



VIOLATION OF GRICEAN MAXIM IN SUCCEEDING CONVERSATION IN DEDDY CORBUZIER'S PODCAST WITH NADIEM MAKARIM: A PRAGMATIC STUDY

Ade Lativa Fitri^{1*}, Mahyuni², Lalu Jaswadi Putera³

English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of
Mataram, Indonesia.

*Corresponding Author: adelativafitri@gmail.com

Abstract: This study was aimed to identify and describe the types of violation of Gricean Maxim, and determine the violation strategy in succeeding conversation in Deddy Corbuzier's podcast with Nadiem Makarim. This study was conducted by implementing qualitative ethnomethodology approach. The results of this study are in the conversation between Deddy Corbuzier and Nadiem Makarim. Four types of violation of Gricean Maxim were found in the conversation with the total of 29 violations. The most dominant type of violation in the conversation are violation of maxim of quantity and maxim of manner with the total of 11 violations in each type. All violations of Gricean Maxim found succeeded the conversation by implementing humor and politeness strategy. Out of 29 violations, 28 violations used politeness strategy. This study shows that violation of Gricean Maxim can be found in non-formal concersation, such as conversation in podcast. This study also reflects that violating Gricean Maxim does not always mean a speaker wants to fail a conversation. A speaker can still succeed conversation while violating Gricean Maxim by applying certain strategies to obtain shared understanding between the speaker and the listener.

Keywords: *Pragmatics, Gricean Maxim, Violation of Maxim, Humor, Politeness, Podcast*

INTRODUCTION

As social beings, humans communicate in order to fulfill their needs. According to Bara (2011), communication is a reciprocal activity of sharing messages between two or more people. In order to communicate successfully, humans maintain a certain mode of interaction that is using effective utterances.

In pragmatics, this certain mode of interaction is called as *Cooperative Principle* developed by a British philosopher and linguist, Herbert Paul Grice. Cooperative means that a speaker is expected to be informative, truthful, relevant and clear which means each participant is expected to give contribution in a conversation as required. Grice, in a book of '*Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Arts*' (1975:45), formulated this principle as follows:

Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

In Cooperative Principle, there is a set of maxim of conversation that should be observed by a speaker who follows this principle, called the Gricean Maxim (Grice, 1975:45-47). Gricean Maxim consists of (1) maxim of quantity, in which a speaker has to be informative; (2) maxim of quality, in which a speaker has to tell the truth or something that can be proved; (3) maxim of relevance, in which a speaker has to be relevant to the topics; (4) maxim of manner, in which a speaker has to be brief and avoid ambiguity. Following these maxims helps a speaker to produce effective response so that they will be easily understood. Following these maxims also mean that a speaker provides explicit meaning, which refers to an actual meaning.

However, sometimes a speaker does not follow the maxims. A speaker breaks the rule and produces responses that do not fulfill or obey the maxims for certain purpose, which is called violation of Gricean Maxim (Grice, 1975:49). However, violating Gricean Maxim does not always mean that a speaker wants to fail a conversation. Since a speaker may violate maxims for certain purpose, violation can sometimes intentionally be done as a strategy to succeed a conversation in certain way, such as presenting humor and being polite. As a speaker presents humor, a conversation will be more alive and entertaining, meanwhile as a speaker obeys politeness, a listener will feel respected and the feeling will encourage them to keep the conversation on. This maxim of conversation and violation of Gricean Maxim can be found in any type of conversation, such as non-formal conversation in podcast. Podcast may involve a speaker and a listener who communicate face-to-face in which both parties express messages directly. Different from daily conversation, the speaker and the listener in podcast usually have certain topics dealt to discuss and the conversation is uploaded on the internet in the form of audio file. However, conversation in a podcast is still similar to daily conversation since it is conducted in casual way. Nowadays, podcast is sometimes not only an audio but also visual and audio and it now hugely happen on youtube platform.

Deddy Co is the biggest Indonesian podcast channel on youtube with more than nineteen million subscribers and million viewers on each episode of his podcast. He is known as a podcaster who succeeds to bring lots of Indonesian famous politicians in to his podcast. Two episodes of his podcast with the Indonesian Minister of Education, Nadiem Ma, were his first episodes with a politician. They are entitled '*Nadiem Ma: Ujian Nasional Itu Diskriminasi!*' or in English stated as '*Nadiem Ma: National Exam is A Discrimination!*' (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SL_L4c5hJgc) which will be labeled as *first episode* reaching two point five millions viewers and '*Kuliah Gak Penting! (Kasih Ortu Kalian Nonton)*' or in English stated as '*College Study is not Important! (Let Your Parents Watch)*' (<https://youtu.be/RO-RBSfxZ0M>) which will be labeled as *second episode*, reaching five point five millions viewers. The two parties are also labeled as Co for Co and Ma for Ma. Researcher has watched the episodes and found several examples of speakers following and violating Gricean Maxim. The example of following the maxim.

The reason this study is conducted because the researcher wants to observe what type of violation occurred in the conversation and how both parties, Co and Ma, succeeded the conversation in podcast by violating Gricean Maxim. These two episodes are the beginning of the podcast's success to attract other politicians to come. In these episodes, viewers are able to see how politicians, who has position in government and usually speak in formal forum, finally speak in a casual opportunity with a celebrity who is used to hosting a podcast and a talk show. This becomes more interesting because these episodes starring Ma, whose educational background is master of business administration and was a CEO of one of the biggest startup companies in Indonesia, talked as the Indonesian Minister of Education about the ministry's policy related to national exam, honorary teacher, and many more about education.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study will be conducted by using qualitative ethnomethodology approach. According to Moleong (2005), qualitative analysis is an analysis which comprehends the phenomena perceived by the candidates such as behavior, perception, motivation, action; holistically and describes it through words and language. Creswell (1998: 21) states, “In the qualitative method, the researcher plays as the main instrument of the data collection that compiles words, analyzes inductively, and observes the utterances delivered by the speakers.” Meanwhile ethnomethodology’s interest is in how ordinary people make sense their social world. This theory, introduced by Harold Grafinkel (1967), has a clear characteristic in which he sees that nothing has fixed meaning and things depend on the context. He stated, “Ethnomethodology studies analyze everyday activities as members’ methods for making those same activities visibly-rationaland-reportable-for-all-practical-purposes, i.e., áccountable’as organization of commonplace everyday activities.”

The source of the data is Deddy Corbuzier’s podcast with Nadiem Makarim entitled ‘*Nadiem Makarim: Ujian Nasional Itu Diskriminasi!*’ and ‘*Kuliah Gak Penting! (Kasih Ortu Kalian Nonton)*’. The data will be the conversation between Deddy Corbuzier and Nadiem Makarim. The data collected will be interpreted to know the types of violation occurred and the interpreted data will be deepened to know how the violations succeeded the conversation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

1. Type of Violation in Conversation

There are 337 utterances produced in the conversation in two episodes of podcast, which are 179 utterances found in the first episode consisting of 89 utterances produced by Co and 89 utterances produced by Ma; and 158 utterances found in the second episode consisting of 79 utterances produced by Co and 79 utterances produced by Ma. From 337 utterances, this study collected 29 data of violation of Gricean Maxim as can be seen in the tables below:

Types of Violation/Speaker	Co	Ma	Total
Maxim of Quantity	2	6	8
Maxim of Quality	0	2	2
Maxim of Relevance	1	1	2
Maxim of Manner	2	7	9
Total	5	16	21

Table 4.1.1. Types of Violation of Gricean Maxim in the first episode of podcast.

Type of Violation/Speaker	Co	Ma	Total
Maxim of Quantity	0	3	3
Maxim of Quality	0	0	0
Maxim of Relevance	2	1	3
Maxim of Manner	0	2	2
Total	2	6	8

Table 4.1.2. Types of Violation of Gricean Maxim in the first episode of podcast.

Based on the tables above, the violation of Gricean Maxim are more found in the first episode than the second episode of the podcast which are 21 violations and 8 violations. In each episode, Ma is the speaker who violated more maxim than Co. In the first episode, he violated 16 maxims and in the second episode, he violated 6 maxims. However, the type of maxim most violated by the speakers is different from one episode to another. The first episode shows maxim of manner as the type of maxim that was most violated with the total of 9 violations occurred, meanwhile the second episode shows maxim of quantity and maxim of relevance as the most violated maxims with the total of 3 violations occurred in each type of maxim. There is also type of maxim that was not violated by certain speaker, that is Co never violated maxim of quality. Therefore, the total of the presence of each violation are 11 violations of maxim of quantity, 2 violations of maxim of quality, 5 violations of maxim of relevance and 11 violations of maxim of manner.

This study found that these violations did not always occur in different dialogue. There were some dialogues violating more than one maxim.

2. Violation Strategy in Succeeding Conversation

This study also found that each type of violation in the conversation was done by implementing certain strategy to succeed conversation, they are creating humor and being polite. From the 29 data of violation of Gricean Maxim, the study found only 1 data that used strategy of creating humor and it specifically used the theory by Taghiyev which is lexical-semantic ambiguity. Meanwhile the strategy of being polite was found in the rest of violation occurred. The strategy of being polite appeared in the violation is *off the record* strategy. Off the record strategy has 15 types of strategy. Some violations applied more than one type of *off the record* strategy.

Discussion

1. Type of Violation in Conversation

Violation of Maxim of Quantity

To obey maxim of quantity, a speaker is expected to give enough information, no more and no less. Violating this maxim means the speaker gives more or less information than is required. This study found 11 violations of maxim of quantity in the conversation in Deddy Co's podcast.

Dialogue 1

Ma: Halo, Mas Deddy. Apa kabar? (Hello, Deddy. How are you?)

Co: **Apa kabar, bro?** Lu nggak tidur ya? (**How are you, bro?** You did not sleep, did you?)

Source: The first episode of Deddy Co's podcast with Nadiem Ma

In western culture, saying *how are you?* does not always mean asking someone's condition, it can be a statement to open a conversation like *hi* or *hello*. The utterance of *apa kabar?* can be even translated into *how do you do?* which can be replied with *how do you do?* too. However, in Indonesia, saying *apa kabar?* should culturally be replied with some response such as *kabar baik* which means *I am fine*. This fact is in line with Cline (2006), cited from *An Analysis of Gricean Maxim's Violation in Daily Conversation* (2016) by Fahmi Rizal, who states that cultural values system influence discourse patterns and promote different communicative styles. This cultural background is a context that makes the conversation makes sense as what is stated in the approach of ethnomethodology. This sense of conversation also shows that a speaker produces utterance required. However, on this conversation, Ma asked Co's condition, but Co replied with same utterance which means he did not give enough information that was required by Ma Giving no enough information means that the speaker was not being informative. This dialogue against the rule of Gricean Maxim in which the speaker is required to be informative by not giving less or more information than is required. This means Co, according to Grice, violated maxim of quantity.

Violation of Maxim of Quality

To obey maxim of quality, a speaker is expected to be truthful in giving the information. Violating this maxim means that the speaker tells lies or refuses to give information. The study found 2 violations of maxim of quality in the conversation of maxim of quality.

Dialogue 1

Co: Kenapa lu mikir lu bisa ngerubah ini semua? Why? Why do you think? (Why do you think you can change this all? Why? Why do you think?)

Ma: Yah... **banyak alasan** (Yea... **many reasons**)

Source: The first episode of Deddy Co's podcast with Nadiem Ma

As mentioned in the previous data, according to Collin Dictionary, *why* question requires the speaker to speak about reasons of the issue discussed. The context is that Co and Ma talked about Ministry of Education's innovation in solving educational problems in Indonesia. Co asked Ma about his reason of why he thinks his innovation is able to make a change. This question required Ma to mention or explain his reason to make sense the conversation. However, Ma refused to give the information that he just replied with *many reasons*. The fact that the question was about himself and he replied with that response shows that he definitely knew the answer but refused to answer. According to Gricean Maxim theory, refusing to give information means he violated maxim of quality.

Violation of Maxim of Relevance

To obey maxim of relevance, speaker is expected to be relevant to what has been said by the other speaker before. Violating this maxim means that the speaker produces utterances that are not relevant to what has been said before. This study found 5 violations of maxim of relevance in the conversation in Deddy Co's podcast.

Dialogue 1

Co: Ngapain ada orang bunuh diri live? (Why would people do live suicide online?)

Ma: **Sedih (That's sad)**

Source: The second episode of Deddy Co's podcast with Nadiem Ma

According to Collin Dictionary, the word *why* in a question sentence is an adverb that requires an answer containing a reason of something. Therefore, it is understood that Co asked Ma about the reason people live on social media while committing to

suicide. It would have made sense if Ma had replied with mentioning or explaining a reason or more. However, Ma did not reply by answering with relevant utterance. He instead expressed his feeling towards the issue which was not the point they talked about in the middle of discussing the reason behind the phenomenon occurred. Therefore, Ma did not give relevant reply that was required by Co. In the theory of Gricean Maxim, the speaker is required to give relevant answer to what has been said by the previous speaker. This irrelevant answer produced by Ma shows that he violated the maxim of relevance. This also shows that one dialogue can violate more than one maxim as it also violated the previous type of maxim which is maxim of quantity.

Violation of Maxim of Manner

To obey maxim of manner, a speaker is expected to be clear and brief. Violating this maxim means that the speaker produces utterances that are not clear, not brief, and ambiguous. The study found 11 violations of maxim of manner in the conversation in Deddy Co's podcast.

Dialogue 1

Co: Lu nggak tidur ya? (You did not sleep, did you?)

Ma: **Ya susah-susah tidur-tidur gitu lah, tapi semangat sih (Yea, it was hard but I am excited)**

Source: The first episode of Deddy Co's podcast with Nadiem Ma

In this dialogue, Co asked Ma for a confirmation if he did not sleep. This indicates by emphasis at the end of the sentence with *ya* or *did you?* This required an answer of yes or no by Ma to show whether it was true or not. However, Ma replied that he was hard to sleep but he is excited. This information is not clear and ambiguous because it might mean that he did not sleep because he was hard to sleep or he eventually slept after feeling so hard to sleep that led him to have sleep deprivation; he said he is excited as his current condition instead. Not giving easily understood utterance contrasts the rule of Gricean Maxim in which the speaker is required to give clear and brief utterance. By saying this, Ma is considered violated maxim of manner.

2. Violation Strategy in Succeeding Conversation

Violations of Maxim of Quantity

Dialogue 1

Ma: Halo, Mas Deddy. Apa kabar? (Hello, Deddy. How are you?)

Co: **Apa kabar, bro?** Lu nggak tidur ya? (**How are you, bro?** You did not sleep, did you?)

Source: The first episode of Deddy Co's podcast with Nadiem Ma

As Co did not give enough information, Ma should not have understood Co. However, there was no conflict happened because of misunderstanding. It is because they were supposed to meet and have conversation before the camera rolling. Therefore, the word "*apa kabar?*" or "*how are you?*" produced by Ma and Co is a form of politeness to start a conversation in a podcast by implementing *off the record* strategy of using rhetorical question in which the speaker does not require to give an answer. This shows that the dialogue of the conversation is considered success since the two parties understand each other and no conflict occurred.

Violations of Maxim of Quality

Dialogue 1

Co: Kenapa lu mikir lu bisa ngerubah ini semua? Why? Why do you think? (Why do you think you can change this all? Why? Why do you think?)

Ma: Yah... **banyak alasan** (Yea... **many reasons**)

Source: The first episode of Deddy Co's podcast with Nadiem Ma

The question was about Ma himself which indicated he should have known the answer. However, instead of mentioning or explaining the answer, he chose to refuse to give information to protect his own face. This made both parties successfully avoided the conflict. Therefore, it shows that he succeeded the conversation by using politeness strategy of understating the information.

Violations of Maxim of Relevance

Dialogue 1

Co: Ngapain ada orang bunuh diri live? (Why would people do live suicide online?)

Ma: **Sedih (That's sad)**

Source: The second episode of Deddy Co's podcast with Nadiem Ma

According to Collin Dictionary, the word *why* in a question sentence is an adverb that requires an answer containing a reason of something. Therefore, it is understood that Co asked Ma about the reason people live on social media while committing to suicide. It would have made sense if Ma had replied with mentioning or explaining a reason or more. However, Ma did not reply by answering with relevant utterance. He instead expressed his feeling towards the issue which was not the point they talked about in the middle of discussing the reason behind the phenomenon occurred. This possibly because he wanted to protect the faces of those who committed to suicide. So instead of misunderstood the utterance, Co and Ma successfully avoided the conflict and understood each other which indicated by next utterance produced in which Co replied with *very sad* which is the agreement of Ma's utterance. Therefore, Ma and Co succeeded the conversation in which Ma showed politeness in responding Co by giving an understatement.

Violations of Maxim of Manner

Dialogue 1

Co: Lu nggak tidur ya? (You did not sleep, did you?)

Ma: **Ya susah-susah tidur-tidur gitu lah, tapi semangat sih (Yea, it was hard but I am excited)**

Source: The first episode of Deddy Co's podcast with Nadiem Ma

In this dialogue, Co asked Ma for a confirmation if he did not sleep. This indicates by emphasis at the end of the sentence with *ya* or *did you?* This required an answer of yes or no by Ma to show whether it was true or not. However, Ma replied that he was hard to sleep but he is excited. This information is not clear and ambiguous because it might mean that he did not sleep because he was hard to sleep or he eventually slept after feeling so hard to sleep that led him to have sleep deprivation; he said he is excited as his current condition instead. This happened because Ma wanted to protect Co's face who had invited him, thus, he would not get offended. Therefore, instead of creating conflict, Ma's ambiguous utterance is one of the politeness strategies he had done in the conversation to show his respect towards Co who had invited him to the podcast by not giving clear answer and saying he is excited instead. In the other hand, it is considered that they succeeded the conversation

CONCLUSIONS

Gricean Maxim is the guidance for speakers to produce effective utterances so that both speaker and listener will easily understand each other and avoid conflict. However, the violation of Gricean Maxim can happen in any type of conversation, including casual conversation in a podcast. This study found 4 types of violations occurred in the conversation which consists of 11 violations of maxim of quantity, 2 violations of maxim of quality, 5 violation of maxim of relevance and 11 violations of maxim of manner throughout 337 utterances. The study found that Ma is a speaker who violated the maxim the most with violation of maxim of quantity and violation of maxim of manner as the most violated maxim done by Ma. Besides, the study also

found that one dialogue may violate more than one maxim, such as a dialogue violates maxim of quantity and maxim of quality at once.

However, speakers do not always violate the maxim to fail the conversation. Based on the study, this study found that there were two strategies speakers used in succeeding conversation while violating the maxim, they are creating humor and being polite. Out of 29 violations, there was only one violation used humor strategy of lexical-semantic ambiguity and 28 violations used politeness strategy of off the record. This study also found that some violations could have applied more than one type of off the record strategy in its violation. Instead of failing the conversation, these strategies are used to protect someone's face, avoid conflict and to be more entertaining. This concludes that violating Gricean Maxim can also succeed a conversation.

REFERENCES

Bara, B. G. 2011. *Cognitive Pragmatics: The Mental Process of Communication*

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Collins Dictionary. (Accessed on 31.07.2023).
<https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/why>

Co, D. 2020. Nadiem Ma: Ujian Nasional Itu Diskriminasi! (Accessed on 5,5, 2021)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SL_L4c5hJgc

Co, D. 2020. Kuliah Gak Penting! (Kasih Ortu Kalian Nonton) (Accessed on 5,5, 2021)
(<https://youtu.be/RO-RBSfxZ0M>)

Creswell, J.W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. London: Sage Publications

Garfinkel, H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. USA: Prentice-Hall. Inc

Grice, H.P. 1975. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Arts*. "Logic and Conversation, 41-58

Meleong. 2005. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Re,aja Rosdakarya

Taghiyev, I.A. 2018. *The Structural Syntactic Ambiguity and Supra Segmental Means*. Azerbaijan: Khazar University