CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology of the present study, which has been developed based on the research problems that have been formulated in Chapter I, i.e. the realization of maxims by main character's utterances and to find the perlocutionary effects of the utterances on the interlocutors produced by the main character in the conversations. Accordingly, this chapter presents the research design, procedures of data collection, and procedures of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

The present study employs the qualitative method. In accordance with Cresswell (2013), this study is qualitative because the data are in the form of words or text and the result of the analysis will be in the form of description. The data of the present study are in the form of conversations from *Sherlock* TV series and the aim of the study was not focused on finding the total of utterances which are classified as observance and non-observance but rather to obtain the quality of utterances. In other words, the analysis would be presented in the form of description. It is also stated that in qualitative research, the interpretation of data is the core (Flick, 2009).

3.2 Data Collection

The data are conversations taken from BBC's TV series entitled *Sherlock*. Only one episode is selected from the series, i.e. episode 1 entitled *A study in Pink*. This episode was aired on 25th July 2010 on BBC. This episode was selected because it was easier to be analyzed, since it was the first episode airing for the series when the story begins.

The conversations were obtained from subscene.com from the uploader 'SceneinHD'. The particular uploader was chosen by the suitability of the video to the subtitle. The reason for choosing the conversation from the subtitle site instead of transcribing directly from the video, is due to the time efficiency. However, the subtitle or the transcript has been through some verification to avoid language errors and incomplete utterances. Furthermore, the analysis focuses on the utterances produced by the main character in the movie, which in this case is Sherlock Holmes. The analysis of the conversation was conducted to examine how Sherlock Holmes realized the cooperative principles, and the utterances produced by other characters. It also aims to examine the perlocutionary effects in Sherlock Holmes' utterances. Therefore, scenes and conversations which did not include Sherlock Holmes were not taken into account.

3.3 Data Analysis

3.3.1 The procedure

Specifically, the data were analyzed through several steps. Firstly, Sherlock Holmes' utterances were classified into observance or non-observance of the maxims. Secondly, they were categorized into Thomas' (1995) five classifications of failures to observe maxims such as violating, floating, infringing, opting out or suspending maxim of quantity, quality, relation, or manner. Thirdly, perlocutionary effects on interlocutors produced by Sherlock Holmes' utterances both observed and unobserved were analyzed. Then, it was followed by discussing and interpreting the classified data for drawing the conclusion from the analysis.

3.3.2 Sample of Data Analysis in *Sherlock* TV Series' conversations

A. Observing the maxims

Observing the maxims occur when the speakers observe all the maxims (Thomas, 1995). It means the speakers must follow the maxims of quantity by which they must be informative as is required, maxim of quality that they have to be true,

maxim of relation that they have to be relevant, and maxim of manner when the speakers must be brief with what they are saying.

From the conversations, it was found the excerpts that the character Sherlock Holmes observed the maxims. For the further examples, the name of the characters are shortened by their initials (full information of characters' abbreviation are presented in chapter IV).

Dialogue 3, line 5-7

SH: Mrs. Hudson, the landlady, she's given me a special deal. Owes me a favor. A few years back, her husband got himself sentenced to death in Florida. I was able to help out.

JW: Sorry, you stopped her husband being executed?

SH: <u>Oh, no, I ensured it.</u>

In line 5 when SH described his relation with Mrs. Hudson, he made statement 'I was able to help out' which made JW wanted to make sure and assumed that SH had spared Mrs. Hudson's husband. However, SH's statement was opposite to what he assumed. In this case, even though the response is different with the expectation, as long as the response has fulfilled the four maxims, it is categorized as observing the maxims.

From the example above, in line 7, SH gave amount of information and brief utterance. He also made a relevant statement from what was asked, and especially he stated the reality and did not tell the untruth. By saying "Oh, no, I ensured it", SH had stated something relevant and brief with the initial question. He also said something which was true without giving more or less of the information.

23

B. Non-observance of maxims

1. Flouting maxim

1.2 Flouting maxim of quantity

> **Dialogue 1, line 10& 11**
>
> MC: I was wondering if you'd like to have coffee
>
> SH: Black, two sugars, please. I'll be upstairs.

At a glance, this type of conversation is easy to find in daily conversation. People might consider that nothing is wrong with the response. However, if the utterance is analyzed by four conversational maxims, it was categorized as flouting maxims of quantity. Basically, MC asked SH whether he would like to have coffee, the information was expected that the response would be yes or no. But SH gave more information than is required that he added information by the time MC came with the coffee he would be in the next floors.

1.3 Flouting maxim of quality

> **Dialogue 3, line 46**
>
> SH: Brilliant! Yes! Four serial suicides and now a note. Oh it's Christmas Mrs. Hudson, I'll be late. Might need some food.

Leech (1983) stated that in maxim of quality, the speaker should make his contribution which is true. In the example above, SH stated that he just found four serial suicides and he called it as Christmas. Christmas as common information is a date on December 25th where Christians annually celebrate the birth of Christ. In this case, SH blatantly said an untrue statement when he said Christmas by finding four serial suicides. Grice (1975), as stated in Thomas, found that it is a way to generate a conversational implicature in the form of a figure of speech.

24

1.4 Flouting maxim of relation

Dialogue 6, line 16-20

SH: Her case.

JW: Her case?

SH: Her suitcase, yes, obviously. The murderer took her suitcase, first big mistake.

JW: Ok, he took her case. So?

SH: <u>It's not use, there's not other way. We'll have to risk it. On my desk there's a number. I want you to send a text.</u>

In fulfilling maxim of relation, the speaker should be relevant (Thomas, 1995). In the excerpt above in line 20, SH responded irrelevantly to what JW has asked. Initially, JW asked SH if the villain got the victim's suitcase so what would happened. However, SH did not immediately answer the question yet he talked to himself and seemed brainstorming by murmuring "It's no use, there's no other way. We'll have to risk it." Besides he added and ordered JW to text someone. In the end, SH has not answered JW's question yet about the case. The response above has clearly depicted that SH did not fulfill maxim of relation.

1.5 Flouting maxim of manner

Dialogue 10, line 54-59

JW: He's your brother?

SH: Course he's my brother.

JW: So he's not...

SH: Not what?

JW: I don't know... criminal mastermind?

SH: <u>Close enough.</u>

Maxim of manner deals with some rules such avoid ambiguousness of expression and be orderly (Thomas, 1995). In line 59 in dialogue 10 above, SH made

25

response "Close enough". He made an unclear statement whether he told yes or no. SH blatantly made an ambiguous response and his expression was categorized as flouting maxim of manner.

2. Violating maxim

Dialogue 5, line 49-52

AN: She's German. Rache. It's German for revenge. She could be trying to tell us...

SH: <u>Yes, thank you for your input.</u>

IL: So she's German?

SH: Of course she's not. She's from out of town, though. Intended to stay in London for one night before returning to home to Cardiff- so far, so obvious.

As Thomas (1995) said that people mistakenly considered floating maxim as violating, in fact the two are clearly different. Grice (1975) stated that violation is unostentatious or hidden non-observance of the maxim. As in the excerpt above, when AN explained his assumption about the corpse, SH responded "Yes, thank you for your input," as if he agreed with AN. However, he made a statement which was violating the maxim because he said something which was true but actually it was untruth. It was proved then when IL asked SH to convince him, SH denied it. His thought was different from his earlier statements.

3. Opting out the maxim

Conversation 9, line 88-89

SH: What do you mean...more than a man? An organization... what?

JF: <u>There's a name that no one says. And I'm not going to say it either.</u> Now, enough chatter. Time to choose.

In the excerpt above JF was unwilling to say the name which SH asked because JF concealed the identity of the third party. JF also did not have intention to make a false implicature and the consequence was being uncooperative. Thomas (1995) stated that kind of this type is categorized as opting out of a maxim.

C. Perlocutionary effects on interlocutors

Conversation 2, line 18-22

Sherlock Holmes : How do you feel about the violin?

John Watson : I'm sorry, what?

Sherlock Holmes : I play the violin when I'm thinking and sometimes I don't talk for days on end.
Would that bother you?
Potential flat mates should know the worst about each other.

John Watson : <u>You told him about me?</u>

Mike : Not a word.

From the excerpt above, SH flouted two types of maxims. The first one is in line 18. He suddenly asked JW about something which did not relate to their previous topic, which means it was a flouting of relation. The outcome is JW did not really understand what SH asked about. However, in the next line when SH flouted maxim of quantity by telling JW about his habit playing the violin, he also mentioned flat mate. It seems that JW has realized what SH implied. In the end, perlocutionary effect of SH's utterance was an irritation, since irritating is included as a type of perlocutionary effects presented by Lycan (2008). JW felt irritated because previously he did not understand what SH was talking about, but at the end SH told him that it was about a flat mate. Knowing this, JW felt surprised that he did not expect SH knew him that he was looking for a flat mate. So, he expressed his irritation to MK.