

ANALYSIS THE VIOLATION OF MAXIM IN VLOG JURNALRISA EPISODE “TANYARISA #11 – SPECIAL PETER CS”

Nikita Febriyani¹, Cynantia Rachmijati²

^{1,2} IKIP Siliwangi

¹ nikitafebriyani@student.ikipsiliwangi.ac.id, ² cynantia@yandex.com

Abstract

The aims of this research to analyze the violation of maxim on vlog jurnalrisa the episode “Tanyarisa #11 - SPESIAL PETER CS”. To achieve this goal, this study was designed with descriptive qualitative. Data collected by transcription Host and Speaker conversations (childhood friends) in Youtube Channel jurnalrisa with a duration of 50:36 minutes. The data is then analyzed by four Grice maxims quantitatively. The finding shows; first, there are three types of a maxim of violations as 50% violated the maxim of quantity, 40% violated the maxim of relevance, 10% violated the maxim of manner. Second, the dominant type of violation that has been violated of quantity because they tend not to reveal information. Third, the violations of the maxim happen because when the speakers provide information or utterances to change the conversation, there is ambiguity, obscurity answers, and exaggerates or reduces information so it is not informative.

Keywords: Cooperative Principle, Violation of Maxim, Vlog

INTRODUCTION

Language is a communication system consisting of sound, words, and grammar or a communication system that can express what someone feels and wants (Herani & Rachmijati, 2019). Moreover, according to Longman Advanced American Dictionary (2007, p. 895) as cited in Ulliyadhi & Raharja (2019), language is a system of communication with written or spoken words used by certain people country or region. Language is built from the habits and geographical areas in which live speakers. A good language is developed based on a certain system and set of rules observed by the speaker. Therefore, language has a more specific function which is to build relationships, solidarity, and cooperation in the community, language has been used to express thoughts with feelings so that listeners will be able to feel what was discussed.

Humans as social beings are interacting or communicating use language through conversation. Communication is one implementation of the function of language in society as a means of carrying out affairs (Parmawati, 2018). According to Kelton (1991) cited in Suartana, Ramendra, & Juniarta (2018) communication can define as the transmission process information and mutual understanding from one individual to another. This aims to maintain good social interaction between one individual and another. Effective communication occurs when the speaker and listener are active in interacting. So, the process of communication between speakers and listeners becomes smooth and effective called a cooperative. This means that they must understand each other's topic of what they are talking about, because if one does not understand it can be concluded that the conversation will not work well.

In linguistics, especially in pragmatic, there is a theory of how humans cooperate in conversation. The theory is called the cooperative principle. According to Grice (1975) cited in Agusmita & Marlina (2018) states that when you interact with others, you must make your contribution as needed with the purpose or direction of the conversation received in which you are involved. In addition, Levinson (1983) cited in Ceballos & Sosas (2018) summarized the principle of cooperation as a specification of what participants had to do to communicate efficiently, rationally, and cooperatively optimally. This means that each participant is expected to contribute to the conversation as needed. Partridge (2006: 45) cited in Rahmi, Refnaldi, & Wahyuni (2018) also assumes that by following the cooperative principle, it will avoid some communication, it is because cooperative principle consists of several conversational maxims which are used to cooperate and share the understanding of participant in the conversation.

The cooperative principle is built by four sets of a maxim. Grice (1975: 45) as cited in Novebry & Rosa (2019) claims the principle as the principle of cooperation consisting of four principles, namely the quantity maxim, the quality maxim, the relevance maxim, and the maxim manner. The first is maxim quality, speakers are expected to say in accordance with reality with evidence that is appropriate, not lying, and the maxim is in the form of statements about the truth. The second is a maxim of quantity, obedient is expected to have enough information, meaning obedient should not provide too little and too much information. It can be concluded that the maxim of quantity is the strongest or most informative utterance that can be made in that situation. The third is a maxim of relevance, that the speaker must be truly relevant to what has been said before. The last is a maxim of manner, speakers say briefly and in a good way to avoid obscurity and ambiguity.

However, not all communication meets the principles of cooperation or all four principles in their conversation. People fail to fulfill or observe maxims in many contexts of daily life and on many occasions (Massanga, & Msuya, 2017 in Ayasreh et al., 2019). There are many reasons for not complying with these principles, for example, some people are unable to speak clearly because they are nervous, scared, stuttering, anxious, do not know the culture or are not fluent or because someone wants to lie intentionally or for other reasons. Previous research claims that adage violations are sometimes caused by misunderstanding by the listener or when the listener fails to draw conclusions from the speaker's intentions (Gumpers, 1982 in Ayasreh et al., 2019). This study focuses on violation of maxim, violating towards maxims can mislead a listener. According to Grice (1975) as cited in Raharja & Rosyidah (2019) violations occur when the speaker deliberately does not apply certain principles in their conversation to cause misunderstanding on the part of their participants or to achieve some other goals. There are four types of violation of maxim between 1) Maxim of quantity: make your contribution informative as needed (for current exchange purposes). Don't make your contribution more informative than needed. 2) Maxim of quality: don't say what you believe is wrong. Don't say that you lack sufficient evidence. 3) Maxim of relation: relevant. 4) The saying of manners: avoid unclear expressions, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary tendencies), and regularly. (Grice, 1975 in Nur, 2018)

The researcher is interested in studying the maxim that is violated in the video jurnalisa vlog which is a YouTube channel by a famous artist, Risa Saraswati, with a total of 3.76 million subscribers. The aims of this research to analyze the violation of maxim in the episode "Tanyarisa # 11 - SPESIAL PETER CS" because it has been watched 8.9 million times.

METHOD

The research of the study is designed to be qualitative. According to Polkinghorne (1983: 269), as cited in Novebry & Rosa (2019), qualitative methods rely more on linguistics than numerical data (scores), and we use meaning based rather than statistical forms of data analysis. In this study, a qualitative descriptive approach was chosen because the analysis is about finding and analyzing the utterances of characters in YouTube channel jurnalrisa episode “Tanyarisa #11 – SPESIAL PETER CS” from <https://youtu.be/LwGcWUAButI>.

The data taken is a video that was uploaded on the 15th of November 2018 with tanyarisa #11-special Peter CS. In conducting this research, the researcher used several steps for the process to collecting data in which the researcher downloaded the video in an application, YouTube on December 24th 2018, watching videos, transcribing conversations, and copying in writing. Then the writer identifies the speech related to the type of maxim of the violation of conversation after the findings data have been analyzed the next step the author explains and describes the maxim violations that occur.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The researcher collects the data from a vlogger in vlog video that was uploaded on the youtube channel <https://youtu.be/LwGcWUAButI> in the episode "JurnalRisa TanyaaRisa # 11 - Special Peter CS" with duration 50:36 minutes. This episode is a question and answer between the Vlogger and his childhood friends. The researcher found violations of the maxim carried out during the question and answer process. The researcher found 5 utterances of maxim quantity, 4 utterances violated the maxim of relevance, 1 utterance violated maxim of manner. The most often broken maxim is the Quantity maxim, the speaker tends not to want to reveal information, the speaker gives too little information than the situation requires, or is out of control when they say too much. The reason for that is that the subject often intends to mislead the listener. The second maxim relevance is most often violated. They violate the adage to avoid subjects that could be dangerous for the listener, violate the maxim of relevance used to save the interlocutor from being hurt, or to make the speaker's voice sound less offensive then they are to avoid confrontation and the last violated maxim that occurred was manner maxim.

Discussion

Based on the result can be seen that violations of maxim quantity 5 utterances. Then at maxim quality 0 utterances, at maxim relevance 4 utterances, and in maxim manner 1 utterance as follows:

Data 1

Host : sekarang masih pake seragam ngga?
 Speaker 2 : *baju untuk sekolah.*
 Host : baju untuk sekolah?
 Speaker 2 : Ya!

From the conversation, Host asked "*sekarang masih pake seragam ngga?*" and the expected informative answers are "*baju untuk sekolah*" or "*tidak baju untuk sekolah*" while the answer from Speaker 2 is "*baju untuk sekolah*" it can be concluded that the speech answered by Speaker 2 is more informative and is a violation of maxim quantity

Data 2

Host : iya? Ini siapa nih?
 Speaker 2 : *risa lupa sama aku*
 Host : *engg dong ngga lupa*
 Speaker 2 : *risa tidak tau aku siapa*

From the conversation, Host asked "iya? Ini siapa nih?" And the expected answer from the Host question is Speaker 2 answering someone's name but Speaker 2 answers the statement "risa lupa sama aku". It can be concluded that the speech answered by Speaker 2 is a violation of maxim relevance because the answer does not match the question asked.

Data 3

Host : *katanya kapan pertama kali Peter bertemu Hans, Hendrik, William, dan Janshen?*
 Speaker 2 : *Di sekolah*
 Host : *disekolah? Di rumah?*
 Speaker 2 : *iya dirumah bersama Risa*

From the conversation, Host asked "*katanya kapan pertama kali Peter bertemu Hans, Hendrik, William, dan Janshen?*" The expected answer was *only one place*. While Speaker 2 answers *the first utterance "di sekolah" and the second utterance "iya di rumah bersama Risa"*. It can be concluded that the speech answered by Speaker 2 is a violation of maxim quantity.

Data 4

Host : *katanya kalau kalian ada yang menyanyikan lagu "abdi teh" "boneka abdi" itu jaraknya jauh sekali tempatnya jauh sekali dari tempat ini, kamu mau datang tidak?*
 Speaker 2 : *kalau jauh sudah tidak bisa di dengar*
 Host : *oh iya bener ya*

From the conversation, Host asked "*katanya kalau kalian ada yang menyanyikan lagu "abdi teh" "boneka abdi" itu jaraknya jauh sekali tempatnya jauh sekali dari tempat ini, kamu mau datang tidak?*" And the expected informative answer was "*datang*" or "*tidak datang*" while the answer from Speaker 2 is "*kalau jauh sudah tidak bisa di dengar*". it can be concluded that the speech answered by Speaker 2 is more informative and is a violation of maxim quantity.

Data 5

Host : *peter, diantara kalian.. siapa yang paling berani?*
 Speaker 2 : *kamu tau*

From the conversation, Host asked "*peter, diantara kalian.. siapa yang paling berani?*" and the informative answer that is expected is to *mention someone's name* while the answer from Speaker 2 is "kamu tau" it can be concluded that the speech answered by Speaker 2 is not clear or ambiguous and is a violation of maxim manner.

Data 6

Speaker 4 : *peter itu jahil*
 Host : *dia sering bikin kamu marah?*
 Speaker 4 : *aku menonton*
 Host : *oh kamu nonton aja, kamu liat gitu?*
 Speaker 4 : *terhibur*

From the conversation above, Host asks the first question, "*dia sering bikin kamu marah?*" And the expected informative answer is "*iya*" or "*tidak*" while the answer from Speaker 4 is a statement that is "*aku menonton*". It can be concluded that utterance is answered by Speaker 4

does not match the Host question. The second question that was asked was "*oh kamu nonton aja, kamu liat gitu?*" And the expected answer was "*iya*" or "*tidak*" while the answer from Speaker 4 was an activity carried out. It can be concluded that the two statements delivered by Speaker 4 do not match the questions posed by the Host and are a violation of maxim relevance.

Data 7

Host : kamu tidak mau berteman dengan mamat modol?

Speaker 4 : saya sudah punya teman

Host : dia baik loh

Speaker 4 : saya tau

From the conversation above, Host asks the question " kamu tidak mau berteman dengan mamat modol?" And the expected answer is "*iya*", "*sudah*" or "*tidak*" while Speaker 4 answers "*saya sudah punya teman*". It can be concluded that the utterance answered by Speaker 4 is not in accordance with the question and is a violation of maxim quantity.

Data 8

Host : kalian pernah berantem?

Speaker 4 : *siapa?*

From the conversation above, Host asks "*kalian pernah berantem*" And the expected answer is "*iya*" or "*tidak*" while Speaker 4 answers with a question "*siapa?*". It can be concluded that the utterance answered by Speaker 4 is not as expected by the Host and is a violation of maxim relevance.

Data 9

Host : terus pertanyaan selanjutnya, apakah kalian belajar?

Speaker 1 : tentu

Host : Hendrick? Janshen? Tidak pernah belajar ya Janshen?

Speaker 4 : Tidak

Host : Peter?

Speaker 3 : Tidak

Speaker 2 : *aku suka lihat Risa menulis*

From the conversation above, Host asked "*terus pertanyaan selanjutnya, apakah kalian belajar?*" And the expected answer are "*iya*", "*tentu*" or "*tidak*". Speaker 1, Speaker 3, and Speaker 4 answer according to the question while Speaker 2 answers with a statement "*aku suka lihat Risa menulis*". It can be concluded that the utterance answered by Speaker 2 is not as expected by the Host and is a violation of maxim quantity.

Data 10

Host : ok, sekarang pertanyaan selanjutnya adalah bagaimana kabar Elizabeth?

Speaker 2 : Tidak, tidak pernah tau

Host : *menjelaskan

Speaker 1 : *kemana Elizabeth?*

Speaker 3 : *ada pertanyaan lain?*

Host : oke kita skip ya pertanyaan elizabeth, mereka tidak mau jawab karena mereka takut....(lanjut menjelaskan hal lain)

From the conversation above, Host asked " ok, sekarang pertanyaan selanjutnya adalah bagaimana kabar Elizabeth?" And the expected answer is "*the name of a place*" or "*tidak tahu*". Speaker 2 answers according to the question while Speaker 1 answers with a question "*kemana Elizabeth?*" and Speaker 3 also answers with a question "*ada pertanyaan lain?*". It can be

concluded that the speech answered by Speaker 1 and Speaker 3 is not as expected by the Host and is a violation of maxim relation.

From explained the data above, can be conclude in Table 1

Table 1.

Types of violation a maxim	Frequency	Persentase
Quantity	5	50%
Quality	0	0%
Relevance	4	40%
Manner	1	10%
Total	10	100%

CONCLUSION

Based on the above research, this research is concluded as follows. First, there are three types of a maxim of violations in Video Blog jurnalrisa episode #tanyarisa Peter CS. as many as 5 utterances (50%) violated the maxim of quantity. 4 utterances (40%) violated the maxim of relevance, 1 utterance (10%) violated the maxim of manner. Second, the results of this study show that the dominant type of violation that has been violated in the Video Blog is the episode #tanyarisa Peter CS was the maxim of quantity because they tend not to reveal information. Third, the violations of the maxim happen because when the speakers provide information or utterances to change the conversation, there is ambiguity, obscurity answers, and exaggerates or reduces information so it is not informative.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Alhamdulillah, thank you Allah, my family, my lecture and those who have supported this research.

REFERENCES

- Agusmita, C. M., & Marlina, L. (2018). An Analysis of Conversational Maxim Violation Found in “ The Monster House ” Movie Script. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature*, 7(1).
- Ayasreh, A. M., Al-Sabti, N., Suleiman Awwad, A., Mansoor, M., & Razali, R. (2019). Instances of violation and flouting of the maxim by gaddafi interview during the arab spring. *International Journal of English and Education*, 8(1), 185–193.
- Ceballos, C., & Sosas, R. (2018). On Court Proceedings: A Forensic Linguistic Analysis On Maxim Violation. *Journal of Nusantara Studies (JONUS)*, 3(2), 17–31.
- Herani, I. E., & Rachmijati, C. (2019). an Analysis of Tense and Aspect in the “Tangled” Movie Script. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 2(2), 187. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v2i2.p187-193>
- Novebry, A., & Rosa, R. N. (2019). Analysis of maxim violation in situational comedy the big bang theory. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature*, 8(1), 1–12.
- Nur, M. U. (2018). Violation of Grice’S Cooperative Principle on the Dialogue of “the Wild Duck” By Henrik Ibsen. *Journal of Research on Applied Linguistics, Language and*

- Language Teaching*, 1(2), 163–168. <https://doi.org/10.31002/jrlt.v1i2.289>
- Parmawati, A. (2018). Using Analytic Teams Technique to Improve Students' speaking Skill. *Edulitics (Education, Literature, And Linguistics) Journal*, 3(2), 21-25.
- Raharja, A., & Rosyidah, A. (2019). Maxim of cooperative principle violation by Dodit Mulyanto in stand-up comedy Indonesia season 4. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(1), 62–77. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1836/jopr.v1i1.62-77>
- Rahmi, S. S., Refnaldi, & Wahyuni, D. (2018). the Violation of Conversational Maxims Found in, 7(1).
- Suartana, P. C., Ramendra, D. P., & Juniarta, P. A. (2018). An Analysis of Maxim Violation to Achieve Politeness in Teacher's Utterances of SMPN 3 Singaraja in Academic Year of 2017/2018. *Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*, x, 41–46.