

Law Case Defendant's Communicative Strategy in Court Trial: A Maxim Violation Analysis

Raden Rizki Dwiputri Ramadhiani, Dr. Ruswan Dallyono, S.Sos, M.Pd., Ernie D. A. Imperiani, M.Ed.

English Language and Literature
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
putriramadhiani@student.upi.edu , ruswan.dallyono@upi.edu ,
ernie_imperiani@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

This study on maxims violation analyzes the interviews of the defendant, Miryam Haryani, in a video of a proceeding entitled, "JPU Cekar Kesaksian Miryam Dalam Sidang Kasus E-KTP". The research employs a descriptive qualitative method in which the data of the study were in the form of transcripts of the defendant's answers in answering several questions during the trial. By employing Grice's (1975) theory of Cooperative Principle, the study uses the four principles which are quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The study reveals that of the three maxim rules violated by Miryam, the maxim of relation was committed the most by the defendant. By violating the maxim of relation, it implied that she tried to hold out the truth in her statements. The findings of this study indicate that Miryam used a strategy in covering their statements to achieve a goal.

Keywords: *Cooperative Principle, Gricean Maxims, Maxims Violation, Pragmatics*

INTRODUCTION

People engage in an activity called conversation to connect with others. In a conversation, language is utilized by people as their major tool in order to convey their ideas or feelings directly or indirectly. Therefore, the use of the language in a conversation is said to be a dynamic process, where it accommodates both the speakers' intention and hearers' interpretation (Marmaridou, 2000). Regarding the speakers' intention, they may produce direct or indirect meaning of utterances.

Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975) is believed to be one way to clarify the meaning of direct or indirect utterances by the speakers. In addition, it contains an explanation of how people manage their utterances in exchanging a message. Grice (1975) argues that people's behavior in conversational exchanges could be cooperative and uncooperative. The speakers are said to be cooperative when they follow a certain principle of communication. Meanwhile, the speakers are said to

be uncooperative contributors when they do not adhere to the maxims.

The way they fail to observe the maxims is called the non-observance of the maxims (Thomas, 1995) which divided into five types; flouting, violating, infringing, opting-out, and suspending. From the five non-observances mentioned above, the most potential way that is suitable for telling lies is the non-observance of violation.

As stated in Grice (1975), speakers who violate the maxims are liable to mislead the hearer which means that they are capable to deceive others. By violating the maxims, the hearer may not realize when speakers attempt to tell lies. Therefore, examining the violation of maxim in an investigatory interview context is intriguing and significant.

As well as this study which examines an example of a courtroom setting hearing in the E-KTP issue. The case being studied is Miryam S. Haryani's statements in a courtroom during a time in which she was still a defendant. The main reason why it is investigated is that the local media

dubbed the case as a 'megacorruption' issue.

METHODOLOGY

Departing from theory of Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975), this paper aims to find out the types of violation of maxims that the defendant is used in answering the interviewers' questions and also to find out the implied meaning in Miryam's statement during the trial.

The data consisted of video of question and answer during the trial between the judge and Miryam as a defendant in a courtroom. The video was taken from the video-sharing platform, YouTube, and was published on March 30, 2017. The video is titled "*JPU Cekar Kesaksian Miryam Dalam Sidang Kasus E-KTP*" (Prosecutors rain down Miryam's testimony on E-KTP case with questions), and it was uploaded by the official account of CNN Indonesia. The main reason why this study used the data was because it had the major potential in having maxims violations.

Then, the video was transcribed to help facilitate the analysis. However, the conversations that were transcribed were only the potential lines that consisted of violations which were committed by the defendant. By using descriptive qualitative as its method, the analysis was conducted in several steps. The first step was identifying the potential lines that consisted of any violation committed by the defendant. Then, the second step was categorizing those utterances whether the defendant violated maxim of quantity, quality, relation, or manner by using the theory. The next step was interpreting each excerpt which probable of having the implied meaning.

The process of analyzing the data in the discussion section was carried out sequentially following the highest number of maxim violation committed by the defendant. The sequence started with maxim of relation, followed by maxim of quantity, and the last one is maxim of manner.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In terms of types of four maxim rules, this study reveals that the defendant, Miryam, was found to only violate three out of four maxims. Further explanations for each finding are discussed in the next section.

Types of Maxim Violation Used by the defendant

This part provides the findings of what type of maxims that the defendant violated in answering the questions during investigation.

The Violation of Maxims on Relation

Providing relevant information is one of the rules of the cooperative principle by Grice (1975). Giving full contribution is expected in a conversation that makes the conversation to run smoothly. The rules that Grice has provided for this kind of case is certainly very helpful in a conversation at any context, especially in question and answer session in legal contexts which the defendant's answer is the evidence of

a case. If the answer itself is irrelevant, then the testimony may impact the defendant, the victim, or even the defendant negatively. As seen from the result of this study, Miryam's purpose of violating the manner maxim was to hide or avoid the question given. This case occurs in several excerpts mentioned in the next section.

In this conversation, when the prosecutor asked the question repeatedly to the defendant, the judge was seen taking over because Miryam was seen to be very unclear.

Excerpt 1 (Translated Version)

J : *Apa yang Bu Elsa tunjukkan untuk dibaca?* (Then, what did Mrs. Elsa showed to be read?)

M : *Bu Elsa menanyakan ini ada komentar dari Bu Diah.* (Mrs. Elsa asked that there was a comment by Mrs. Diah.)

If seen by the statement given by the judge by asking on what did Mrs. Elsa showed to the defendant at that time, Miryam answered it with "she asked..." in which it shows a

violation of maxim of relation. The reason she violated the maxim was because the judge was specifically asked about what news that has to be read. However, Miryam answered with an irrelevant statement by saying Mrs. Elsa was asking about something. It can be assumed that the judge expected an explanation in the answer such as “there is a news about...”. A similar case was investigated by Yuvike and Winiharti (2009) where the speaker did the violation because they tried to deny an accusation by giving an unrelated answer. Therefore, because of the irrelevancy of the answer, then Miryam's statement can be stated as violating the maxim of relation.

In another context, Miryam can also be seen to be violating the maxim of relation when she was asked by the judge about what was the stated news about her at that time. The discussion can be seen in the next section.

Excerpt 2 (Translated Version)

J : (Interrupting)
Iya, bagaimana

ceritanya? (I see. How was the news?)

M : **Kan saya cuma baca Kompas sekilas, yang mulia...** (I just took a glance on the news, your Honor...)

J : (interrupting)
Iya... (I see)

M : **Habis itu yasudah.. nanti.. eh.. saya ke kamu seperti adek, saya akan bantu lah untuk dalam masalah hukumnya kamu, sabar aja.** (And then just that... later... eh... I have considered you as sister. I will help you to get through this problem. All you need is to be patient.)

On the exchanges above, it can be seen that the defendant violated several times in answering the question with irrelevant statements. It is proven when the first sentence uttered by the judge that said “...how was the news?”. The question indicated that he has a clear purpose to ask about the story on the news. However, the defendant answered it with “*I just took a glance on the news...*” and continued with

“later... eh... I have considered you as sister. I will help you to get through this problem. All you need is to be patient.” In which it indicated discontinuity. The defendant explained her answer with statements that are not in line with the question which caused the answer to be irrelevant.

The answer by the defendant in the excerpt can be stated as violating the maxim because there are answers that are not expected. As seen in excerpt 2, when the judge repeatedly interrupting the defendant while giving a statement, it can be concluded that the judge was aware that the statements given by the defendant did not answer his or the prosecutor’s questions. A similar result was found in a study by Ceballos and Sosas (2018) which the reason why the defendants violate the maxim of relation is because they tried to retell their version of story rather than providing a concrete answer which resulted in a violation. In conclusion, the findings on violations of maxims shows that the defendant tended to obscure her

answers in order to confuse the interlocutors.

The second highest of maxim that violated by the defendant was maxim of quantity. Further discussion of how Miryam was violating the maxim is presented in the next section.

The Violation of Maxims on Quantity

The amount of information given by a speaker is crucial in maxim of quantity as Grice (1975) stated that just the right amount of information is needed for the hearer to understand. Moreover, Grice (1975) also stated that providing too much information during a conversation could be assumed by the hearers as an overwhelm information, and they may deem it ineffective. However, if the speaker provides less information than needed, the hearer also could not get the complete meaning of the conversation and probably do not understand what the speaker has said hence considering the speaker to be uncooperative. In this study, the

defendant's purpose was to avoid the question given to her.

The excerpt below shows the violation of maxim of quantity by Miryam. In the excerpt, the assigned judge of that time was questioning Miryam, regarding her comments on the issue. Further explanation can be seen in the following discussion.

Excerpt 3 (Translated Version)

J : *Bagaimana komentarnya di situ?*
(How was the comment on that?)

M : *Saya karna gak baca jelas.. **gak baca sungguh-sungguh, sayanya ini pak yang mulia, karena saya gak baca sungguh-sungguh jadi oh yaudah. Abis itu "oh gitu ya bu ya". Udah hanya begitu aja.*** (Because I did not read it clearly, your Honor, because I did not really read it, so I was like oh... alright. After that, "oh... I see." Then, just that.)

In response to the judge's question, the defendant replied with unrequired information by saying "...so I was like oh... alright. After

that, "oh... I see. Then, just like that,". The answers given did not seem to answer and even tended to ramble. It can also be seen when Miryam uttered phrases such as "...after that, "oh... I see." Then, just that," can be concluded that the vagueness of the answers given indicates that Miryam seemed to cover up something. This finding can be linked to a study conducted by Yuvike and Winiharti (2009) that the results show a similarity in which the defendants provided long and unnecessary answers as an intention to hide or cover up something, so no one knows what the participant did.

In the excerpt below Miryam also showed a violation of maxim of quantity by providing less information. In this context, the judge was asking the defendant what news related to her. There are also several conversations that support this exchange before get into the statement submitted by the judge below. The judge still asked to the defendant about the news. However, with her strategy, Miryam answered it with a convoluted and ambiguous

answer. Therefore, the violation of quantity occurred in the example below.

Excerpt 4 (Translated Version)

J : (Interrupting)
Kan semakin lebih menarik lagi. Jalan keluarnya yaitu ibu terangkan secara benar. Ibu merasa perlu diminta sabar, bahkan ada embel-embel lagi “nanti saya bantu”, memangnya apa berita di Koran itu yang menyangkut berita ibu? (It is even more interesting. The only way to solve this problem is to explain the story truthfully. You feel the need to be patient. Moreover, there was a statement about “I will help you”. The truth is, what kind of news was linked to your name?)

M : *Katanya ada nama saya di berita itu terkait...* (She said that there was my name mentioned on that news...)

In excerpt 4, there was an indication of violation of the quantity maxim because of the answer that the defendant gave to the judge contained less information than it was required. It can be seen when the judge asked “...*what kind of news was linked to your name?*”, and she answered by giving only a short

statement which did not answer the question. It made her seem deliberately giving incomplete answers, while the judge expected an answer with more explanation. This statement showed the lack of information provided because the defendant responded with the same statement as the judge had said. The judge knew that Miryam was linked to the news, yet Miryam still answered it with uncertainty instead of answering the question with some explanation about what the news was about. The same case also happened from the previous study conducted by Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011). The study found that the maxim of quantity happens because of giving a short statement to the hearer. Therefore, it can be concluded that Miryam was violating the maxim of quantity.

The last maxim violation committed by Miryam is the maxim of manner. The detail explanation of how Miryam committed the maxim is shown as follow.

The Violation of Maxims on Manner

According to Grice (1975), maxim of manner requires the speaker to avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, and also omit unnecessary statement. In short, the speaker must convey their words or statements clearly and concisely. As stated also by Paltridge (2006), when a speaker is concerned about the understanding of the hearer by saying "it might be confusing," or "maybe this takes a long time," that means they are aware to the maxim of manner. If the speaker does the opposite of being clear and concise, that is by giving an unclear statement or a statement that is too long, it can be said that the speaker is uncooperative. This section discusses the maxim of manner that has been violated by Miryam. Furthermore, Miryam tended to give complicated and rambling answers as can be seen in the following excerpt. Upon further analysis, the defendant's intention was to avoid the given questions.

Excerpt 5 (Translated Version)

- J : *Bagaimana komentarnya di situ?*
(How was the comment on there?)
- M : *Saya karna gak bacajelas.. **gak baca sungguh-sungguh, saya nya ini pak yang mulia, karena saya gak baca sungguh-sungguh jadi oh yaudah. Abis itu "oh gitu ya bu ya". Udah hanya begitu aja.*** (Because I did not read it carefully ... I did not really read it, so I was like oh... alright. After that, "oh... I see." Then, just that.)

On the conversation uttered by the judge and the defendant in excerpt 5, a violation of maxim of manner was detected. It occurred when the judge asked about how was the comment, yet it was answered with an unclear and rambling answer by saying "*Because I did not read it carefully...*". Especially, when the defendant herself gave her statement in an ambiguous and unfinished utterance by saying "*After that, "oh... I see." Then, just that,*" which made the statement difficult to be understood by the hearer. In addition, the statement given by the defendant

seemed to be complicated and not specific. This is in line with Tupan and Natalia's (2008) study which showed that the participant violated the maxim of manner so that the hearer could not give any respond because they speechless by the confusion. Since the doubts that appear on the defendant's words are very visible, it can be assumed and seen that in the conversation above there was a violation of maxim of manner.

The maxim of manner puts emphasis on the importance of having clear responses in order to avoid confusion (Ceballos & Sosas, 2018). However, in this case, Miryam seemed to violate intentionally in several contexts of conversation.

In contrast to the previous discussion, in Excerpt 6 she answered the judge's question with some unfinished statements that made the judge to be confused.

Excerpt 6 (Translated Version)

J : *Ya, dengarkan saya dulu. Kalau ibu diminta sabar, tentu*

karena ada penyebabnya. Apa penyebabnya sampai dia perlu untuk meminta ibu tetap sabar? Sama halnya seperti saya sekarang. Orangnya penuh kesabaran. Tiba-tiba ada orang minta saya untuk sabar. Saya akan Tanya, "kok anda meminta saya sabar kenapa?" Ibu sendiri kenapa harus diminta sabar pada waktu itu? (Listen to me first. If you were asked to be patient, obviously there was a cause. Then what is the cause so you are asked to remain being patient. It has the same situation as me right now. A person who is full of patience then suddenly, someone asked me to be patient. I will ask to them, "why do you ask me to be patient?" So now, why do you have to be patient at that time?)

M : *Ya mungkin pemikiran saya, Bu Elsa mendengar berita-berita yang cukup banyak...(Probably, based on my assumption, Mrs. Elsa heard quite a lot of news...)*

As seen in the excerpt above, the judge stressed his question by stating that there must be a "cause" for someone to ask other "to be patient". It can be assumed that the judge expected the defendant to answer in detail. However, when the defendant answered by saying "...Mrs. Elsa heard quite a lot of news...", it indicated that she was trying to hide information by giving unspecific answer. Thus, the statement given by Miryam had the potential to confuse the judge. Inversely proportional to the findings in the study conducted by Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011) in which the participant abided the maxim of manner because they tried to avoid obscurity.

From the three violations that occurred in Miryam's testimony, they indicate that she intentionally violated the maxim in order to achieve certain purposes either to the judge or the prosecutor. It is possible that one of the aims was to confuse the two, thus she would not be asked for giving more detail about the case. Despite the three violations, it can be

noticed that Miryam did not violated the maxim of quality. However, it cannot be assumed that she was telling the truth during her testimony. Moreover, the study has no power whatsoever to assess the quality of the statements. This study, however, investigated the defendant's testimony as well as the implications lied beneath them. Further discussion is shown in the next section below.

The Implication of Miryam's Statements

In order to answer the second research question, the implicature of the statements has been analyzed and categorized in accordance to the types of violation; the order of the discussion will follow the previous section's order with maxim of relation violation as the first and later followed by quantity and manner. It has to be noted that, however, some implicature may not be as strong as others. Nonetheless, all implicatures will still be discussed.

The Implication of Violating the Maxims of Relation

During the testimony, Miryam is seen to be withholding

information as evident from the judge's constant repetition of questions. In order to hold out the information, Miryam answered the questions in short phrases with little to no relevance to the given questions. Furthermore, the long statements she gave also tended to ramble. On the other hand, after some time, the judge was able to extract information from Miryam. She answered carefully with the judge which kept stressing the questions.

Excerpt 7 (Translated version)

P: *Ya komentarnya Bu Diah apa?*

(What was the comment that Mrs. Diah has stated?)

M: *Dia bilang itu ada komentar Bu Diah katanya. Saya **gak terlalu baca banget**.*

(She said that there was a comment from Mrs. Diah. I did not really take a clear look on it.)

As can be seen in excerpt 7, Miryam immediately withheld the information away from the prosecutor by claiming she did not

read the article carefully; the article mentioned is the piece of a newspaper shown to her by Mrs. Elsa. However, without even trying to remember the said statement by a certain character named Mrs. Diah, she claimed to have not read aforementioned article carefully. Thus, Miryam set out to hold her stance to not answer the questions directly. As said in the previous chapters, the type of hedging used by people to create a disclaimer regarding their uncertainty regarding the statements would appear with the example being, "I'm not so sure."

Compared to the findings of Tajabadi, et al (2014), Miryam did not use clarification nor adding points during her time in the courtroom. She, on the other hand, did the other way around. In contrast to avoid ambiguity, she delivered the same information over some course of time to hold out information as well as delaying the process of testimony. Ambiguity is also an integral part of the testimony as her replies were very convoluted. Thus, it obstructed the judge to comprehend the answer she gives.

In addition, in the beginning, the prosecutor's question is overlaid with the reporter's voice. However, after some explanation from Miryam, the said prosecutor gave another question with a rising tone indicating that they were the same, and the second was used as an emphasis to the previous question. With that being said, Miryam's previous answer combined with her statement in excerpt 7, it is clear that Miryam deliberately confused the prosecutor in order to cover the comment from a character named Elsa. Instead of answering with sentence such as "I forgot what Mrs. Elsa said," she instead gave another answer in a convoluted way by claiming to not have read it carefully.

In the next portion of the proceeding, Miryam was seen to be clarifying her previous statement as the judge took over the prosecutor's position in asking questions. As seen in excerpt 8 below, Miryam used direct quotes. However, the usage of the direct quote did not help the judge to better understand her testimony. In addition, the following answer given by Miryam was the

same as the previous statement. Hence, we can clearly see that Miryam repeated the same information. Yet, the relevance between the answer to the question did not connect meaning that she repeated what she did; she held the information regarding Mrs. Diah's comments in the news.

Excerpt 8.

J : *Maaf saya ambil alih. Ibu kan diminta membaca Kompas, tentang apa itu yang diperlihatkan?*

(Sorry if I took over. You have been asked to read Kompas newspaper, what exactly it is shown?)

M : *Jadi Bu Elsa menunjukkan "Yani udah baca Kompas belum?". Saya jawab "belum, bu". "Saya cari ya". Dicarilah sama Bu Elsa.*

(So, Mrs. Elsa shown me and said "Yani, have you read Kompas?" I answered "I haven't read yet". "I will find the news for you." Finally, Mrs. Elsa searched for it.)

The similar case occurred in the following excerpt. This time, however, the judge was able to draw out information from Miryam, albeit in a very slow process. In courtroom settings, defendantes are asked to deliver the details that they know since their testimony is used as evidence to defend or prosecute a defendant. Moreover, defendantes are sworn upon a holy scripture of their choosing to declare that they will speak only the truth. In excerpt 9, Miryam replied the judge's question with simple phrases. She left the details out which means that Miryam did not cooperate well during the testimony.

Excerpt 9

J: *Apa yang Bu Elsa tunjukkan untuk dibaca?* (Then, what did Mrs. Elsa found to be read?)

M: *Bu Elsa menanyakan ini ada komentar dari Bu Diah.* (Mrs. Elsa said that there was a comment by Mrs. Diah.)

J: *Mengenai apa?* (About what?)

M: *Mengenai E-KTP.* (About E-KTP.)

The absence of the details implied that Miryam was being careful in her testimony as to not give unnecessary or even unwanted statements. The main topic of the question still laid in the comment of Mrs. Diah. However, she answered the judge with details that were already known by the judge. For instance, when asked about what the conversation was about, she said that it was about the "E-KTP" issue. In addition to the statement of the obvious, Miryam's answer may also be seen as a way for her to be safe. As such, she projected herself as a person with little information about the ongoing case. With Grice's theory (1975) in mind which refers to making your contribution as needed, Miryam was evidenced to have violated the maxim to dismiss the topic of the testimony as well as to hold out the information.

The repetition went on as seen on excerpt 10. In contrast to excerpt 9, Miryam answered the questions with a long answer instead of short ones. However, she still held her stance in which she claimed to

not read the news carefully. It has to be noted that not reading carefully does not equal to not have read at all. Hence, it can be said that Miryam has known the details of the news during the time in the court but dismissed it by stating that she did not read it carefully. Moreover, after giving the same information that is already known by the judge, Miryam dismissed the information by closing the statement with "That's it."

Excerpt 10

J: *Bagaimana komentarnya di situ?*
(How was the comment on there?)

M: *Saya karna **gak baca jelas.. gak baca sungguh-sungguh**, saya nya ini pak yang mulia, karena saya **gak baca sungguh-sungguh** jadi oh yaudah. Abis itu "oh gitu ya bu ya". **Udah hanya begitu aja.***
(Because I did not read it clearly... I did not really read it, so I was like oh... alright. Then, "oh... I see." Then, that's it.)

As previously stated in this part of the chapter, Miryam was seen to give answers that were not related to the questions at hand. With that

being said, it is possible that the defendant was trying to create a safe parameter in which she puts herself as an innocent bystander in the whirlpool of corruption. However, as stated earlier, this study does not judge whether Miryam is lying or not; this research, particularly in this part, analyzes the implicit meaning of a defendant's statements during her testimony.

The Implication of Violating the Maxims of Quantity

In the maxim of quantity theory, new information is added into the equation. Upon analysis, several statements of Miryam were seen to violate several maxims at the same time. As can be seen in excerpt 7, in addition of violating them maxim of relation, the statement also violated the maxim of quantity as evidenced by her statement of not reading it carefully. Moreover, as seen in excerpt 9 and 10, the defendant gave a response to the question by adding the details in the conversation in which she insisted that she did not carefully read the news. As mentioned earlier, it has to be noted

that not reading carefully does not mean to not have read the full story. In short, Miryam did not lie on whether she has read the news or not; she, however, decided to create a disclaimer in which to put herself in a safe position by obscuring the details.

In the following excerpt (11), Miryam was seen to have added new information, specifically one involving her. In the statement, she stated that she has ceased all phone activity. This, however, does not mean that she did not follow the rest of the events in the mega corruption case since she had other information such as printed newspaper, television broadcasts, and even reading online articles through computers. The defendant did not mention any source of news. Furthermore, this act is similar to the previous one in excerpt 10 in which she closed the statement with an unclear reply to dismiss the current topic.

Excerpt 11

J: *Kalau liat cara ibu tadi, Bu Elsa menyodorkan koran karena satu berita, itu tentu karena penting*

kan? Menyangkut E-KTP. Masa anda tidak tertarik untuk membacanya?

(If I look at the way you explain it, Mrs. Elsa handed the newspaper because of the particular news, which is certainly because it is important. A news regarding E-KTP. Are you sure that you are not interested in reading it?)

M: *Terus terang memang setelah mencuatnya kasus ini ya, yang mulia, saya memang gak begitu mengikuti perkembangan dan saya stop semua berita-berita. Bahkan saya tidak pegang hand phone gitu.*

(Honestly, indeed, after this case came up, your honor, I did not really keep up with the progress and I decided to stop watching the news. Even I avoid the use of cell phone.)

Defendants may lose their credibility if they are proven to be uncooperative during the investigation or testimony. The uncertainty of the truth, the hesitation during speaking, the repetition of the

statements, as well as the way Miryam delivered her version of the truth during her testimony triggered a doubt within the judge as indicated by his tone of speaking. However, as implied in the last reply as shown in excerpt 9, 10, and 11, the defendant seemed to be very dismissive of the topics as implied. Also, she did not directly answer the judge's question regarding her interest in the study, rather, she proceeded to give new yet irrelevant information to the subject at hand.

Although this study is not on par with the study of Rini (2010) or Attardo (1993), a similar line can be drawn between the two. Rini's study concluded that a pragmatic manipulation, in this instance the violation of maxim, is done in order to achieve humorous verbal interactions between the characters in the television situational comedy show. The study done by Attardo yields a similar result in which violations are done deliberately to present the humor of the show. It is impossible for a speaker to speak or argue without ulterior motive. As evidenced earlier, Miryam may also

has her own motive in her statements as implied in the aforementioned excerpts, particularly excerpt 9.

Miryam's manner of answering the question raised the judge's suspicion even more. As evident in excerpt 12 in the next section, the judge was seen to doubt her statements by stating that it is very odd for a conversation to not occur after a long way of meeting one another. Miryam, however, was still on her strategy to confuse the judge. The implication of her statements in the following excerpt is that she is still holding out information by giving as less as possible. Moreover, by giving information of her given *tausiah*, which refers to religious advice, she added new and irrelevant information to the topic at hand.

Excerpt 12

J: *Ini aneh ini pembicaraan seperti ini. Kan sudah capek-capek cari koran, entah anda baca tapi kemudian tidak ada perbincangan tentang masalah itu*
(It is an odd kind of conversation. She already bothered looking for the news,

- whether you read it or not but then there was no conversation to discuss about it.)
- M: *Cuma kan saya bilang...* (interrupted by the judge)
(It's just that I said...)
- J: *Sekali lagi saudara saksi saya ingatkan. Bicaralah yang benar. Saya sudah mengatakan dan melibatkan nama Tuhan. Dengan bersumpah di sini kita melibatkan nama Tuhan hadir di tempat ini. Bukan di hadapan saya saja anda memberi keterangan. Jawab secara benar, apa yang diperbincangkan pada waktu itu?*
(Let me remind you once again. Speak the truth. I have said and involved the name of God. By stating our vow here, we involve the name of God to be present in this room. It is not just in front of me that you have to give this information. Now answer truthfully, what was discussed at that time?)
- M: *Dia bilang yang.. "yang sabar Yani, yang sabar."*
- (She said, "be patient, Yani, be patient.")
- J: *Ibu diminta sabar dengan Bu Elsa?*
(You are being asked to be patient by Mrs. Elsa?)
- M: *Iya, "yang sabar. Nanti akan saya bantu."*
(Yes, "be patient. I will help you.")

In the excerpt above, Miryam was asked about the details of the talk she had with Mrs. Elsa. Based on her answer, she was about to give a hedged answer by saying "It's just that I said...". Yet, she was interrupted by the judge which reminded her that she had taken the oath to state only the truth. Then, before giving her answer, Miryam was seen to have paused for a little while. After that, she claimed that she was told to be patient. The hesitation as evidenced in her pause as well as her very short responses, it can be seen that Miryam was being extremely careful in not to spill the wrong information. The length of her responses indicates that she did not wish to share more than she would

like, even though her lack of details violated the maxims.

In excerpt 13, Miryam repeated the same information about her being told to be patient and her claims in not reading the news carefully. In addition of adding irrelevant information or answering in a confusing way, Miryam also put herself as a victim.

Excerpt 13

J: *Iya. Memangnya berita apa itu di Koran sampai anda diminta untuk bersikap sabar?*

(I see. What kind of news is it in the newspaper until you are being asked to be patient?)

M: *Ya karna saya.. versi saya ya, yang mulia. **Saya gak baca banget gitu, jadi saya hanya diberikan itu.. apa namanya.. semacam tausiah sedikit lah sama beliau. “yang sabar.. nanti juga kan saya udah kaya saudara sama kamu Yani, sudah seperti kakak beradik, nanti ini lah konsultasi bagaimana-bagaimananya kepada saya.”***

(It is because... from my perspective, your

honor. I did not read it clearly, so I was given only that... what is it... some kind of *tausiah* by her. “Be patient. I have considered you as my own sister, Yani. We are just like sisters. You can consult all the problems with me.)

J: *Ya, dengarkan saya dulu. Kalau ibu diminta sabar, tentu karena ada penyebabnya. Apa penyebabnya sampai dia perlu untuk meminta ibu tetap sabar? Sama halnya seperti saya sekarang. Orangnya penuh kesabaran. Tiba-tiba ada orang minta saya untuk sabar. Saya akan Tanya, “kok anda meminta saya sabar kenapa?” Ibu sendiri kenapa harus diminta sabar pada waktu itu?*

(Listen to me first. If you were asked to be patient, obviously there was a cause. Then what is the cause so you are asked to remain being patient. It has the same situation as me right now. A person full of patience. Suddenly, someone asked me to be

patient. I will ask to them, "why do you ask me to be patient?" So now, why do you have to be patient at that time?)

- M: *Ya mungkin pemikiran saya, Bu Elsa mendengar berita-berita yang cukup banyak...*
(Probably, based on my assumption, Mrs. Elsa heard quite a lot of news...)

As seen in the excerpt above in the previous section, Miryam was being told to be patient of the case that has befallen to her. The case is that she was being dragged to the courtroom since her name was mentioned in one news article. We can imply that by saying that she is being told to be patient as well as given religious advice on the matter at hand, Miryam projected herself to have been harmed in some way, particularly her reputation. She emphasized the fact that she was being told to be patient, despite her claims of not knowing the news she was related to. Her quick answers were seen to be a sign of dismissing the topic, while her longer replies tended to ramble to go around the

proceeding. This, combined with her way of putting herself as a victim to the case, can be seen as a way for her to wash her hands out of the event in the court. In short, she was putting herself as an innocent bystander when compared to others involved in the matter.

In excerpt 14, Miryam did not quite answer the questions given to her. Also, when saying that Mrs. Elsa did not deliver the news to her, Miryam is seen to have paused. However, when further asked about what kind of news she was given, she instantly replied that it was presumably about the E-KTP issue.

Excerpt 14

- J: (Interrupting) *Ya itu yang ditanyakan bapak jaksa. Berita apa itu?*

(That is exactly the question which the prosecutor has been asking. What kind of news?)

- M: *Beliau tidak menyampaikan ke saya.*

(She did not deliver the news to me.)

- J: (Interrupting) *yang ibu pahami, bukan yang diinformasikannya.*

Yang ibu pahami apa berita mengenai ibu pada waktu itu?

(So, based on your understanding, not based on what is informed. Tell me, what do you understand about the news about you at that time?)

M: ***Berita-berita mengenai kasus E-KTP yang mencuat ini.***

(It was news regarding the E-KTP issues.)

As seen from the context when she responded slow and later quick, it was clear that Miryam took a long time to think about what to say. Furthermore, it can be said that was hiding the information by giving it very slowly and later quickly to obscure the process of hiding it.

Her way of saying that she has no clue regarding the news related to her goes on until the end of the video. In excerpt 15, she kept on claiming to not knowing what the news is about in spite of her name's involvement to the media coverage.

Excerpt 15

J: *(Interrupting) Kan semakin lebih menarik*

lagi. Jalan keluarnya yaitu ibu terangkan secara benar. Ibu merasa perlu diminta sabar, bahkan ada embel-embel lagi "nanti saya bantu", memangnya apa berita di Koran itu yang menyangkut berita ibu?

(It is even more interesting. The only way to solve this problem is to explain the story truthfully. You feel the need to be patient. Moreover, there was a statement about "I will help you". The truth is, what kind of news is linking your name?)

M: *Katanya ada nama saya di berita itu terkait..*

(She said that there was my name mentioned on that news...)

J: *(Interrupting) ya.. terkaitnya bagaimana? (Yes... how was the news connects with you?)*

M: ***Kan karena beliau yang baca..***

(It was her who reads...)

J: *(interrupting) iya, iya..*

(I see...)

M: *Terus (kata) beliau, "Yani baca." Saya gak begitu terlalu baca. Terus beliau bilang, "Itu ada Bu Diah komentar tentang Yani di Kompas itu..."*
 (Then she said, "Yani, read this." I did not read it clearly. Then, she said, "there was a comment by Mrs. Diah talking about Yani on the newspaper...")

Her claim of not reading the news carefully kept going despite her statement in which she said that Mrs. Elsa tells her to read the article. The defendant pushed the notion of her not reading it carefully. In addition, she also emphasized the information that the one who knows about Mrs. Diah's comment is Mrs. Elsa. With her defensive answer, it indicates that Miryam still gave only a small amount of information so that she did not discuss information that should not have been revealed.

Her claims in excerpt 16 indicate that she was hiding the information from the judge. Until the very last part of the video, she did not tell what the comment is about.

Moreover, she claimed that Mrs. Elsa did not tell her what it was about.

Excerpt 16

J: *Iya. Apa komentarnya?*
 (I see. What was the comment about?)

M: *Dia gak cerita..*
 (She did not mention it.)

J: *dan ibu tidak...*
 (And you did not...)

M: *Dan saya tidak begitu terlalu baca sekali, yang mulia.*
 (And I did not really read it clearly, your honor.)

J: *Dan tidak juga tertarik tertarik mengetahuinya?*
 (And you also not interested to find out?)

M: *Tidak tertarik.*
 (No, I'm not.)

J: *Aneh.*
 (Odd.)

The most interesting part is that in the whole interview, it was the defendant that was pressed by the judges judging from the amount of interruptions made by the person in charge. In this case, however, it was

Miryam that interrupted the judge. She firmly claimed that she did not read it carefully once again. The firm response is also seen in her statement that she is not interested to the publishing related to her name. In the video, she did not clarify her being uninterested to the case as it was cut shortly. However, her reply as seen in the excerpt below stopped firmly without trying to add other information. The judge, once again, was suspicious of her testimony.

The Implication of Violating the Maxims of Manner

In terms of maxim of manner implicature, the occurrence of the violation appeared alongside the other two, maxim of quantity and relation. The manner in which Miryam answered the judge's and the prosecutor's question was seen to be dismissive and convoluted. As can be seen in an excerpt below,

J: *Bagaimana komentarnya di situ?*
(How was the comment on there?)

M: *Saya karna gak baca jelas.. gak baca sungguh-sungguh, saya nya ini pak yang*

mulia, karena saya gak baca sungguh-sungguh jadi oh yaudah. Abis itu "oh gitu ya bu ya". Udah hanya begitu aja.

(Because I did not read it clearly... I did not really read it, so I was like oh... alright. Then, "oh... I see." Then, that's it.)

She gave responses to the question given by trying to be as obscure as possible. In contrast to the maxim of manner rule in which the speaker has to avoid ambiguity and obscurity, Miryam's statements were unclear. Thus, her way of delivering the answers implied that it was done to hold out information.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzes how the defendant, Miryam, violated the maxims in the trial process in the form of question and answer conversations. From the conversation between Miryam, the prosecutor, and the judge, it can be concluded that Miryam often committed the violation of the maxim of relation. From the findings, the violation of maxims were done in order to

achieve certain purposes. Miryam violates the maxim of relation because she tried to avoid the questions given to her by giving irrelevant answers. In addition, the violation can occur several times in one conversation. It can be interpreted that her intention in violating several maxims on one sentence is to create statements that are difficult to be identified as lying.

In addition, Miryam kept pushing the same information several times. At first, she claims to not read the news carefully. As such, she is unable to identify Mrs. Diah statement as instructed by both the judge and prosecutor. Then, she keeps going around the answer to avoid the question as well as dismiss the topic. Moreover, she puts herself as a victim to the situation by stating that Mrs. Elsa told her to be patient in spite of her unknowingness of the situation. Then, it is implied that she wishes to give further details by stating that the news does not incite her curiosity.

REFERENCES

- Afidah, L., & Wahyudi, R. (2014). How it starts and ends: A study of Indonesian stand-up comedy. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 14(2), 170-186
- Alwasilah, A. C. (2005). Developing theories of teaching academic Indonesian to non-language majors: ways of collecting and analyzing data. *Indonesian JELT*, 1(2), 125-136.
- Amalia, Y. (2019, October 9). *Dicecar Jaksa soal Bertemu Markus Nari, Miryam Berdalih Lupa dan Tak Bahas e-KTP*. Retrieved January 5, 2020, from Merdeka.com: <https://www.merdeka.com/peristiwa/dicecar-jaksa-soal-bertemu-markus-nari-miryam-berdalih-lupa-dan-tak-bahas-e-ktp.html>
- Attardo, S. (1993). Violation of conversational maxims and cooperation: The case of jokes. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19(6), 537-558.
- Ceballos, C. T., & Sosas, R. V. (2018). On court proceedings: a forensic linguistic analysis on maxim violation. *Journal of Nusantara Studies (JONUS)*, 3(2), 17-31.
- Croker, R. A. (2009). An introduction to qualitative research. In *Qualitative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 3-24). Palgrave Macmillan, London
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse*. London: Routledge.

- Baskoro, B. S. (2014). *Pragmatik dan Wacana Korupsi*. Gadjah Mada University.
- Blome-Tillmann, M. (2008). Conversational implicature and the cancellability test. *Analysis*, 68(2), 156-160.
- Davies, B. (2000). Grice's cooperative principle: Getting the meaning across. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, 8, 1-26.
- Dynel, M. (2008). There is method in the humorous speaker's madness: Humor and Grice's model. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 159-185.
- Emma, D. (2006). Breaking maxims in conversation: A comparative study of how scriptwriters break maxims in *Desperate Housewives* and *That 70's Show*. *Independent thesis Basic level (degree of Bachelor)*, 1-37. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A5829&dswid=7062>
- Filani, I. (2015). Discourse types in stand-up comedy performances: an example of Nigerian stand-up comedy. *European Journal of Humour Research*. 3(1), 41-60.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. 1975, 41-58.
- Hidayat, R. (2017, March 9). *Tujuh hal yang perlu Anda ketahui terkait 'megakorupsi' e-KTP*. Retrieved January 5, 2020, from BBC News Indonesia: <https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/trensosial-39218275>
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Juliana, N. (2015). *Grice's conversational implicature in written short humor dialogues (Thesis)*. Indonesia University of Education.
- Khoyi, A., M. & Behnam, B. (2014). Discourse of law: Analysis of cooperative principles and speech acts in Iranian law courts. *Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning*. 2(4), 312-322.
- Kondowe, W., Ngwira, F. F., & Madula, P. (2014). Linguistic analysis of Malawi political newspaper cartoons on President Joyce Banda: Towards Grice's conversational implicature. *International journal of humanities and social science*, 4(7), 401-51.
- Marmaridou, (2000). *Pragmatic meaning and cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co.
- McCarthy, M. (2008). Discourse analysis. *ELT journal*, 62(2), 211-213.
- Palupi, S. R. (2006). *An analysis of humor types and grice's maxim in the situation comedy Friends episode of "the one with that could have been"* (Thesis). SebelasMaret University.
- Pavličková, E. (2011). Legal writing in light of Grice's cooperative principle. *English Matters II*, 13-20.
- Potts, C. (2007). Into the conventional-implicature

- dimension. *Philosophy compass*, 2(4), 665-679
- Pragmatic maxim. (2018). In *Merriam-Webster online dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pragmatic%20maxim>.
- Riestania, M. (2017). *Violation of the cooperative principle in court context (Thesis)*. Indonesia University of Education.
- Rini, S. (2010). Violating the maxims of quality and quantity on the 'Demo Sabun' sketch of extravaganza Situation Comedy TV. *Register Journal*, 3(2), 145-162.
- Sadehvandi, P. K. N., & Khosravizadeh, P. (2011). Some instances of violation and flouting of the maxim of quantity by the main characters (Barry & Tim) in Dinner for Schmucks. In *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics. P* (pp. 122-127).
- Saul, J. M. (2001). Wayne A. Davis, Implicature: Intention, convention, and principle in the failure of Gricean theory. *Noûs*, 35(4), 631-641.
- Schwarz, N., Strack, F., Hilton, D., & Naderer, G. (1991). Base rates, representativeness, and the logic of conversation: The contextual relevance of "irrelevant" information. *Social Cognition*, 9(1), 67-84.
- Tajabadi, A., Dowlatabadi, H., & Mehri, E. (2014). Grice's cooperative maxims in oral arguments: The case of Dispute Settlement Council in Iran. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1859-1865.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.
- Trotter II, R. T. (2012). Qualitative research sample design and sample size: Resolving and unresolved issues and inferential imperatives. *Preventive medicine*, 55(5), 398-400
- Tupan, A. H., & Natalia, H. (2008). The multiple violations of conversational maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of desperate housewives. *K@ta*, 10(1), 63.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yuvike, Y., & Winiharti, M. (2009). The non-observance of the conversational maxims: An analysis of the dialogues in Arthur Miller's the Crucible. *Lingua Cultura*, 3(2), 116-127.