

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In our daily life as a human being, we interact with a lot of people around us. Therefore, as time goes, we created tools to ease our interaction and language is one of them. Language was created to facilitate communication, share ideas and opinion, convey our thoughts and, interact, it is in line with the statement of Jakobson (1960). Moreover, Halliday (as cited in Liu, 2014) also stated that language is a combination of several components that systematically produce meaning. Therefore, we can say that language is a very fundamental but powerful tool as it helps us communicating to each other with meaningful messages in it.

Communication itself is a very essential part in human's daily life either it is between two persons or entire organization. It is the main way people share information and build connections with each other. Keith Davis stated and discussed about communication in his book as the activity to exchange several things in the mind of two persons or more such as ideas, thoughts, information, and/or truths or facts in a particular way to make sure the message is delivered and received properly (Davis, 1981). So that, communication works as a bridge between people in order to be able to understand one another. Thus, the goal of communication is to make the recipients accept the messages in a proper and correct way.

Communication is not just about the words conveyed but also the meaning behind it. This is where the field of pragmatics becomes essential. Yule (1996) stated that pragmatics is the study that is concerned with the meaning of the speaker's utterances and how the listener would interpret them based on the context, situation, or even condition when the conversation happens. Communication goes beyond literal meaning. Understanding pragmatics helps people avoid misunderstandings and misinterpretations of the utterances. So, the communication can be carried out effectively.

In order to have clear and effective communication, both the renderer and the listener play a significant part. It aligns with Paul Grice's statement when he first introduced his Cooperative Principles in 1975. This theory suggests that the renderer and the listener play important roles in creating effective communication (Grice, 1975). Cooperative principle also known as Grice's Maxims consist of four maxims, which are the maxim of quantity, quality, relation (or also known as relevance), and manner. These maxims work as a guide for effective communication.

Following these maxims can help produce clearer and more effective communication. It creates a precision in conveying information that is not only beneficial, but also necessary. Such precision allows speakers and listeners to maintain mutual understanding and trust during interactions. The lack of precision may cause miscommunication. It might even lead to several other problems like misunderstandings, conflicts, and inefficiencies in various settings (Littlejohn & Foss, 2008).

Even so, many people still violate these maxims in daily communication, including in formal and high-stakes contexts such as courtroom trials. In such settings, every statement must be clear and truthful as any violation may lead to serious consequences, including an inadequate defense by the lawyer, loss of trust from the jury, or even a wrongful verdict by the judge. The courtroom demands not only honesty but also linguistic precision, as each word may influence how testimonies are interpreted. Violating conversational maxims in this situation may also affect the speaker's credibility and reliability before the court. Therefore, maintaining clarity and precision in language guided by these maxims, during testimony is crucial to ensuring fairness and accuracy in the judicial process.

The court or courtroom definition itself is a setting where legal cases and trials are conducted and resolved through a judge's verdict (Cambridge University Press, n.d.-a). One type of trial held in a courtroom is a defamation trial. The Cambridge Online Dictionary defines a defamation trial as a legal proceeding focused on resolving disputes where an individual's reputation is harmed or damaged through false statements (Cambridge University Press, n.d.-b). One of the most famous defamation trials of this decade is the Johnny Depp vs. Amber Heard case. It was started when Depp sued her ex-wife, Heard for a defamation because of her released op-ed for The Washington Post claiming she was a victim of domestic violence. This trial became a great topic on social media like TikTok, Instagram, and Twitter. The most viral part of this trial was the testimonies given by Amber Heard which people said to be funny, irrelevant, or even senseless.

Hence, this study tries to analyse the maxim violations Amber Heard did when she gave her testimonies on the trial. It is so interesting to be studied knowing there were two famous actors involved which were Johnny Depp, a well-known actor with his very diverse and unique roles, against Amber Heard, a rising actress for her role as *Mera* in *Aquaman*. Defamation trials are also not a data source that is often used as research material, and this makes this study more interesting.

In addition, Amber Heard was believed to have given lengthy unnecessary and unrelated answers when giving her testimonies during her defamation trials against Johnny Depp. Such behaviour often made her responses seem less cooperative and harder to follow, which could disrupt the flow of questioning. This could be seen as a maxim violation. One of those violations can be seen from the example below:

Data 1

Lawyer : “And how do you feel about that?”

Amber Heard : *“I struggle to have the words. I struggle to find the words to describe how painful this is. This is horrible for me to sit here for weeks and relive everything. I hear people that I knew, some well, some not, my ex-husband, who's in my shared a life, speak about our lives and the way that they have. This is the most painful and difficult thing I've ever gone through. For sure.”* (01:46 – 02:21)

The example above shows Amber Heard’s testimony that violated a maxim of quantity. The lawyer asked her a straightforward question about her feelings after she explained her presence in court. Instead of giving a concise response, she delivered a lengthy and emotionally charged statement that went beyond what was necessary. This behaviour represents a violation of the maxim of quantity, which

requires the speakers to provide sufficient but not excessive information. Rather than directly expressing her emotions regarding the lawsuit, Heard elaborated with repeated remarks, emotional descriptions, and additional references to the trial itself. Such an extended response diminished the clarity and focus of her testimony and suggested that her intention might not have been purely to inform but also to influence the audience's emotional perception.

The purpose of this study is to identify and analyze the types of maxim violations found in Amber Heard's testimonies during the defamation trial between her and Johnny Depp. The analysis focuses on her spoken statements to determine how she violated the maxims. This research also aims to identify which maxim is most frequently and least frequently violated across her testimonies. By examining these violations, the study seeks to uncover the communicative patterns that reflect Heard's speaking style and strategies during the trial. Moreover, it aims to explore the possible reasons behind her violations.

1.2 Problems of the Study

Looking from this research background that has been explained, there were two main problems to be discussed as mentioned below:

1. What types of maxim violations are found in Amber Heard's testimonies during Johnny Depp's defamation trial?
2. What are the reasons behind Amber Heard's maxim violations in her testimony during Johnny Depp's defamation trial?

1.3 Objectives of Study

Looking from the problems mentioned above, this study was focused on two main objectives, which are:

1. To identify the types of maxim violations found in Amber Heard's testimonies during Johnny Depp's defamation trial.
2. To analyze the reasons behind Amber Heard's maxim violations in her testimony during the trial.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

Depending on the background and the problems of this study as mentioned above, this study was limited to analyzing the maxims violation which was conducted by Amber Heard when giving her testimonies during the defamation court and only focused on her testimonies. This study used the theory of Grice (1975) of the Cooperative Principle to analyse the maxim violations in Heard's testimonies along with the reasons behind those violations. The reasons behind these violations were explained using the theory of Leech (1983), supported by theory from Halliday & Hasan (1989) providing the context of situational aspects influencing her speech. This research was also limited only to Amber Heard's testimonies, which are provided on YouTube shared by Law&Crime Network entitled "Amber Heard Testifies in Defamation Trial – Part One (Johnny Depp v Amber Heard)" as the data source.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The aim of this study is to be beneficial for the academic purposes, specifically in the field of linguistics. This study also aims to give advantages to society, particularly to show society how important it is to not violate maxim principles in our daily life and communication. The significances of this study are divided into two aspects, theoretical and practical as the detailed below:

1.5.1 Theoretical Significance

Theoretically speaking, this study contributes to the development of pragmatics by focusing on Cooperative Principle, especially the concept of maxim violations. It explains how these violations work in communication and how they can create meaning beyond what is directly spoken. By discussing maxim violations in detail, this study strengthens the theoretical understanding of pragmatics and contributes to the broader discussion of how language functions in interaction.

1.5.2 Practical Significance

Practically speaking, this study can be useful for a better understanding of communication in daily life. By learning how maxim violations work, readers can become more aware of the hidden meanings behind spoken words and the reasons why speakers may not always follow conversational rules. Understanding maxim violation can also help readers to be more attentive during the everyday communication process. It will also help readers to be more thoughtful and responsible to their utterances or statements in order to create an effective, clear, and more cooperative conversations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, CONCEPTS, AND THEORIES

2.1 Review of Related Literature

In conducting this study, several related prior studies were used as guidelines. These literatures are useful for providing theories and examples related to the topic. By using them, the researcher can compare past findings with the current one. In short, these related literatures support the researcher in completing this study. Those related previous literatures as follows:

The first study was from Febriyani & Rachmijati (2021) with the title of “Analysis the Violation of Maxim in Vlog Jurnalrisa Episode “Tanyarisa #11 – Special Peter CS.” In this study, the researcher also used the theory of Paul Grice to analyze the violation of the maxim conducted by the host and the guest on the video. This study aimed to identify the maxims violated in the video. As a result, the study showed that only three out of four maxims were violated, which were the maxims of quantity, relation, and manner. The maxim of relation was not violated at all on the data source of this study. In addition, this study showed that the most frequently violated maxim was the maxim of quality, followed up by the maxim of relation. The researcher believed that it was because the host and the speaker tried to not reveal many information. Another reason was because the host and the speaker tried to change conversation in the middle that caused ambiguity. This differs from what was found in the current study, where the most frequently violated maxim was the maxim of quantity, while the maxim of quality was not violated at

all. Looking from the study above, there is a similarity of the theory used between this study and the current study which is the theory of Grice about Cooperative Principle. On the other hand, this study used vlog as a data source and Indonesian utterances; meanwhile, the current study uses a defamation trial as the data source and chooses the English utterances. The contribution of this previous study is that it supports the use of Grice's theory as a valid framework for analyzing violations of the maxims across different communication settings.

The next study was conducted by Dewi and Ariyaningsih (2023) entitled "Conversational Maxim Violation by the Main Character in the Shang-Chi and The Legend of the Ten Rings Movie." Still using the same theory which is the theory of Grice about cooperative principle, this study aimed to find out the most frequent maxim violated by the main character. This study successfully found out that the maxim of quantity was the most violated one in the movie by the main character. It was also mentioned in this study that the main character violated the maxims in order to avoid any hassle with other character due to unacceptable truth. At least the main character had violated the maxims for fifteen times. The study conducted by Dewi and Ariyaningsih (2023) shares similarities with the present study in terms of the theoretical framework employed and the focus on analyzing the utterances of a single speaker. Moreover, both studies find that the maxim of quantity is the most frequently violated. However, between these two studies, the data sources are different. This study used movie which is a made-up story, but in the meantime, the current study uses trials which is a real-life situation. This previous study provides

insight into how maxim violations can reveal a speaker's intentions, which supports the current study in analyzing similar motives within real-life testimonies.

Farhana (2021) conducted research which she later titled as "An Analysis of Politeness Strategies and the Maxim Violation in a Movie Script of Enola Holmes." The theory from Brown and Levinson was used to analysing the politeness strategy in the movie and the theory of Grice was used to analysing the violations conducted by the characters. Farhana divided the results of their research into two parts, which were the politeness strategy and the maxim violations. The study showed bald on record was the politeness strategy which often used in the movie and the researcher thought it was because the characters were close to one another. In addition, for the maxim, relevancy one was the most violated maxim by the character and it was because they need to save face, avoid disadvantages, and/or hide the honesty to make the listener happy. In contrast, the current study found that the maxim of quantity was the most frequently violated, while the maxim of relation was the least violated. This study shares the similarity with the current study from the theory side which is cooperative principle, however, this study focuses on why the characters on the movie of *Enola Home* violated the maxim and its relation to politeness strategy from Brown and Levinson. On the other side, the current study focuses more on identifying the reasons behind the violations found in real courtroom testimonies. The previous study provides a reference for understanding how politeness and social motives can influence a speaker's reason for violating conversational maxims.

Wanti (2021) shares their study entitled “Maxim Violation in EFL Classroom” which has conducted in 2021. This study used the theory of Grice to examine the maxim violations in the EFL classroom of SMAN 2 Blitar. The aims of this study were to determine the types, the dominated types of the maxim which were violated, and the reason behind it. There were 22 utterances that violated the maxims with maxim of quantity being the most violated one. It happened because during the learning and teaching process, the students and the teacher violated the maxims in order to build belief and convince the hearer. This study has similarity on the finding and theory but difference on the data source, even though both this study and the current study use real-life situation as the data source, the current study use legal proceeding as data source, which is a more formal and tense context than a classroom. This study contributes by showing that maxim violations may occur intentionally to achieve certain communicative goals, which supports the current study in exploring similar reasons within testimonies.

The last study as a guideline for this study was conducted by Serli (2021) with the title of “The Violations of Leech’s Politeness Principle Maxims Used by Arteria Dahlan in “Ragu-Ragu Perpu” Mata Najwa Talkshow (A Pragmatic Analysis).” In this study, the researcher applied the theory of Leech in order to discover the politeness maxim used and violated by Arteria Dahlan during the talk show. The researcher also discovered the reason of the violation. Based on the result, only three out of six maxims were violated, those were approbation, modesty, and agreement maxim. The reason was because the renderer was offended and overconfident which then lead him to disagree to his interlocutor. This study has

significant differences with the current study since both use different theory and different kind of data source. However, it contributes by providing insight into how emotional and situational factors influence a speaker's decision to violate maxims which helps the current study identify similar reasoning in testimonies.

All of the previous studies serve as valuable guidelines for developing the current research, as they all explore the pragmatic aspect of communication. The main difference between those studies and the current one lies in the data source. Rather than merely identifying or classifying the types of violations, the current study aims to analyze the underlying reasons why the maxims were violated within a real-life context of courtroom testimonies.

2.2 Concepts

This part explained several important terms used in this study to make everything clear for the reader. The explanation of terms is needed to avoid misunderstanding and confusion. Some of the terms that were defined are cooperative principle, maxim violation, and defamation trial. These terms were chosen because they are closely related to the focus of this research. By giving these definitions, the study have a clear basis and the discussion is easier to follow.

2.2.1 Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975) introduced the cooperative principle to explain the behaviour of people during a conversation and what do we do to keep the communication effective, clear and, cooperative. Grice believes that in communication, all the people engaged in it, either the speaker or the listener play important role to create

a successful conversation. Cooperative principles involve four maxims, which are maxim of quantity, quality, relation (also known as relevance), and manner. These maxims help to make sure the conversation goes effective with enough information as required, based on facts, align with the purpose of the conversation at the level it occurs. Grice's theory plays crucial and important role of analyzing how speakers and listener navigate their interaction.

2.2.2 Maxim Violation

Although the cooperative principle has outlined how speakers and listeners are expected to communicate, explained the rules, and provided the maxims, sometimes these expectations are not always fulfilled in real interactions. It is what it's called as maxim violation. A maxim violation occurs when a speaker unintentionally fails to observe one or more of maxims (Grice, 1975). It includes withholding and/or oversharing the information, stating something untrue or not based on facts, introducing irrelevant topics, or speaking ambiguously that may disrupt the effectiveness of communication. However, violating a maxim does not necessarily result in communication failure, as it may still serve certain communicative purposes depending on the context. Some maxim violation may have specific purposes, such as creating jokes, being polite, or saying something indirectly. Dewi and Ariyaningsih (2023) also explained that a nervous speaker who struggles to speak might also violate the maxim due to their anxiousness. Understanding maxim violation is really important, especially for the speaker to figure out how and when to use a language of several occasions in daily life to not confuse the listener.

2.2.3 Defamation Trial

Defamation trials are the legal proceedings which conducted to solve the lawsuit when one party feels his or her reputation has been tarnished and harmed because of another person's false statements (Cambridge University Press, n.d.-b). However, defamation trials are not only legal proceedings but also communicative event which is full of pressure. The trial examines how the statement was said, to whom, and in what situation and condition, to be able to be considered as defamation. Feldman (2006) emphasized that defamation trials are not only law battle, but also a battle zone of how well the speaker uses their language in their testimonies to be able to persuade and convince the judges and juries.

2.3 Theories

This research focused on two main problems. The first was to identify the types of maxim violations found in Amber Heard's testimonies during the defamation trial, and the second was to analyze the reasons behind those violations. To address these problems, this study applied Cooperative Principle as the main theory by Grice (1975), which served as the foundation for identifying and categorizing the violated maxims. The theory of Leech (1983) was used as a supporting theory to explain the underlying reasons for the maxim violations. In addition, the theory of Halliday & Hasan (1989) about situational context was applied to provide a deeper understanding of the surrounding factors influencing the speaker's utterances.

2.3.1 Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975) proposed the Cooperative Principle as a framework to understand how individuals maintain effective and meaningful communication. He suggested that in every conversation, both the speaker and the listener share the responsibility of making the interaction cooperative and understandable. This cooperation is guided by four conversational maxims: quantity, quality, relation (relevance), and manner. These maxims serve as principles that help participants convey messages clearly, truthfully, and appropriately. These maxims also ensure that communication provides sufficient information, stays relevant to the topic, and is delivered in an orderly and comprehensible way. In short, Grice's theory explains how people use language cooperatively to achieve mutual understanding in conversation.

2.3.2 Types of Maxims

There are many types of maxim which work as the guideline to create an effective and clear communication, however, Grice (1975) argued that only four maxims are needed, which are the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. More details regarding those four maxims of cooperative principle as below:

2.3.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity suggests speaker to provide the right amount of information for the listener to be able to grab the information properly and correctly. Withholding or overshare information will cause the listener to not be able to

capture the message that the speaker wants to convey or even become a boomerang to the speaker if misinterpretation occurs. Therefore, the speaker is not allowed to give neither too little nor too much information to maintain an effective communication. We can see from the example below:

A: How did Harry fare in court the other day?

B: Oh, he got a fine.

(Levinson, 1983)

In the dialogue, B follows the Maxim of Quantity because the answer provides exactly the amount of information required by A's question. A asked how Harry fared in court, so B's reply "he got a fine" directly addresses that inquiry. The response is clear and sufficient, giving the main outcome without adding irrelevant details such as the amount of the fine or the background of the case. By avoiding both too little and too much information, B ensures that the exchange remains efficient and focused. This shows that B is cooperating in the conversation by giving an appropriately informative contribution.

2.3.2.2 Maxim of Quality

Based on this maxim, the speaker should only provide the information that they believe to be true and must be supported by concrete and solid evidence. If the information is uncertain or unconfirmed, then it can't be labelled as facts and it is better to not be said. It is to avoid misinformation and to create a communication that only relies on facts or truths. Understanding this maxim can help maintaining the credibility and trust in communication especially for the speaker since the listener relies on the assumption of the speaker is honest and sincere during the conversation. For example:

Aya : Did Raj feed the cat and clean the litterbox?

Bo : He fed the cat.

(Anderson et al., 2022)

In this case, Bo states “He fed the cat,” which indicates that Bo is confident and has reason to believe that Raj indeed fed the cat. Bo does not make any claim about the litterbox, likely because they are unsure whether it was cleaned or not. This indicates that Bo aims to provide truthful information based on reliable knowledge. By limiting the answer to information that is truthful and verified, Bo upholds the Maxim of Quality.

2.3.2.3 Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation (or also known as maxim of relevance) asks the speaker to say relevant information to the previous conveyed information. The speaker is not allowed to introduce unrelated topic in the middle of conversation. It is to ensure the topic doesn't go out of hand and each given information is related to the overall discussion. This maxim helps the listener to conclude the information by connecting the ideas logically and even involve in the exchange easily. It is also to avoid confusion and misinterpretation by the listener. The example is provided below:

A: Can you tell me the time?

B: Well, the milkman has come.

(Levinson, 1983)

B follows the Maxim of Relevance because the response, although indirect, still provides information related to A's question. A asks for the time, and instead of stating the exact hour, B says, “Well, the milkman has come.” This implies that the

milkman's arrival is a regular event that happens at a specific time, allowing A to infer the approximate time from that clue. The utterance is therefore contextually relevant, as it helps A obtain the needed information without directly stating it. By giving a response that contributes meaningfully to the topic of time, B maintains relevance in the conversation and upholds the Maxim of Relevance.

2.3.2.4 Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner shows how the clarity in communication is essential. This maxim emphasizes how the information is said. It suggests the speaker to organize their information in right order. They are also expected to provide straightforward information and present their ideas in a structured way that makes the listener able to understand their ideas easily. For instance, this maxim requires the speaker to give instructions in logical order than disorganized sentence to help listener easily catch up with the intended meaning. The purpose of following maxim of manner is to avoid ambiguity and obscurity. For example:

Aya : How do I properly wash my hands?
 Bo : Wet your hands with clean, running water. Turn off the tap, and apply soap. Lather your hands by rubbing them together with the soap. Lather the backs of your hands, between your fingers, and under your nails. Scrub your hands for at least 20 seconds. Rinse your hands well under clean, running water. Dry your hands using a clean towel or air dry them.

(Anderson et al., 2022)

Bo follows the Maxim of Manner because the answer is clear, detailed, and easy to follow. Bo explains the steps of washing hands in a logical order, starting from wetting the hands to drying them. The instructions are simple and direct, without any confusing or vague words. This makes the message easy to understand

for the listener. By being clear and well-organized, Bo's response follows the Maxim of Manner.

2.3.3 Maxim Violations

When people do not always follow the rules of maxim or fail to understand, observe, and apply it on daily conversation, it is called as a maxim violation (Grice, 1975). These violations can occur for so many reasons and on so many occasions, such as to hide or manipulate something, be polite, or just to create jokes. In some cases, maxim violations can also reveal the speaker's intentions or emotions. Identifying maxim violations helps us understand that a conversation may become less effective and clear due to the violations. Each type of maxim violations were discussed in the following section:

2.3.3.1 Maxim of Quantity Violation

The maxim of quantity violation occurs when a speaker gives either too much or too less information to the listener (Grice, 1975). Withholding or giving less information will create a confusion or misunderstanding, which then force the listener to ask for more clarification, while oversharing information will overwhelm the listener with many unimportant or unnecessary details. These both cases may disrupt the effectiveness and the clarity of the communication. The example as below:

Aya : Did Raj feed the cat and clean the litterbox?

Bo : He fed the cat.

(Anderson et al., 2022)

Bo's response violates the Maxim of Quantity because the information provided is incomplete. Aya's question asks about two actions, whether Raj fed the cat and cleaned the litterbox but, Bo only answers one part by saying, "He fed the cat." While this statement is true, it does not fully address the entire question, leaving out whether Raj cleaned the litterbox. According to the Maxim of Quantity, a speaker should make their contribution as informative as required for the purpose of the conversation. By giving less information than expected, Bo's response fails to meet this requirement and therefore violates the Maxim of Quantity.

2.3.3.2 Maxim of Quality Violation

Grice (1975) stated that the maxim of quality violation occurs when a speaker stated information which isn't based on fact nor able to provide adequate evidence. The speaker may already know that something is false yet still decide to convey it or claim something without any supporting proofs. Violating maxim of quality includes lying, exaggerating, or assuming something but presenting it as a fact. This kind of violations may lead to a breakdown of trust between speakers and listener, and even ruin the credibility of someone whom committing this violation. Violating this maxim may cause misunderstanding, spread misinformation, conflicts, and as mentioned before, the ruined credibility of a person. We can see from the example below:

A: Teheran's in Turkey isn't it, teacher?

B: And London's in Armenia I suppose.

(Levinson, 1983)

In this dialogue, the response violates the Maxim of Quality because B deliberately provides information that is false. When A mistakenly says that Teheran

is in Turkey, B replies with “And London’s in Armenia I suppose,” even though both speakers know that London is not in Armenia. B’s statement is not meant to convey factual information but to point out that A’s statement is incorrect. By saying something untrue to emphasize the inaccuracy of A’s remark, B’s utterance fails to meet the requirement of the Maxim of Quality, which states that a speaker should not say what they believe to be false.

2.3.3.3 Maxim of Relation Violation

Maxim of relation violation happens when the speaker neglects the relevancy of their statement to the topic of the conversation (Grice, 1975). It causes them to provide unrelated response or statements to the discussion which currently happens. It may happen when they want to avoid answering the given question intentionally or not, maybe due to misunderstanding and/or distraction. Violating the maxim of relation may cause confusion, bother the way conversation goes, or even signal that the speaker is lying, manipulating the conversation, or wanting to divert the topic or subject. The example as below:

A: I do think Mrs Jenkins is an old windbag, don't you?

B: Huh, lovely weather for March, isn't it?

(Levinson, 1983)

B’s utterance violates the Maxim of Relevance because it does not relate to A’s statement. A talks about Mrs. Jenkins and expects a response about her, while B suddenly comments on the weather. The topic of “lovely weather for March” has no connection to A’s remark about Mrs. Jenkins. Since B’s reply is off-topic and

unrelated to A's comment, it fails to maintain relevance in the conversation and therefore violates the Maxim of Relevance.

2.3.3.4 Maxim of Manner Violation

Grice (1975) stated that whenever a speaker uses confusing, ambiguous, vague, or unclear complicated language and cannot manage to organize their statements logically and in order, it means they are currently violating the maxim of manner. It can be seen if the speaker is long-winded explaining something with messy sequence that causes their statements difficult to understand and interpret. Therefore, violating the maxim of manner will lead to ineffective communication, confusion, ambiguity, and even misunderstanding since the listener is having a hard time trying to absorb the information or intended meaning from the speaker. For example:

- c. I don't know if this is clear at all, but I think the other car was reversing.
(Yule, 1996)

The speaker begins with "I don't know if this is clear at all," which signals uncertainty and possible lack of clarity in what follows. The Maxim of Manner requires speakers to be clear, orderly, and avoid obscurity or ambiguity. By expressing doubt about the clarity of their own statement, the speaker implies that the information may be confusing or not well-expressed. Although the speaker tries to be honest, the phrasing itself introduces vagueness, making the utterance less clear and thus violating the Maxim of Manner.

2.3.4 Reasons of Maxim Violations

According to Leech (1983), speakers may intentionally violate maxims for different social or strategic purposes rather than simply failing to communicate properly. Speakers may violate maxims to cooperate, defend themselves, disagree, or build positive relationships with others. This shows that breaking the rules of conversation is not always a mistake, but can be a deliberate choice based on the situation and the speaker's intentions. More information regarding Leech's theories on why a speaker violate maxims as below:

2.3.4.1 Competitive Reason

According to Leech (1983), competitive reason occurs when a speaker focuses on their own interests or goals in a conversation rather than prioritizing cooperation. This approach is often used to influence, control, or gain an advantage over the listener. It can be expressed through actions such as requesting, demanding, ordering, or asking in a way that asserts authority or secures a personal benefit. In this strategy, the speaker is more concerned with achieving their purpose than maintaining harmony or mutual understanding. Competitive reason often appears in situations where the stakes are high or the speaker wants to assert control, such as debates, negotiations, or formal interactions.

The utterance "*Can you pass the salt?*" (Brown & Levinson, 1978) can be an illustration of competitive function. This is because the speaker's main intention is to fulfil their own need rather than to exchange information or maintain interactional balance. Although the structure appears as a question, its actual purpose is to get the hearer to take a specific action, which is passing the salt. This

reveals that the speaker is prioritizing a personal goal and directing the hearer's behaviour to achieve it. The utterance therefore reflects a situation where language is used to influence or control the listener's response, which aligns with the competitive nature described by Leech (1983) in which the speaker's objective takes precedence over mutual cooperation.

2.3.4.2 Convivial Reason

Convivial reason occurs when a speaker aims to create friendliness or positive social feelings in a conversation (Leech, 1983). This strategy focuses on maintaining good relationships and expressing warmth toward the listener. This could be in a form of offering, inviting, thanking, congratulating, and greeting. Speakers using convivial reason may engage in praising, complimenting, encouraging, or showing agreement to strengthen social bonds. The main goal is not to assert authority or gain advantage, but to promote harmony and cooperation.

Yule (1996) says "*Congratulations!*" as an example of convivial utterance. The speaker's purpose in saying this utterance is to congratulate the listener. By expressing joy and appreciation for the listener's achievement, the speaker fosters a sense of goodwill and strengthens the interpersonal relationship. This aligns with the theory of Leech (1983) about the concept of convivial reason.

2.3.4.3 Collaborative Reason

Leech (1983) stated that collaborative reason occurs when a speaker aims to support cooperation and mutual understanding in a conversation. This strategy focuses on helping the listener and ensuring that communication is clear and effective. Speakers using collaborative reason may engage in clarifying, explaining,

suggesting, or confirming to assist the listener in understanding or achieving a goal. The main purpose is to maintain effective communication and cooperation rather than pursuing personal advantage. Collaborative reason is applied in situations where mutual understanding and smooth interaction are essential, such as legal proceedings or formal discussions.

The example from Yule (1996), "*Chomsky didn't write about peanuts*" illustrates the collaborative function. This utterance is a neutral and informational statement. The speaker provides clarification or correction to ensure the listener's understanding of factual information. The statement reflects the collaborative nature of communication, as it focuses on maintaining clarity and shared understanding between interlocutors. This is in line with the statement of Leech (1983) about the concept of collaborative reason.

2.3.4.4 Conflictive Reason

Conflictive reason occurs when a speaker communicates in a way that expresses disagreement or challenges the listener (Leech, 1983). The main focus is on opposing or confronting rather than cooperating or maintaining mutual understanding. This strategy can involve actions such as threats, accusations, curses, insult, or reprimands, which are used to assert a position or defend an argument. It is typically found in formal or high-stakes situations, such as courtroom proceedings or debates, where clearly stating and supporting one's argument is essential.

The utterance "*You're dumber than a rock*" by Yule (1996) is a great example of conflictive reason behind a statement. Through this expression, the

speaker directly insults the listener with the intention of attacking or belittling them. The speaker shows mockery that could lead to anger or disagreement. It creates tension instead of understanding. This illustrates how conflictive reason functions as a way to express opposition and confront the listener rather than maintaining harmony.

2.3.5 Context of Situation

Halliday & Hasan (1985) introduced the concept of context of situation to explain how language is shaped by the circumstances in which it is used. They argue that understanding an utterance fully requires knowing not only the words themselves, but also the social and situational factors surrounding the communication. By analyzing the context, researchers can understand better on why certain choices in language are made. This concept provides a framework for examining communication more deeply, showing how meaning is constructed not just by grammar and vocabulary but also by the situation in which interaction occurs. Context of situation includes aspects such as who is speaking, to whom, about what, and in what setting, which all influence how language is interpreted and understood. These aspects are identified by Halliday (1985) as field, tenor, and mode.

2.3.5.1 Field

Field refers to what is happening in the communication, it can be the subject, topic, or activity being carried out (Halliday & Hasan, 1985). It focuses on the purpose and content of the interaction, answering the question: "*What is this conversation about?*" Understanding the field helps identify why certain language

choices are made, including the type of information emphasized or omitted. In a formal context like a courtroom, the field would include legal matters, testimony, and evidence presentation, which influence the speaker's utterances and the way they communicate. By analyzing the field, researchers can better understand the relevance and appropriateness of what is said in a given situation.

2.3.5.2 Tenor

Halliday & Hasan (1985) identified tenor as the participants in the communication and their relationships. It focuses on who is speaking, who is being addressed, and the social roles and status between them. Understanding tenor helps explain why speakers choose certain language forms, levels of politeness, or tones of expression. It shows how the relationship between participants influences communication, including how formal or informal, direct or indirect, the interaction might be. By analyzing tenor, researchers can better understand the social dynamics that shape language use and the choices speakers make in their utterances.

2.3.5.3 Mode

According to Halliday & Hasan (1985), mode refers to how a message is delivered in a communication, including the form and channel used. It looks at whether the communication is spoken or written, formal or informal, and the way participants interact with each other. Mode also considers the structure of the communication, such as whether it is interactive or one-way, and the types of language choices that suit the situation. Understanding mode helps explain why speakers choose certain words, sentence structures, or ways of expressing

themselves. It shows how the form of communication affects how messages are created, shared, and understood.

