

A STUDY ON FLOUTING AND HEDGING MAXIMS USED BY THE MAIN CHARACTERS ON “DADDY DAY CAMP”

Maria Helmi
Universitas Negeri Padang
mariahelmi@gmail.com

Submit, 21-07-2020

Accepted, 28-12-2022

Publish, 30-12-2022

ABSTRACT

This research focused on analyzing flouting and hedging maxims used by the main characters in "Daddy Day Camp." This research aimed to investigate and explore how the maxims are flouted and hedged by the main characters in "Daddy Day Camp." The qualitative method was used in this research because the data were in words rather than that numbers and statistics. The data were taken from the utterances spoken by the main characters on "Daddy Day Camp." After collecting the data, they are classified and analyzed based on Grice's Cooperative principle theory. This research found many maxims of cooperative principle flouted and hedged by the main characters on "Daddy Day Camp," especially the maxim of quality and Quantity. On the other hand, this research also found that the utterances spoken by the main characters hedged the maxims of the cooperative principle. Some reports hedge the maxim of quality and relevance because the statements expressed by the main characters are not accurate but seem informative, well-founded, and relevant.

Keywords: *Flouting Maxim, Hedging Maxims, Daddy Day Camp*

INTRODUCTION

Good communication is needed for everyone in interaction with others for the transmission to run well and effectively. Besides, good communication is required to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation between the speaker and the hearer. There is a theory that helps people be cooperative in conversation. It is a cooperative principle, a principle of conversation proposed by Grice 1975, stating that participants expect each to make a "conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange." The cooperative principle describes how people interact with one another. People who obey the cooperative principle in their language use will ensure that what they say in a conversation furthers the purpose of that conversation. Paul Grice proposes four conversational maxims that arise from the pragmatics of natural language. The Vice's Maxims are a way to explain the link between utterances and what is understood from them. The principle describes how effective

communication in conversation is achieved in everyday social situations and is further broken down into the four Maxims of Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner.

When we look at communication between people surrounding us, we will find many of them disobey Grice's maxims. People sometimes break the rule of maxims of quality, Quantity, relevance, or even manner. Breaking the rules of cooperative principle or Grice's maxims are called flouting and hedging. Usually, we can find some floating in tautology, metaphor, overstatement, understatement, rhetorical question, and irony. Furthermore, the maxims are hedged when the information is not accurate but seems informative, well-founded, and relevant; moreover, the speaker quotes the information from other people.

In this research, I discussed flouting and hedging maxims used by the main characters on "Dad Day Camp". Discussing flouting and hedging maxims used by the main characters is an interesting topic because it has some uniqueness. First of all, the languages used by the main characters have many variations; for example, they use irony languages, metaphor languages, and even idiom languages. Secondly, in communication, people tend to speak what is in their minds. They never think about the rules, especially the rules of the cooperative principle. Therefore, they flouted and hedged the rules of the cooperative principle. Thirdly, there were two different characters on "Daddy Day Camp." One is white American, and the other is black American. Both of them produced different flouting and hedging.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cooperative Principle

The success of a conversation depends upon the various speakers' approaches to the interaction. How people try to make conversations work is called the cooperative principle. Grice in Grundy (2000:73) argues that the "speaker intend to be cooperative is for the speaker to give as much as information as is expected." He also stated that when we talk, we try to be cooperative by elevating this notion into "The Cooperative Principle." The Cooperative Principle is enunciated in the following way: make your conversational contribution such as is required, as the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Finegan, 2004:300). Concerning with his Cooperative Principle, Grice divides Cooperative Principle into four basic conversational maxims: the maxim of Quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance and maxim of manner (Grundy, 2000:74).

Maxims of Quantity

Maxim of Quantity, as one of the cooperative principles, is primarily concerned with giving information as required rather than giving the contribution more informative than required. Therefore, each participant's contribution to the conversation should be just as informative as it requires; it should not be less informative or more informative. And say as much as helpful but less informative or less informative.

The maxim of Quantity provides that, in normal circumstances, speakers say just enough, that they supply no less information and no more than is necessary for the communication: Be appropriately informative (Finegan, 2004:300). For example:

A: Where is the hospital?

B: In the next to that store.

Maxims of Quality

Maxim of quality can be defined as being as truthful as required. It means that speakers should tell the truth and not say what they think is false or make statements for which they lack evidence. In maxim of quality, speakers and writers are expected to say only what they believe to be true and to have evidence for what they say. Again, the other side of the coin is that speakers are aware of this expectation; they know that hearers expect them to honor the maxim of quality. For example, Rani is a student at Padang state university. Next two days, she should attend the research proposal seminar on her campus. When the day comes, she gets sick and cannot attend the seminar. Then, she asks her close friend, who has the same faculty as her, about the result of the seminar. Here, Rani follows the maxim of quality. She believes that her close friend came to the important agenda is the research proposal seminar.

Maxims of Relevance

Maxims of relation mean that the utterance must be relevant which the topic being discussed. Finegan (2004:301) states that this maxim directs speakers to their utterances in such a way that they are relevant to ongoing context: Be relevant at the time of the utterance. The maxim of relevance is fulfilled when the speaker gives a contribution relevant to the topic of the preceding utterance. Therefore, each participant's contribution should be relevant to the subject of conversation (Grundy, 2000:74).

For example:

A. How about your score, Jane?

B. Not too bad

Here, Jane's utterance fulfilled the maxim of relevance because her answer was relevant to the question.

Maxims of Manner

Maxim of manner obligates the speaker's utterance to be perspicuous, not to be ambiguous, obscure, or disorderly, and to unnecessary prolixity. Therefore, each participant's contribution should be reasonably direct. It should not be vague, ambiguous, or excessively wordy. For example:

A. What did you think of that drama?

B. I really like of the action of each player. They can play their role as good as possible.

The answer of B is categorized as the maxim of manner. He can answer the question from his partner about the drama clearly. From the explanation mentioned above, I can conclude that although it is very difficult to obey and use all of the cooperative principles and their maxims in uttering or writing sentences, it is essential to follow the cooperative principle for communication to run more effectively.

Flouting Maxims

Flouting is a deliberate and apparent violation of maxims. Grundy (2000: 78) states that flouting the maxim is a particularly salient way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an implicature thus. There is a trade-off between abiding by maxims. For example:

John: Where's Meredith?

Elizabeth: The control room or the science lab.

From the example above, Elizabeth's answer violated the maxim of Quantity. Elizabeth didn't give as much information as John wanted (Meredith's exact location) but instead gave a weaker statement (giving two possible options).

According to Brown and Yule (1989:32), "flouting of the maxim is the result of the speaker conveying in addition to the literal meaning which is conversational implicature."

The flouting of each maxim is determined based on the following criteria:

1. A speaker flouts the maxim of Quantity when his contribution is not informative as required for the exchange's current purpose and more informative than is required.

2. A speaker flouts the maxim of quality when his contribution is not true and he says something which lacks adequate evidence.

3. A speaker flouts the maxim of relation if his contribution is irrelevant.

4. A speaker flouts the maxim of manner; if the contribution is not perspicuous, it may be obscure, ambiguous, and disorderly. (<http://www.artsci.wust.edu/~Mind Dict/grice.htm>),

Usually, flouting maxims can be found in Tautology, Metaphor, Overstatement, understatement, Rhetorical question, and Irony (Grundy, 2000:76-77). The detailed description is as follows:

Tautology

Tautology is saying the same thing more than once in different ways without making one's meaning clearer or more forceful (Hornby, 1995:1224).

For example: "women are women."

The word women repeated twice, and the speaker cannot give more information about women. He assumed that the hearer understood who women were. Women have different characteristics than men.

Tautology usually flouts the maxim of Quantity. But by uttering a tautology, the speaker encourages the listener to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance; it may be an excuse (Goody: 225).

Tautology may be criticism: "Your clothes belong where your clothes belong. My clothes belong where my clothes belong-look upstairs". Moreover, tautologies serve a similar function, for example, a refusal of request: "If I will not give it, I will not" (C.II mean it), or complain, for example: "if it is as a road, it is a road!" (C.I Boy, what a terrible road!).

Metaphor

A metaphor is an expression that means or describes one thing or idea using words usually used of something else with very similar qualities or words to mean something different from their ordinary meaning (Hornby, 1995:654). Metaphor is one of the most frequent violations of Grice's conversational principles.

Besides, metaphor is the imaginative use of a word or phrase to describe something as another object to show that they have the same qualities and make the description more forceful (Hornby, 1995:734), e.g., "She has a heart of stone." It means that she did not want to hear any advice from others. She still keeps on the thing she thinks is right, even though others tell her that thing is false.

Overstatement

The opposite of understatement is an overstatement. It is exaggerating or choosing a point on a scale higher than the actual state of affairs (Goody, 224). It means that the speaker says more than is necessary that violating the maxim of quality. In another way, he may also convey implicatures. He may do this by the inverse of the understatement principle, that is, by exaggerating on choosing a point on an often lie far beyond what is said scale, which is higher than the actual state of affairs. For examples:

(1) Now we have all been screwed by the cabinet (Sun headline)

(2) There were a million people in the room tonight.

(3) These examples are classified as overstatements because they use exaggerated statements (we have all a million people). Therefore, the information is more informative.

Moreover, an overstatement also conveys an excuse for being late, and it could make an apology for not getting in touch. For example, I tried to call a hundred times, but there were never any answers. It also could convey the relevant criticisms, for example: (1) you never do the washing up. (2) Why are you always smoking?

Furthermore, if the speaker wishes to convey an off-record sarcasm, he might use overstatement as a trigger for the appropriate implicatures (Goody: 225)

Understatement

An understatement is a statement expressing an idea very weakly (Hornby, 1995:1299). Understatement is one way of generating implicatures by saying less than is required. Typical ways of constructing understatement are to choose a point on a scalar predicate (e.g., tall, good, nice) that is well below the point that describes the state of affairs (Goody, 1996: 222). For example:

(1) He was very angry

(2) A: What do you think of Harry?

B: Nothing wrong with him (C.I.1 do not particularly like it).

Those examples are classified as an understatement because the speakers give a less informative statement. Understatement can be in the form of:

(1) Accepting a compliment, for example:

A: What a marvelous place you have been here?

B: Oh, I do not know it is a place.

(2) Insult, for example:

A: I do indeed come from Scotland, but I cannot help it...

B: That, Sir, I find, is what many of your countrymen can not help.

(3) Accepting an offer, for example:

A. Have another drink?

B: I do not mind. I do.

The examples above give less informative information (Goody: 224).

Rhetorical Question

A rhetorical question is a figure of speech in a question posed to make a statement or initiate introspection rather than to get an answer. In a rhetorical question, one is asked only to produce an effect or make a statement rather than to get an answer (Hornby, 1995:1008). In other words, it requires no answer because the answer is obvious and does not need to be stated. For example:

"Who cares?"

"How many times do I have to call you? "(I have called you many times, but you were not there)

"How many times do I have to tell you to close the door when you got

out?"

Those examples above are classified as rhetorical questions because the speaker does not expect the answer from the hearer. Sometimes, the rhetorical question is evidenced only in sequencing. The rhetorical question usually uses words that help to force the interpretation of questions (to push them on record), such as just event, ever (Goody, 1996:229). For example:

A: "Did he even or ever come to visit me once while I was in the hospital?"

B: "Just why would I have done that? "

Irony

The irony is the expression of one's meaning by saying the direct opposite of what one is thinking but using tone of voice to indicate one's real meaning (Hornby, 1995:632). Again, by saying the opposite of what he means, a violation of quality maxims, the speaker can directly convey his intended meaning if there are clues that his intended meaning is being conveyed indirectly (Goody: 226). It means irony refers to the sense of the difference between what is asserted and what is actually the case. Verbal irony is a statement in which the implicit meaning intended by the speaker differs from what he ostensibly asserts.

Hedging Maxims

Maxims are hedged when the information is not totally accurate but seen as informative, well-founded, and relevant. The information is taken by quoting from other personal opinions. Besides, the maxims hedges or intensifiers are that none of them adds truth-value to the utterances to which they are attached. This confirms: that the hedges and intensifiers are more comments on the extent to which the speaker abides by the maxims, which guided our conversational contribution, than a part of what is said or conveyed (Grundy, 2000: 79).

Hedges may intentionally or unintentionally be employed in both spoken and written language since they are crucially important in communication. Hedges help speakers and writers communicate more precisely the degree of accuracy a truth in assessments. Interestingly, from pragmatics aspects, hedges indicate how far the maxims are observed. In this case, hedges are markers tied to the expectation of the maxims of Quantity, quality, manner, and relevance. For example:

1. All I know is smoking is harmful to your health.

In (1), it can be observed that information conveyed by the speaker is limited by adding all I know and as you probably know. By so saying, the speaker wants to inform that s/he is not only making an assertion but observing the (maxim) of Quantity as well.

2. They told me that they were married.

If the speaker only says that "they are married" and they do not know for sure if they are married, they may violate the maxim of quality since they say something that they do not know to be true or false. Nevertheless, by adding, they told me that the speaker wants to confirm that they are observing the conversational maxim of quality in conversation, speakers may also be aware of the maxim of the manner by producing hedges like:

3. I am not sure if all of these are clear to you, but this is what I know.

The above example (3) shows that hedges are good indications the speakers are not only conscious of the maxim of manner, but they are also trying to observe them.

4. By the way, do you like this car?

By using, by the way, what has been said by the speakers is not relevant to the moment in which the conversation takes place. Such a hedge can be found in the middle of the speaker's conversation as the speaker wants to switch to another topic that is different from the previous one. Therefore, by the way, it functions as a hedge indicating that the speaker wants to drift into another topic or wants to stop the previous topic.

It seems that when people are involved in conversations, they not only convey information but they want to verify how informative, true, relevant, and perspicuous information is.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used qualitative research as its method of analyzing and collecting the data. This research is designed in descriptive qualitative research because the purpose of this research is to describe the flouting and hedging maxims used by the main characters on "Daddy Day Camp." So, this research described how the maxims were flouted and hedged by the main characters on "Daddy Day Camp."

The subjects of this research were utterances, which contain flouting and hedging maxims used by the main characters on "Daddy Day Camp." The data sources of this research were the transcripts of the utterances on "Daddy Day Camp" that were supposed to be flouting and hedging maxims. To get the original and valid data, the following steps were used: firstly, watching the movie "Daddy Day Camp." Secondly, observing every word or sentence which were flouted and hedged by the main characters. Thirdly, recording all the utterances produced by the main characters. The result of the recording would be transcribed into written form. Finally, arranged the data which were appropriate to the problem of the study.

FINDINGS

There are some data obtained from the utterances of the main characters on "Daddy Day Camp" when they are delivering their opinions to other characters in the conversation. Those utterances can be classified into flouting and hedging maxims. Those are as follows:

Datum 1: The following flouts the first maxim of Quantity.

Charlie: "Ohh-Phil...Phil".

Phil: "Rare. Good. See".

Context:

When Charlie states the utterance: "Phil...Phil", he unconsciously flouts the first maxim of Quantity because he does not make his contribution in conversation as informative as required. He calls Phil's name only twice to give him a clue not to eat the hamburger. By producing less information, Phil as the listener, cannot catch or understand what Charlie is talking about. He still eats the hamburger even though he himself feels something awkward in the taste of the hamburger. If only Charlie added his information as required by saying, "Phil does not eat the hamburger. There is a bluebottle in it", Phil would understand it and, of course, would not continue eating the hamburger.

Datum 2: The following flouts the second maxim of Quantity

Phil: "It was the end of the Summer Olympiad between us and our rival camp. The final event, The relay race. Coming down the stretch, I was flying like the wind".

Charlie: "You were sweating sheets of rain. You could barely move in a straight line".

Context:

When Charlie states the utterance, " You were sweating sheets of rain," he uses an exaggerated statement, which makes the information too or more informative than required, or it indicates an overstatement. Charlie wants to tell others that Phil's body was wet with sweat when he was running in the relay race at Olympiad, and his sweat was like heavy rain. Therefore, in this utterance, Charlie overtly flouts the second maxim of Quantity; he makes his contribution to conversation more informative than what is required.

Data 3: The following flouts the first maxim of quality

Kim: "Just because you had a bad experience as a kid at camp doesn't mean our son will have one too".

Charlie: "What are you talking about, my bad experience?"

Context:

When Charlie states the utterance, " What are you talking about, my bad experience?" he uses a rhetorical question. Actually, Charlie does not need the

answer from his wife because he knows what his wife means. The question uttered by Charlie signifies a sincere question. It means that Charlie asks a question with no intention of obtaining an answer, and it tends to break a sincere condition on the question, namely that Charlie wants his wife to provide him with the indicated information. In addition, this utterance only gains an effect and does not affect any answer. As a result, Charlie breaks the sincerity condition. Therefore, he flouts the truth maxim called the maxim of quality; he flouts the first maxim of quality; he does not try to make his contribution one that is true. Absolutely, Charlie knows what his wife is talking about, but he still asks his wife using a rhetorical question. He pretends not to understand what his wife is talking about.

Datum 4: The following hedges the maxim of relevance and flouts the first maxim of quality

Phil: "At least, it used to be."

Ben: "Cool."

Max: "Awesome"

Charlie: "It's a lake. I don't remember a lake. Well, this isn't anything. Wait till you see where you are going. Camp Driftwood".

Context:

When Charlie delivers his opinion about camp Canola, he states: "It's a lake. I don't remember a lake. Well, this isn't anything. Wait till you see where you are going. Camp Driftwood". In this situation of saying the word "well, this isn't anything," Charlie hedges the maxim of relevance. He consciously makes his contribution irrelevant to the topic, which is being talked about by his son, Max and Phil. While the others are still looking at camp Canola and are surprised by its scenery, Charlie tries to move to another topic. He does not want to talk more about camp Canola. He begins to talk about his favorite camp, "Driftwood," in order to move his son's attention from the camp Canola.

In addition, Charlie also flouts the maxim of quality by saying, "This isn't anything." The utterance " This isn't anything" contradicted the meaning with the real meaning. Charlie absolutely does not try to make his contribution one that is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality. He says what he believes to be false, and he lies about the real condition of camp Canola. In fact, camp Canola is a good place for camping; there are a lake, beautiful scenery, and games for children.

Datum 5: The following flouts the first maxim of quality and the second maxim of Quantity

Lance : "Are you folks lost?"

Charlie: "No, we're here to check out the camp."

Lance : "You want to bring your kids here? That's beautiful. Yeah. Hey, good luck with that".

Context:

When Lance states: "Yeah. Hey, good luck with that", he overtly flouts the second maxim of Quantity. He makes his contribution more informative than what is required. In fact, only by saying, "That's beautiful," Charlie knows what Lance means even though he does not mention it explicitly. It is enough for Lance to say: "That's beautiful," without adding utterance: "Hey, good luck with that," because Charlie knows the true condition of camp Canola; it is too untidy. Charlie also knows Lance's utterance: "That's beautiful," only to mock him.

Datum 6: The following flouts the second maxim of Quantity and the first maxim of quality

Morty: "Well, soon I'm going to have no choice but to sell it to Canola. It's a pity. Because all he wants to do is bulldoze over it. Can you believe it? That the kid has been a pain in my hence since he won the '77 Olympiad. I just hate to give that jerk Lance Warner the satisfaction."

Charlie: "Warner? Lance Warner? He wants to buy this camp and tear it down? Our camp?"

Context:

When Charlie states the utterance: "Warner? Lance Warner? He wants to buy this camp and tear it down? Our camp?" he uses an exaggerated question to show his disbelief at what Morty says. In this case, Charlie's utterance is categorized as an overstatement; it says more than necessary. Actually, the utterance seems informative when he just says, "Warner?" but he says it to make the question clear. Therefore, the information is too informative than what is required. As a result, Charlie overtly flouts the second maxim of Quantity; he makes his contribution more informative than required.

Besides, Charlie's utterances are indicated as a tautology. By saying: "Lance? Lance Warner? There is a repetition of the word in different ways without making one's meaning clearer or more forceful. Actually, it is enough just saying: "Warner?" because uncle Morty as the hearer, understands what Charlie is asking about.

Moreover, when Charlie states, "Warner? Lance Warner? He wants to buy this camp and tear it down? Our camp?" he consciously uses a rhetorical question. Before Charlie utters his rhetorical question, uncle Morty tells Charlie that someone he hates very much and who wants to take his camp Driftwood is Lance Warner, but Charlie still asks about that. In fact, Charlie knows that someone who wants to tear down the camp Driftwood is Lance Warner. He uses a rhetorical question only to make sure whether or not uncle Morty is telling the truth. Therefore, Charlie flouts the maxim of quality; he does not try to make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false.

Datum 7: The following flouts the first maxim of quality and the second maxim of Quantity

Bobby : "That's him. He's the Chief. And you poop in your shorts'.

Charlie : "Nice son, you got there, Lance."

Lance: "He isn't my kid. I hate kids".

Context:

When Charlie delivers his opinion, he states: "Nice son, you got there, Lance." He uses an ironic utterance. Charlie does not tell directly what he actually wants to convey to his rival about his son's attitude. In fact, the real meaning of the utterance is that the son has a bad attitude, but Charlie uses an ironic to implicate it. Therefore, Charlie flouts the maxim of quality; he does not make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he tells the opposite meaning of the word "nice"; he does not tell the true meaning of the word "nice."

In addition, Lance also flouts the maxim of quality by saying: "He isn't my kid. I hate kids"; Lance does not try to make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. He tries to save his honor by lying to Charlie. He does want to admit that Bobby is his son.

On other occasions, Lance also flouts the maxim of Quantity by saying, "I hate kids." He uses an exaggerated statement, which makes the information too or more informative than what is required, or it is categorized as an overstatement. As a result, Lance overtly flouts the second maxim of Quantity; he makes his contribution more informative than what is required. Actually, it is enough for Lance just say: "He is not my son." By saying that utterance, Charlie can understand and know what Lance means.

Datum 8: The following flouts the first maxim of quality and the second maxim of Quantity

Buck : "Here's your diaper. Clean yourself off. Move out".

Lance : "Do not go. Get back here. You are cowards. No one messes with Lance Warner, you hear me? No one.

Context:

When Lance states: "Do not go. Get back here. You are cowards. No one messes with Lance Warner, you hear me? No one", he uses a rhetorical question to show his anger because his cloth looks so messy. Actually, Lance does not need the answer because he knows the answer. His offering the question with no intention of obtaining an answer is to break a sincere condition on the question. He only wants to provide his hearer with the indicated information. Therefore, as a result, Lance flouts the maxim of quality; he does not try to make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. He knows that Buck and his team hear what he just says, but he still asks the question of whether or not Buck and the children hear what he says.

In addition, Lance also flouts the maxim of Quantity by saying: "Get back here. You are cowards. No one messes with Lance Warner, you hear me? No one. He uses an exaggerated statement, which makes the information too or more informative than what is required, or it is categorized as an overstatement. As a result, Lance overtly flouts the second maxim of Quantity; he makes his contribution more informative than what is required. Actually, it is enough for Lance just say: "Do not go" by saying it, Buck and the children understand and know what he means.

Datum 9: The following flouts the first maxim of quality and the second maxim of Quantity

Lance: "What kind of insane militant nut factory are you running here, huh?". "Huh, Charlie Hinton? Driftwood Class of '77". "That's right, I know who you are".

Charlie: "Listen, Lance. I'm really sorry about this. In fact, my father and I were just about to have a discussion about it".

Context:

When the Lance states: "What kind of insane militant nut factory you running here, huh?" "Huh, Charlie Hinton? Driftwood Class of '77?" he uses a rhetorical question to show his upset and anger toward Charlie's team. Charlie does not need the answer to his question because he knows the answer. He just wants to strengthen his question and wants Charlie to provide him with indicated information.

In addition, Lance's questions are only producing an effect and not expecting any answer. Therefore, in this case, Lance flouts the maxims of quality. He does not try to make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. Lance's questions leave their answers hanging in the air.

In addition, Lance also flouts the maxim of Quantity by adding more information than that is required. It seems when Lance states: "Huh, Charlie Hinton? Driftwood Class of '77"? That's right. I know who you are" actually, it is enough for him to say: "Charlie Hinton?" without adding some words, " Drift-wood Class of '77". That's right, I know who you are". Moreover, he knows absolutely who Charlie is before he comes to the Driftwood camp. He tries to find out who Charlie is, and finally, he finds Charlie's junior photo in his office. He knows that Charlie was his rival in the Olympiad when he was a child some years ago. Because Lance knows who Charlie is, he still asks a question about whether or not the man standing in front of him is Charlie, and he adds more statements to make sure his question. Lance obviously flouts the second maxim of Quantity; he makes his contribution more informative than what is required.

Datum 10: The following flouts the first maxim of quality

Charlie: "Listen, Lance. I'm really sorry about this. In fact, my father and I were just about to have a discussion about it".

Lance : "This is your father? Oh, this is classic. Oh, sure. The chicken's come home to roost, huh? Now I know why you don't want to compete in the Olympiad. You're afraid of getting your butt kicked again in front of Lieutenant Prune Juice.

Buck : "Colonel."

Lance : "Oh, Colonel. Sorry".

Context:

This utterance is stated by Lance when Charlie tells Lance that colonel Buck is his own father. Lance cannot believe what Charlie is talking about. When Lance states: "This is your father? Oh, this is classic", he uses a rhetorical question; it is a question produced only to gain an effect or to make a statement rather than to get an answer. Actually, Lance knows the answer; he does not need the answer absolutely, and he just wants Charlie provides him indicated information. Therefore, Lance flouts the maxim of quality; he does not make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false.

Moreover, when Lance states: "Oh, sure. The chicken's come home to roost, huh?" Lance's utterances indicate a metaphor. Giving only explicit meaning, he does not convey the literal meaning of his utterances. He tries to mock Charlie by giving symbolic utterances. The real meaning of his metaphor utterance is that Charlie is a weak man. Lance argues that Charlie asks his father's help to help him to do everything, including attacking him by throwing many vegetables and creams at his cloth. As a result, Lance flouts the maxim of quality; he does not make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. He does not use the true meaning in his interaction with Charlie.

In addition, when Lance states: "Lieutenant Prune Juice," he again flouts the maxim of quality. He does not make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first and the second maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false, and he says that for which he lacks adequate evidence. In the conversation above, Lance calls Colonel Buck's name with "Lieutenant Prune Juice," but in fact, Buck is not Lieutenant but Colonel. He lacks evidence about Colonel Buck's rank.

Datum 11: The following hedges the first and second maxim of quality and flouts the second maxim of Quantity

Charlie: "Yes, right. Jack, I think that banana is about as cooked as it's going to get there".

Jack : "It's so slimy."

Charlie: No, it's roasting. It's supposed to bring out the flavor. Try it. You'll like it, I promise. Good, right?

Context:

This utterance is stated by Charlie when he sees a banana roast by Jack almost cooked. He tells Jack to get and eat it. When Charlie states: "Jack, I think that banana is about as cooked as it 's going to get there," by saying: "I think that, "he overtly hedges the maxim of quality; he does not make his contribution one is true. He hedges the first and the second maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false, and he says that for which he lacks adequate evidence. He tells unsure information, or he does not tell the fact about the roasted banana. In fact, he does not know whether or not the banana is almost cooked. He just tells his opinion about the banana, and he does not have clear evidence.

Moreover, when Charlie states: "No, it's roasting. It's supposed to bring out the flavor. Try it. You'll like it, I promise. Good, right" he uses an exaggerated statement which makes the information too or more informative than that is required, or it is categorized as overstatement. Charlie wants to strengthen his statement in order for Jack to believe and wants to eat the roasted banana. Therefore, Charlie's utterances flout the second maxim of Quantity. He makes his contribution more informative than what is required. Actually, it is enough to say: "it's roasting," without adding some other statements. By saying: "It's roasting," Jack can understand what Charlie is talking about.

Datum 12: The following flouts the first maxim of quality.

Charlie: "Calling Buck, man, what was I thinking?"

Phil : "It's the only way he knows, Charlie".

Context:

When Charlie states: "Calling Buck man, what was I thinking?" he uses a rhetorical question. By saying: "what was I thinking?" Charlie flouts the maxim of quality. He does not make his contribution one is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. Charlie's question does not need any answer; he asks only to show his disappointment toward his father. After hearing his father's idea on how to be a strong man, his son does the same thing, which can endanger him in the middle of the jungle. Giving a question without obtaining any answer is breaking a sincere condition on the question. In this situation, Charlie lets his question hang in the air without any answer.

Datum 13: The following flouts the first maxim of Quantity

Charlie: "Oh, my neck, I'm such a cold feel like a human pincushion."

Phil: "Relax, Charlie. Look around".

Context:

This utterance is stated by Charlie when he wakes up in the morning and feels his neck so sick after his leg slipped and fell in the woods last night. When Charlie states: "Feel like a human pincushion," he uses an exaggerated statement which makes the information too or more informative than what is required, or it is

categorized as an overstatement. He says something more than is necessary. He wants to describe how sick he fell on his neck by stating more information. He says that his neck was liked injected by a needle, and the sickness was like a human pincushion. Charlie's utterance really seems too excessive since it is impossible that having slipped his leg and fallen his neck on wood, one will feel like a human pincushion. Usually, the human pincushion is only found in a medicine man's house when he or she uses his power to make one sick. Therefore, Charlie's utterance flouts the first maxim of Quantity; he makes his contribution more informative than what is required. Actually, it is enough to say: "my neck was sick," without adding any informative statement. Phil will understand when Charlie just says there is something wrong with his neck.

Datum 14: The following flouts the second maxim of quality

Charlie: "Oh, Buck's going to go on and on about how he was right, and I'm way too overprotective".

Phil: " Buck's not going to go on and on about anything. I haven't seen him all morning".

Context:

When Charlie states: "Oh, Buck's going to go on and on about how he was right, and I'm way too overprotective," he flouts the maxim of quality because he does not make his contribution one is true. He flouts the second maxim of quality; he says that for which he has inadequate evidence. Charlie tells Phil when Buck sees children playing. Happily, he will say that he is right and Charlie is too overprotective toward children. When Charlie says the utterance above, he assumes that Buck is still in the camp together with other children, but in fact, he left the camp last night. Buck leaves the camp because he thinks he has made a mistake about what happened to Ben, and then he decides to go back to his office. Charlie's assumption that Buck's existence is still in the camp is wrong. Therefore, Charlie flouts the second maxim of quality.

Datum 15: The following hedges the second maxim of quality and flouts the first maxim of quality

Lance: "Well, as you can tell, we've obviously destroyed their camp over the last couple of years. I'm thinking, once we kick Driftwood's butt one more time, this is where the new hardware goes. What do you say? It's going to be great".

Context:

When Lance states: "I'm thinking, once we kick Driftwood's butt one more time, this is where the new hardware goes," he overtly hedges the maxim of quality by adding qualifying openers: "I am thinking." He does not try to make his contribution one that is true. Therefore, he hedges the second maxim of quality; he says that for which he has inadequate evidence. Actually, Lance is not completely

sure that he has proper evidence for the statement he makes. Lance confidently tells others that he will win the competition this time before the competition itself starts. He does not have sufficient evidence that he will win the competition.

In addition, Lance also flouts the first maxim of quality by stating: "What do you say?" He uses a rhetorical question in which he does not need an answer from others actually. He flouts the first maxim of quality because he says what he believes to be false. When one asks a question to another, of course, he needs the answer, but in this case, Lance asks the question with no intention of obtaining an answer. Therefore Lance's question is a break of a sincere condition on a question.

Datum 16: The following flouts the first maxim of quality and the maxim of relevance

Lance : "Hey, Chuck E. Cheese! Getting a little nervous? Let me give you the on the day's events".

Charlie : "Okay."

Lance : "The Olympiad starts. Your team sucks. You lose. The end".

Charlie : "Good luck, Lance."

Lance: "I don't need luck."

Context:

When Lance states: "Hey, Chuck E. Cheese," he overtly flouts the maxim of quality. He does not make his contribution one that is true. Lance flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. In fact, he knows who Charlie's name is, but he still calls Charlie by the name Chuck E. Cheese.

On the other occasions, When Charlie shows his response toward Lance's mocking him, he states: "Good luck Lance." Charlie's response flouts the maxim of relevance because his response is not what Lance expected, absolutely, even though Lance mocks him by giving insulting statements that his team sucks and will be lost in the competition. Actually, Lance hopes Charlie will answer his question angrily, but in fact, Charlie still keeps his patience and smiles at him. He ignores Lance's mocking.

Datum 17: The following flouts the first maxim of quality

Jack: "We can't do this without Buck."

Ben: "Yeah."

Charlie: "Sure we can. You know what? He would've wanted it that way. You know why? Because we're a family. We'll pull each other up because that's what families do".

Context:

When Charlie states: "You know what? and You know why?" he uses a rhetorical question. He asks the questions with no intention of obtaining an answer. He breaks a sincere condition on questions. Therefore, Charlie flouts the maxim of quality because he does not try to make his contribution one that is true. He flouts

the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. He asks questions. Actually, he does not expect an answer from the children because he knows the answers to his questions. Charlie lets his questions leave their answers hanging in the air.

Datum 18 : The following hedges the maxim of relevance

Lance : "That looks familiar, Charlie? You lose this. It's *deja vu* all over again".
Charlie "Yeah, well, I got my best athlete here, waiting to change history."

Context:

When Charlie states: "well, I got my best athlete here, waiting to change history," he overtly hedges the maxim of relevance. He delivers his statement irrelevance with the subject that is being talked about at the time. Lance tells Charlie about the competition that he lost at the time, but Charlie moves his topic interaction to another topic. Charlie does not want to remember his loss when he was a child in front of the children. Therefore, by saying the word: "well," Charlie hedges the maxim of relevance; he makes his contribution to the conversation irrelevant to the topic being talked about.

Datum 19: The following flouts the first and the second maxim of quality Lance

: "I told you, you're a loser, just like your old man".

Becca : "You're not a loser, Ben. He greased the wall. He's cheating".

Lance : "No, don't listen to her. She's a compulsive liar. And she steals".

Context:

When Lance states: "No, don't listen to her. She's a compulsive liar, and she steals." he overtly flouts the maxim of quality because he does not try to make his contribution one that is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. Lance tells the lie that he does not grease the wall, but in fact, he does it. He does not give true information to others.

Moreover, Lance also flouts the second maxim of quality; he says that for which he lacks adequate evidence. He accuses Becca as a liar, and she has stolen the oil that he has in the camp. Lance does not have any significant evidence to accuse Becca as a liar. He just tells a lie in order for people who join and watch the competition to believe what is said.

Datum 20: The following flouts the first maxim of quality

Ben: "I did it, Daddy."

Charlie : "I know it, buddy."

Ben : "I love you, Dad."

Charlie : "I love you too, son. I love you too. You are a crazy kid".

Context:

When Charlie states: "you are a crazy kid," he uses an ironic statement. He tells the opposite meaning of what he actually means. He does not tell the real

meaning of his utterance. He uses an ironic statement to show his disbelief at what his son has done. His son wins the relay race, and finally, he defeats the camp canola, which Charlie hates its owner very much. By saying: "you are a crazy kid," Charlie consciously flouts the maxim of quality because he does not try to make his contribution one that is true. He flouts the first maxim of quality; he says what he believes to be false. He does not tell the truth of what he means actually. He says that his son is a crazy kid, but in fact, his son is a good and strong kid; he wins the relay race even though his body is small.

DISCUSSION

This research found that the maxims flout when they are delivering and maintaining their opinions, such as by producing the utterance in the form of rhetorical strategies, namely, tautology, metaphor, overstatement, rhetorical question, and irony. When the utterance produced by using tautology, the maxim of Quantity those "make your contribution as informative as is required" and "do not make your contribution more informative than is required," are breaking because, in tautology, the utterances produced are more informative than what is required.

Besides, the maxim of quality can also be flouted when the speaker produces the utterance in the form of a metaphor. In this case, the speaker uses the word, not in the real condition but uses symbolic or what is literally said is different from what is implied.

Moreover, the maxim of quality, that is, "do not say what you believe to be false," is also flouted when the speaker produces the utterance in the form of a rhetorical question. In this case, the speaker signifies that it is not a sincere question. It means that the speaker asks a question without any intention of obtaining an answer, and it tends to break a sincere condition on the question, namely that the speaker wants the hearer to provide him with the indicated information.

In addition, this research also found that the maxim hedge when the utterance produced is not totally accurate, but it seems informative, well-founded, and relevant. In this case, the maxim of the Quantity is "make your contribution as informative as is required," hedged when the speaker produces his opinion being conveyed is less informative.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this research can be formulated as follows: The maxims are flouted when the main characters on "Daddy Day Camp" produce the utterances in the form of rhetorical strategies, namely, tautology, metaphor, understatement, overstatement, rhetorical question, and irony.

Furthermore, the maxims are hedged when the utterances produced by the main characters are not totally accurate, but they seem informative, well-founded, and relevant. The maxim of Quantity is hedged when the main characters deliver their statement in a less or more informative than what is required. Besides, the maxims of quality are hedged when the main characters do not make their contribution one that is true, and they usually add their statement by saying an opening word such as "I think that." Moreover, the maxim of relevance is hedged when the main characters produce utterances that are irrelevant to the topic which is being talked about at the time and add the utterances produced by using an opening word such as "well."

From the findings, I find that when the main characters deliver their opinion and statement, they often break the maxims of the Cooperative Principle; they do not follow the rules of the Cooperative Principle. Therefore, they often flout and hedge the four maxims of the Cooperative Principle. However, even though it is very difficult to obey and use all of the maxims in communication, Grice's maxims theory is really needed in order the communication can run well and effectively.

REFERENCES

- Brown, G. and George, Y. (1989). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Finegan, E. (2004). *Language its structure and Use Fourth Edition*. Massachusetts: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Goody, E. (1996). *Questions and Politeness*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975) 'Logic and conversation.' In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds) *Studies in Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 183-98.
- Grundy, P. 2000. *Doing pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Hornby, A. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University.