedelai hitam dari Bango yang saya besarkan sepenuh hati seperti anak sendiri. (4) Hasilnya kedelai hitam pilihan untuk membuat kecap Bango yang hitam dan kental. (5) Rasa masakan jadi benar-benar lezat. (6) Karena rasa tak pernah bohong.”

(Sumber: Global TV, Oktober 2013)

The violation of maxim of quality can be seen in speech 5, “*Rasa masakan jadi benar-benar lezat*”. The speech cannot be proven. Advertisers do not provide concrete data that prove *Kecap Bango* able to make food very delicious. How can the audience believe something that has no evidence.

Violation of Maxim of Manner

The maxim of manner in Grice's cooperative principle requires every participant to always speak with each other directly and clearly. The message should not be ambiguous or

obscure. This violation occurs when the speaker gives information disorderedly or unclearly to his speaking partner. There are three advertisements that violate this maxim, namely *Wafer Tango*, *MagicLezat*, and *Kecap Bango*. Below is the analysis of violation of maxim of manner.

Data A1:

“(1) Dulu hidup gue basi banget. (2) Kalo kata kucing gue ‘*kudate-kudate*’. (3) Tapi sekarang gue *cup date*. (4) Makan Mie Sedaap Cup baru. (5) Pertama kali ni, mie*cup* dengan rasa yang *up to date*. (6) *Cup date* itu mie *cup* yang isinya banyak. (7) Ada bal-balnya. (8) Hmmm pingin gue pacarin. (9) Rasanya sensasinya *up to date*. (10) Pecah enaknya. (11) Ini baru mie cup berkualitas, rasanya berkelas. (12) *So update* rasa lu. (13) Cuma Mie Sedaap Cup baru.”

(Sumber: Trans 7, Oktober 2013)

Maxim of manner requires, as stated previously, each participant to express all his thoughts clearly. What is meant by "clear" is the use of right words, which does not contain hidden meaning. Clear information is the one that does not cause multiple interpretations to emerge. The advertisement above violates the maxim of manner because the speaker uses some words that have vague meanings. This can be seen from such words as *kudate*, *cup date*, *bal-bal*, and *pecah enaknya*. These words have vague meanings and they cause the speaker to interpret their meanings themselves. Thus, the speech can lead to different interpretations.

Data A2:

“(1) Tango disukai selera local dan internasional. (2) Tango juga kenalkan bebek dan Blackberry. (3) Astronot dan asongan pun akrab karenanya. (4) Tango satukan *shuffling* dan siskamling. (5) Nikmatnya tango satukan semua perbedaan. (6) Tango... (7) Berapa lapis? (8) Ratusan...”

(Sumber: Trans 7, Oktober 2013)

Violation of maxim of manner occurs when the speaker uses words whose meanings are ambiguous and unclear. This happens in the advertisement above. Advertisers use words that are ambiguous. This is seen in speech 2-4, “*Tango juga kenalkan bebek dan Blackberry*,

Astronot dan asongan pun akrab karenanya, Tango satukan shuffling dansiskamling”.

These utterances have hidden meanings, and therefore violate the maxim of manner. The speech has vague meanings because the speaker does not express his thoughts directly and clearly.

Data A4:

“(1) Nggak sempet makan? (2) Bisa gawat, perut keroncongan. (3) Ganjel aja dengan Energen! (4) Susu, sereal, oats yang kaya nutrisi. (5) Siap dalam semenit. (6) Energen, nutrisi praktis untuk keluarga. (7) Energen, minum makanan bergizi.”

(Sumber: SCTV, Oktober 2013)

In the advertisement above violation of maxim of manner is seen when the speaker makes utterances that are ambiguous or contain unclear information. Speech 7 says, “*Energen, minum makanan bergizi*”. This speech is ambiguous because the words are confusing. What is meant by “*minum makanan*” is not clear. The listeners become confused of whether it is a food product or a drink product. However, the advertisers must have already considered every word that appears in the advertisement so that it can be concluded that the advertisers have a certain purpose that makes them create “weird” expressions. The aim is none other than creating a unique and interesting advertisement in order to make the known public more quickly.

Data A8:

P1: “(1) Bang... Cakue...!!! Bang... Siomay...!!!”

P2: “(2) Masakan ibu nggak kalah enak.”

N: “(3) Saatnya beraksi. (4) Magic Lezat lebih komplit. (5) Ayam, bawang, dan bumbu-bumbu semua ada di sini. (6) Nggak perlu nambahin mecin. (7) Kaldu gurihnya terasa banget. (8) Masakan biasa jadi luar biasa.”

P3: (9) “Nasi goreng...”

P1: (10) “Wahhhh...”

P4: (11) “Siomay...”

P1: (12) “Huhhh...”

P2: (13) “Enak masakan ibu kan?”

P1: (14) “Masakan ibu *magic!*”

N: (15) “Magic Lezat, lezatnya manggil...”

(Sumber: Trans 7, Oktober 2013)

The advertisement above violates maxim of manner because the speaker uses words whose meanings are not clear. This is seen in speech 14, “*Masakan ibu magic!*” in which the word *magic* has a vague meaning. It is not clear what is meant by “*masakan yang magic*” in the advertisement. Does it mean 'magic' performed by a magician? or maybe the product can turn awful food into delicious food, or it has another meaning. Thus, speech 14 raises confusion and make audience think hard to understand what the speech actually tries to express.

Data A10:

“(1) Ini anak kami. (2) Ada juga yang di kebun, namanya Malika. (3) Malika itu kedelai hitam dari Bango yang saya besarkan sepenuh hati seperti anak sendiri. (4) Hasilnya kedelai hitam pilihan untuk membuat kecap Bango yang hitam dan kental. (5) Rasa masakan jadi benar-benar lezat. (6) Karena rasa tak pernah bohong.”

(Sumber: Global TV, Oktober 2013)

Violation of maxim of manner is found in the advertisement above. It is seen in speech 1 and 2, “*Ini anak kami, Ada juga yang di kebun, namanya Malika...*”. According to maxim of manner the speaker should not say anything unclear and ambiguous. The speaker should speak briefly and specifically. In speech 1 and 2 speakers provides ambiguous statement. Speakers make their speaking partners confused with their statements about “*Malika*”. The Ambiguous statements of the speakers could make their speaking partners wonder whether or not “*Malika*” is one of the speakers’ children. In fact, “*Malika*” is black soybean in their garden. This shows that in terms of maxim of manner, the speakers provide unclear and confusing information.

Violation of Maxim of Quantity

Based on maxim of quantity, speakers in conversations should provide necessary contribution to their speaking partners. In maxim of quantity a speaker is expected to deliver messages or information which is sufficient and as informative as possible to other speakers. Violation of maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker gives too much information to his

speaking partner. There are five advertisements that violate maxim of quantity. They are advertisement of *Fitbar*, *Energen Sereal*, *Sambal ABC*, *Kopi Kapal Api*, and *Fruitea*. The analyses of the violations are provided below.

Data A3:

P1:“(1) Biasanya jam segini ni jamnya ngemil. (2) Dulu suka *worry* nimbun kalori dan kolesterol. (3) Untung sekarang ada *Fitbar*. (4) *Nggak bikin worry*, enak lagi.”

P2: “(5) Habis bakar kalori masak nimbun kalori lagi? (6) Sejak ada *Fitbar* nggak perlu *worry*. ”

N: “(7) *Fitbar*, kalori terjaga nol kolesterol.”

P1: “(8) Ganti cemilanmu dengan *Fitbar*.”

N: “(9) *Fitbar*, *snacking with no worry*.”

(Sumber: SCTV, Oktober 2013)

It is found that the advertisement above violates maxim of quantity because there is information that is redundant and repetitive. This can be seen in speech 4, “*Nggak bikin worry, enak lagi*”; in speech 6, “*Sejak ada Fitbar, nggak perlu worry*”; and in speech 9, “*Fitbar, snacking with no worry*”. The Advertisers repeatedly use the word *worry*, combined with *nggak bikin*, *nggak perlu*, dan *with no*, even though it contains the same meaning and information. With this, the advertisement violates maxim of quantity because the principle of the maxim of quantity is to provide necessary information and not to say anything unnecessary. However, since the advertisers have a specific purpose, they deliberately violate maxim of quantity. They want to emphasize that the advertised product is safe and consumers do not have to worry about being obese.

Data A4:

“(1) *Nggak sempet makan?* (2) Bisa gawat, perut keroncongan. (3) Ganjel aja dengan *Energen!* (4) Susu, sereal, oats yang kaya nutrisi. (5) *Siap dalam semenit*. (6) *Energen*, nutrisi praktis untuk keluarga. (7) *Energen*, minum makanan bergizi.”

(Sumber: SCTV, Oktober 2013)

This advertisement also violates maxim of quantity. The Advertisers repeat the same information in two different speeches. This can be seen in speech 5 “*Siap dalam semenit*”

and in speech 6 “*Energen, nutrisi praktis untuk keluarga*”. The phrase *siap dalam semenit* is synonymous with the word *praktis*. This means that it is unnecessarily repeated.

Data A5:

P1: (1) “Asikkkk..... yahhhh kurang menantang....”

P2: (2) “Hhhmmmm.... Hhaaaa....Yakin...???”

N: (3) “Temukan sensasi baru sambal terasi ABC. (4) Sekali coba sensasi pedasnya, akan tertantang terus, terus, dan terus. (5) Dibuat dengan cabai segar dan terasi pilihan.”

P1: (6) “Coba dulu, baru tahu rasanya.”

P2: (7) “Dengan ABC, ibu selalu bisa.”

(Sumber: SCTV, Oktober 2013)

The advertisers violate maxim of quantity because, in the conversation, the speaker provides redundant information. This is observed in speech 4, “*Sekali coba sensasi pedasnya akan tertantang terus, terus, dan terus*”. In this speech the word *terus* is mentioned three times. It is exaggeration because for the listeners, the word *terus* needs to be stated only once to understand.

Violation of Maxim of Relevance

To build a good cooperation between speaker and hearer, each of them has to, according to maxim of relevance, give relevant contribution to something that is being talked about. A speech can be said to obey maxim of relevance when the speech and responses are related to each other. Violation of maxim of relevance occurs when a speaker gives an answer that does not relate to topic of conversation or tries to change the topic of the ongoing conversation. There are six advertisements that violate maxim of relevance. They are advertisement of *Mie Sedaap Cup*, *Mie Sedaap Ayam Spesial*, *The Botol Sosro*, *Fruitea*, *Nu Greentea*, and *Fretea*. The followings are the analysis of the violations of relevance maxim.

Data A1:

“(1) Dulu hidup gue basi banget. (2) Kalo kata kucing gue ‘*kudate-kudate*’.

(3) Tapi sekarang gue*cup date*. (4) Makan Mie Sedaap Cup baru. (5)

Pertama kali ni, miecup dengan rasa yang *up to date*. (6) *Cup date* itu mie cup yang isinya banyak. (7) Ada bal-balnya. (8) Hmm pingin gue pacarin. (9) Rasanya sensasinya *up to date*. (10) Pecah enakya. (11) Ini baru mie cup berkualitas, rasanya berkelas. (12) *So update* rasa lu. (13) Cuma Mie Sedaap Cup baru.”

(Sumber: Trans 7, Oktober 2013)

In some speeches in the advertisement above the speaker violates maxim of relevance. This can be seen in speech 1-4, “*Dulu hidup gue basi banget*”, “*Kalo kata kucing gue ‘kudate-kudate’*”, “*Tapi sekarang gue cup date*”, “*Makan Mie Sedaap Cup baru*”. In the speeches the speaker told that his life used to be "stale" (boring /not fun), but after eating *Mie Sedaap Cup* his life turned into "up to date". The speech does not have any relevance or any cause-and-effect relationships. In reality, it is impossible for noodles to be able to change someone's life.

Data A6:

- N : (1) “Adi saying banget sama ayam-ayamnya.”
 P1 : (2) “Nek, aku sekolah ya.”
 N : (3) “Sore itu...”
 P1 : (4) “Nenek, ayam-ayamku mana?”
 P2 : (5) “Udah, makan dulu sana ada mie ayam spesial tu.”
 P1 : (6) “HmMMM enak... Kaldunya asli... Ayamkuuuuuuu...???”
 P2 : (7) “Bukan Di, ini Mie Sedaap baru. Dari kaldu ayam asli.(8)
 Rasanya pok pok pok pok.”
 P1 : (9) “Jadi, ayamku?”
 P3 : (10) “Mie Sedap Ayam Spesial, asli ayamnya.”

(Sumber: Indosiar, Oktober 2013)

Violation of maxim of relevance occurs in the advertisement above. This can be seen in conversation below:

- Adi : “Nenek, ayam-ayamku mana?”
 Nenek : “Udah, makan dulu sana ada mie ayam spesial tu.”

In this conversation it is clear that the grandmother tries to divert conversation to make Adi forget his chickens. There is no relevance between the question asked by Adi and

the answer given by his grandmother. Adi asked about his chickens to his grandmother, while his grandmother even asks Adi to eat without answering his question first.

CONCLUSION

As has been mentioned above, there are four maxims that must be followed by the participants when interacting so that the process of communication, maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner, can go well. From all the data analysis it is found that violation of the four maxims occurs in the advertisements on TV. This means that most of the advertisements do not follow the rules of conversational maxims. The data show that 70% of advertisements violate maxim of quality. Violation of maxim of manner covers 50% of advertisements, violation of maxim of quantity 30%, and violation of maxim of relevance 20%. The high percentage of violation of maxim of quality shows that the advertisers try to give information that is likely to be incorrect or untrue to their audience. Meanwhile, the high degree of violation of maxim of manner shows that advertisers tend to present disordered or unclear information to their audience. The violations of maxim of quantity and maxim of relevance show that the advertisers provide respectively redundant and irrelevant information to their audience. Although there are many violations of conversational maxims found on TV ads, the advertisements can still be understood, and they are even made more interesting and unusual by the violations. This suggests that interesting advertisements do not have to adhere to the principles of maxim proposed by Grice. The language of advertisement is not bound with the principles of maxim because the more unique the language, the more attractive the advertisement. Such violations can elicit a sense of humor which is fresh and very entertaining. It can be concluded, then, that the violation of maxims in food advertisements does not disrupt the message to be conveyed. On the contrary, it makes the advertisements become more unique and interesting to see.

REFERENCES

- Bungin, B. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Kencana Press.
- Bungin, B. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Cook, G. 1992. *The Discourse of Advertising*. London: Routledge.
- Danesi, M. 2010. *Pengantar Memahami Semiotika Media*. Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- Danesi, M. 2010. *Pesan, Tanda, dan Makna*. Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. "Logic and Conversation." In: *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Arts*. Eds. Cole, Peter and Jerry L. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

