



**THE MAXIM VIOLATIONS OF BARACK OBAMA'S
UTTERANCE IN INTERVIEW WITH CLAUS KLEBER
ABOUT SPY INTELLIGENCE**

A THESIS

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for S-1 Degree
Majoring Linguistics in English Department Faculty of Humanities
Diponegoro University

**Written by:
Aisha Mentari
13020111140123**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG
2018**

PRONOUNCEMENT

The writer states truthfully that this thesis is written by herself without taking the results from other researches in any university, in S-1, S-2, and S-3 degree and diploma. In addition, the witer ascertains that she does not take the material from other publications or someone's work except for the references mentioned in the bibliography.

Semarang, June 2018

Aisha Mentari

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

Sometimes Allah allows you to taste bitterness of this world so that you could fully appreciate the sweetness of faith.

Omar Suleiman

A winner is a dreamer who never gives up.

Nelson Mandela

This thesis is dedicated to my beloved family and everyone who had contributed to the completion of this thesis.

APPROVAL

**The Maxim Violations of Barack Obama's Utterance in Interview
with Claus Kleber about Spy Intelligence**

Written by:

Aisha Mentari

13020111140123

is approved by thesis advisor

on July 9th 2018

Thesis Advisor,

Drs. Mualimin, M. Hum.

NIP. 196111101987101001

The Head of the English Department,

Dr. Agus Subiyanto, M.A.

NIP. 196408141990011001

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata 1 Thesis Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanity Diponegoro University

On 9th of August 2018

Chair Person

Dwi Wulandari, S. S., M.A.
NIP. 197610042001122001

Second Member

Drs. Agus Subiyanto, M. A.
NIP.196408141990011001

First Member

Ayu Ida Savitri, S. S., M. Hum.
NIP. 197908222008012013

Third Member

Dra. R. Aj. Atrinawati, M.Hum.
NIP.196101011990012001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise be to the God, who always gives strength and spirit to the writer so that this thesis on “The Maxim Violations of Barack Obama’s Utterance in Interview with Claus Kleber about Spy Intelligence” came to a completion. On this occasion, the writer would like to thank everybody who had made their contribution to the completion of this final project.

The deepest gratitude and appreciation is extended to Drs. Mualimin, M. Hum., as the writer’s advisor, who had given his continuous guidance, helpful correction, moral support, advice and suggestion without which it is doubtful that this final project came into completion. The writer’s deepest thanks also goes to the following persons:

1. Dr. Redyanto M. Noor, M.Hum., the Dean of Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University.
2. Drs. Agus Subiyanto, M.A., the head of English Studies Program, Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University.
3. All of the distinguished lecturers at the English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University who had shared their precious knowledge and experiences.
4. The writer’s beloved family. Thank you for the endless love, pray, and support.
5. Starbucks Semarang partners, especially the writer’s store manager, Yossy Aryani, for always supporting and helping the writer.
6. Special thanks to Himawan Setyanto, for all the time we spent.

7. Sasing Undip 2011, for fighting together with the writer.

The writer realizes that this final project is still far from perfect. The writer, therefore, will be glad to receive any constructive criticism and recommendation to make this thesis better. Finally, the writer hopes that this thesis will be useful to the reader who wishes to learn something about maxim violation.

Semarang, June 2018

Aisha Mentari

TABLE OF CONTENT

PRONOUNCEMENT	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION	iii
APPROVAL	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENT	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER 1	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Research Question	3
1.3 Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.4 Previous Study.....	3
1.5 The Organization of the Writing	5
CHAPTER 2	7
2.1 Pragmatics	7
2.2 Context	9
2.3 The Gricean Maxim.....	10
2.4 Definition of Maxim Violation.....	16
2.5 Non-Observances of Gricean Maxims	17
CHAPTER 3	21
3.1 Research Design	21
3.2 Data (Population and Samples)	22
3.3 Method of Data Collection	23
CHAPTER 4	25
4.1 Maxim of Quantity Violation.....	25
4.2 Maxim of Quality Violation.....	29
4.3 Maxim of Relevance Violation	32
4.4 Maxim of Manner Violation	36
CHAPTER 5	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY	39

ABSTRAK

Cooperative principles memiliki peran yang penting dalam komunikasi, salah satu unsurnya adalah sebagai panduan dalam berkomunikasi. Penulis tertarik untuk menganalisa *cooperative principles maxims* yang terdapat dalam wawancara Ppresiden Barack Obama dan Claus Kleber. Tesis ini bertujuan untuk mencari tahu *maxims* apa saja yang dilanggar oleh Barack Obama. Data dikumpulkan menggunakan teknik dokumentasi. Kemudian diolah menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Data tersebut kemudian dianalisa menggunakan teori *conversational maxims* oleh Grice. Hasil analisa menunjukkan empat jenis pelanggaran *maxim* yang dilakukan oleh Barack Obama untuk mencapai maksud tertentu.

Kata kunci: cooperative principles, maxims, pelanggaran, wawancara

ABSTRACT

Cooperative principle plays an important role in guiding people's communication. The writer is interested in analyzing the maxims violation in an interview between USA President, Barack Obama, and Claus Kleber. It is aimed at finding out which maxims are violated by Barack's Obama. The data were collected using documentation technique, which were then processed by employing qualitative method. It is then analyzed by using Grice's theory of cooperative principle. The result shows that there are four kinds of maxim violations done by Barack Obama for getting particular purposes.

Key words: Cooperative principle, maxims, violation interview

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

An ideal communication is expected to follow a general idea about communication. The general idea states that people involved in a conversation will cooperate with each other. This cooperation can be manifested in several ways (Leech, 1993). First, people are expected to be as informative as required and avoid the contrary action. Second, people are expected to say something they believe to be true along with the accuracy of the information given. Third, people are expected to avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity and labor the point. However, in daily conversation this ideal communication does not always occur for some reasons. For politeness reason, for example, some people choose to break the rule of being informative as required. Instead, they tend to give as much as information they have.

On the other hand, due to their lack of investigation and lack of knowledge people may in turn give wrong information to others, information which they are sure about its truth value. It also occurs that people sometime want to avoid being relevant in conversation since they assume that the listeners have already known what they mean or they deliberately choose to lie. The violation of mutual cooperation between interlocutors in communication may lead to what so called 'implicature'. Implicature is the process when people fail to cooperate in their exchange. In this process, speakers imply something in their utterances which

require the listener to catch those implications by scrutinizing the context of situation that elicits such utterances. Barnwell (1980:18) says that “The function of language is to communicate meaning of various kinds.” However, people can also see that in languages there are sense and force where they can show what people are saying and what the meaning of their utterances are. When people notice someone speaking, or they realize that he or she is talking, they observe that he or she sometimes is not only talking but also referring to his or her implication.

The goal of learning speaking is that the students are able to communicate English orally. Learners should be able to make themselves understood by using their current proficiency. According to Thornbury (2005:1), speaking is becoming part of our daily life that we take for granted. As a medium of communication, speaking is not an easy skill. It is more complicated than what it seems at first and involves more than just pronouncing words, also how people use it in communication. People assume that normal conversation should follow these rules, they try to infer the underlying meaning of utterances in which the maxims are violated. According to Grice (1989:29), our talk exchanges are characteristically to some degrees at least cooperative, a common purpose or set of purpose.

This study is important to be conducted in order to investigate the violation of principle of being cooperative in an interview especially when it is dealing with sensitive issue, such as the role of Barack Obama as the president and his contribution as the world peacemaker. Through this research, the writer expects to

learn Barack Obama's goals behind the language he uses in the interview with Claus Kleber about spy intelligence.

1.2 Research Question

Based on the background of the study above, the questions in this study can be stated as follows.

1. What kinds of maxim were violated by Barack Obama in the interview?
2. What are the implied meaning of the violated maxims?

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The objectives of the study can be stated into several sentences below.

1. To find out the type of of maxim that Barack Obama violated in the interview.
2. To describe the meanings implied through violating the maxims.

1.4 Previous Study

Studies about Grice's maxims have been done many times. Study on maxim becomes an interesting topic because many people use the maxims and even violate them if they are not comfortable with the situation when speaking. The writer has found five studies that brought up Grice's maxim violation as the topic.

The first previous study is from Wellman Kondowe (2014) who conducts a study which analyzes 20 political cartoons selected from The Nation newspaper in Malay. The researcher uses Grice's conversational implicature to analyze the data.

The finding of the analysis shows that Malawi cartoonist oftentimes fails to observe conversational maxims by flouting, suspending, and opting out.

In another study, Gultom (2013) studies the violation of cooperative principle in the cartoon in Kompas. The study analyzes 68 cartoons within the framework of Grice's implicature theory. The result of the study shows that 12 cartoons violate the maxim of quality and 25 cartoons violate the maxim quantity.

Another research is "Gricean's Maxim on Investigation Report (Case Study of Corruption in District Attorney of Demak)" by F. Antares Hutomo Putro uses the theory of Grice's Cooperative Principle and Searle's Speech Act. He identifies the purpose why the maxims are violated and kind of speech act like declarations, representative, expressive, directives, and commissives that are used as long as the investigation. Maxim and speech act are not suitable to assimilate in one study.

The fourth research is conducted by Copkava (Masaryk University, 2012) focusing on pragmatic principles and humor in "The IT Crowd". The researcher aimed this final project to explore verbal humor used in the British sitcom "The IT Crowd" from a pragmatic point of view. It focused on humorous instances created by non-observance of the Gricean Cooperative Principle and the Politeness Principle proposed by Geoffrey Leech. All maxims of these principles are taken into consideration in the analysis of humorous instances in "The IT Crowd". This research became the supporting reference to reveal the use of politeness principle to raise humor as well as in this research.

Another research is entitled "Conversational Principles of the Fraudulence Case Court Session in the District Law Court of Semarang" by Agus Nugroho. He

uses Grice's Cooperative Principle and Leech's Politeness principles. Again, cooperative principle and politeness principle are not suitable to be conducted in one study because they have no relation. In this study, the writer will focus on Grice's Maxim and associate it with implicature because maxim and implicature are interrelated.

The last research on Gricean Maxim also found in Timotius Bintang Adhiputra's research entitled "Violations Against the Pragmatic Principles in Editorial Cartoon Panji Koming". Similar to F. Antares Hutomo Putro's study, he uses the theory of cooperative principles and politeness principles. In his study, he tried to find out the deviation on Grice's cooperative principles and Leech's politeness principles.

Apart from the above researches, this study will be different from those mentioned studies before because in this study the writer uses the theory of cooperative principles and implicature, therefore, the study is more specific in all the four of Grice's maxims and the implicatures that appear because of the maxim violations.

1.5 The Organization of the Writing

This research is arranged in order to be systematic as follows:

Chapter I INTRODUCTION

It shows the topic and the problems that will be discussed in the thesis. It contains background of the study, research question, purpose of the study, previous study, and organization of the study.

Chapter II THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

It shows some theories related to the topic that will be used to analyze the data. It consists of pragmatics theory, cooperative principle theory, and implicature theory.

Chapter III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

It shows the data of the research. It consist of types of research, data source, population, sample, method of collecting data, and method of analyzing data.

Chapter IV DATA ANALYSIS

It shows the deep analysis about the data and also the explanations of the data described in chapter II. It consists of findings and discussion.

Chapter V CONCLUSION

It shows the results of the study that come from the analysis of the data by the writer.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this study about the violation of maxim and the appearance of implicature that are used by Barack Obama in answering the question about US Intelligence, the writer found some related theories that can be used as the concept to help analyzing the problems.

2.1 Pragmatics

According to Yule (1996:3), pragmatic is the study of the relationship between linguistics forms and the users of those forms. It can be understood, firstly, as the study of speaker meaning. It means that pragmatic is concerned with the study of meaning such as words that are communicated by a speaker or writer, and interpreted by a listener or a reader. In addition, it is related with what people mean by their utterances in communication and how they receive or interpret the utterances. Pragmatic is also study the contextual meaning in which it is concerned with how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with whom they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstance.

Pragmatics can help to analyze the word meaning within context. Furthermore, pragmatics is considered as the study how more gets communicated than is said. It deals with how listeners can arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. According to Brown and Yule (1983:27), pragmatics also analyzes the part of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of both physical and social world, and socio-psychological factor influencing

communication, as well as the knowledge of the time and place in which the words are uttered or written. Interpreting one's meaning, it depends on assumptions of knowledge that are shared by both the speaker or writer and listener or reader.

The linguistic message is constructed by the speaker or writer. Both infer the meaning. Here, there are some kinds of context:

1. The situational context

It is the situation where the interaction is taking place at the moment of speaking.

2. The background knowledge of context

It deals with that both the writer and reader know each other and world. It can be seen in forms of:

- a. Cultural general knowledge, which most people carry with them in their minds, such as about the areas of life.
- b. Interpersonal knowledge, which is kind of specific and possibly private knowledge about the speakers themselves.

Another linguist who also defined pragmatics is Leech (1983: 6). He stated that "Pragmatics is the study of meaning related to speech situation". Pragmatics is the study of the relation of sign to interpreters. Thus, pragmatic is the study of how interpreters engage in the "taking-account of" designate (the construction of interpretants) of sign-vehicles. Pragmatics explores the relationship between meaning, context, and communication. So in this analysis the researcher tries to study of meaning in that conversation.

It is not hard to see why one should look to conversation for insight into pragmatic phenomena, for conversation is clearly the prototypical kind of language usage, the form in which we are all first exposed to language.

2.2 Context

For being able to understand the meaning of an utterance, one cannot ignore the context surrounding since it is very important in interpretation of a sentence. If the context surrounding is ignored, there might appear different interpretation from what is intended.

The importance of context in language can be seen from the opinion of Levinson (1983:24) says, “Pragmatics is the study of the ability of language user to pair sentences with the context in which they would be appropriate”. In addition, Leech (1983:13) states that context deals with the relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of an utterance. Context is a background knowledge, which is showed by the speaker and the hearer in understanding their utterances.

Furthermore, Malinowsky (in Halliday and Hassan, 1985:6-7) states that there are two notions of context, namely context of situation and context of culture, playing an important role in the interpretation of meaning. Context of situation is the situation in which the text is uttered, meanwhile context of culture is the cultural background or history behind the participants.

Context includes situation in which the speech is uttered. It can include participants or people who are involved in speech, time, place, social environment, political condition, etc. Meanwhile, Firth (in Halliday and Hassan,

1985:8) gives a description of context called context of situation, which consist of:

1. The participant in the situation referring to as persons and personalities or the status and roles of the participant,
2. The action of the participants referring to what they are doing, including their verbal action and non- verbal action,
3. Other relevant features of the situation referring to the surrounding objects and events,
4. The effect of the verbal action referring to the changes brought by what the participants in the situation have to say.

Context has many contributions in spoken and written language. Its function is to help speaker and hearer or the writer and the reader in delivering and receiving meaning of other ones.

2.3 The Gricean Maxim

In order to explain the mechanism by which people interpret conversational implicature, Grice introduced the concept of conversational maxims and the cooperative principle. His concept was first outlined at William James lectures at Harvard University in a form of a paper, 'Logic and Conversation' by clarifying the distinction between meaning and use of utterances (Thomas, 1995:62).

Grice's concept is related to conversation. In conducting a conversation, all participants of the conversation want that what they say will be understood by their interlocutors, so the purpose of the conversation will be reached. That is

why, dealing with this case, Grice introduced the Cooperative 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.

Grice was suggesting that in conversational interaction, people work on the assumption that a certain set of rules is in operation, unless they receive indications to the contrary. There will be times when speakers operate the same conversational norms as the interlocutors and they obey the norms. On the other hand, sometimes the interlocutors deliberately mislead the speakers' utterances and cause the occurrences of mistakes and misunderstandings (Thomas, 1995:62).

For example:

John has accidentally locked himself out of his house. It is winter, the middle of the night and he is just wearing his shorts. His wife, Ann, smiling, is looking at him and offering a help:

Ann : Do you want a coat?

John : No, I really want to stand out here in the freezing cold with only shorts on.

John's reply is untrue and uncooperative, but in fact this is the sort of sarcastic reply we encounter every day and have no problem at all in interpreting. If Ann assumes that John is being cooperative and giving an appropriate response to her question, she will look for an alternative interpretation. However, the case is that

without the assumption that the speaker is observing the cooperative principle, there is no mechanism to prompt someone to seek for another level of interpretation. The observation that the speaker has said something untrue, combine with the assumption that the cooperative principle is in operation sets in motion the search for an implicature.

Here, the four conversational maxims are needed to interpret what the implicature might be (Thomas, 1995: 63). The four conversational maxims were proposed by Grice in his '*Logic and Conversation*'. These four sets of maxims are to guide those who are conversing with others in order that they can achieve the purpose of conversation maximally, efficiently, and rationally. For this purpose, they have to speak honestly, relevantly, clearly, and they give information as is needed. The following are the four sets of conversational maxims (Levinson, 1983:101):

1. The Maxim of Quality

Be as truthful as is appropriate:

- a. Do not say what you believe to be false
- b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

These ideas run into three sets of problem; those are connected with the notion 'truth', those connected with the logic of belief, and those involved in the nature of 'adequate evidence'. In a conversation, each participant must say the truth, he will not say what he believes to be false, and will not say something that he has no adequate evidence. For example, *John is a doctor*, implicates I believe he is and I

have adequate evidence that he is a doctor. However, if later it is found out that he has no degree in doctor, it will appear that he disobeyed the maxim of quality.

2. The Maxim of Quantity

Say as much as is helpful:

- a. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.
- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

The maxim is “say as much as is helpful but no more and no less”. In a conversation, the participants must present the message as informative as is required. For example, *I went to Tawang train station yesterday*, will implicate that you went to no other place than the train station. If it is later discovered that you got on to the train and went somewhere else, it means that you disobeyed the maxim of quantity, as you are not being informative.

3. The Maxim of Relation

Make what you say bear on the issue at hand: “Make your contributions relevant”. The maxim of relevance is treated to be the relevancy condition that is interpreted in such away to be directly relevant to the present interaction. It means that the connection between participants can be shown to be one of relevance not only in simple cases of replies. For example:

John: Where's the roast beef?

Ann: The dog looks happy.

Ann's answer means something like “In answer to your question, the beef has been eaten by the dog.” However, Ann does not say that, instead he says

something that seems irrelevant to John's question. Ann's answer can be made relevant to John's question, supposing Ann does not know the exact answer, by implicating that the dog may eat the beef since it looks happy and full.

4. The Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous, and specifically:

- a. Avoid obscurity of expression
- b. Avoid ambiguity
- c. Be brief
- d. Be orderly

Thus, Gazdar (1979: 44-45) rephrases these instructions to be: part (i) instructs speakers and addressers to use, and interpret each other as using the same language or to use the intersection of their perspective languages or idiolects; part (ii) instructs not to use ambiguous expressions; part (iii) concerns with quantifying over the length of expression at some level of representation; and part (iv) is the formulation requires tightening up, generalizing to cover more than two expressions and generalizing to cover spatial precedence as well as temporal precedence.

An example of the first sub-maxim:

A: What are you baking?

B: Be I are tea aitch dee ay wye see ay kay ee.

B is going out of their way to be a bit obscure, spelling out the words rather than simply saying them. B is utterly failing to co-operatively follow the maxim of manner. B is being so obvious that A can infer that there must be a special

reason for being so co-operative: for instance, B wants to make a surprise for someone's birthday and in coincidence, he/she is not far from them.

While another example of the third sub-maxim:

A : I hear you went to the opera last night; how was the lead singer?

B : The singer produced a series of sounds corresponding closely to the score of an aria from "Rigoletto"

Here, B's verbose answer, although it does not say anything more than "*I heard the singer sang a song,*" invites A to infer that the singer was doing a miserably bad job of singing. While the example of the fourth maxim of manner is "*Do the work and collect in my desk*" will have the different meaning with "*collect in my desk and do the work*".

The maxims of co-operative principle that are stated by Grice above are not a scientific law but a norm to maintain the conversational goal. The conversation goal will be less function when one of those sub-maxims is not fulfilled maximally. Levinson says that these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, co-operative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly, and clearly, while providing sufficient information.

An example of a case when a speaker observes all the maxims:

Husband : Where are the car keys?

Wife : They are on the table in the hall.

From the example above, it can be seen that the wife has answered clearly (Manner), truthfully (Quality), has given just the right amount of information

(Quantity) and has directly addresses his husband's goal in asking the question (Relation). She has said precisely what she meant, no more and no less, and has no implicature (Thomas, 1995:64).

2.4 Definition of Maxim Violation

In every individual's life, communicating and interacting with others is vital for carrying out healthy social and professional relationship. It helps person to easily express his/her feeling. According to Grice (1975) in Khosravizadehv and Sdehvandi (2011:1), a violation takes place when speakers intentionally refrain to apply certain maxims in their conversation to cause misunderstanding on their participants' part some other purpose. In the maxim we must make the contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchange. Leech (1983:8), the rule violatng maxims mean that the number of utterances used to deliver message must be informative as what is required and does not more or less than it, so that the information does not boring or disapointing. For example:

A : "What is your job?"

B : "I'm teacher"

In these utterance, what B says is informative for what A asks. When A asks about B's job, B answer and teacher is enough because the message is delivered.

Leech (1983:9), the meaning of "relevant" is the conecton between what the speaker says and the adress hears is related each other. According to Grice(195) in Khosravizedh and Sadehvandi (2011: 1), a violating takes place when speakers intentionally refrain to apply cerain maxim in their conversation to cause misunderstanding on their participants' part or to achieve some other purpose.

Natale (2008:68), gives the criteria of violating of maxim used a distinguished guidelines. Here are the guidelines:

1. Maxim of Quantity Violation:
 - a. If the speaker does circumlocution or not to the point
 - b. If the speaker is uninformative
 - c. If the speaker talks too much
 - d. If the speaker repeat certain words
2. Maxim of Quality Violation:
 - a. If the speaker lies or says something that is believed to be false
 - b. If the speaker does irony or makes ironic and sarcastic statement
 - c. If the speaker denies something
 - d. If the speaker distors information

2.5 Non-Observances of Gricean Maxims

There are many occasions, when people fail to observe the maxims, for example, they are incapable of speaking clearly or because they deliberately choose to lie. According to Grice in Thomas (1995:55-60), there are five ways of failing to observe a maxim, as follows:

a. Flouting of Maxims

A flout occurs when a speaker obviously fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature (Thomas, 1995: 65). For example:

Rachel : Wow! How are you?!

Ross : Good-good, I'm-I'm married. (Shows her his ring).

From the dialogue above, we can see that Ross' response in Rachel's question appears to flout the maxim of quantity. He gives superfluous information to Rachel's question. He should just answer the question by saying, "*Good-good, I'm fine*". However, he flouts the maxim of quantity by giving additional information, which has no relation with the question. Then it seems that he flouts the maxim of Relevance as well. The answer "*I'm- I'm married*" appears having no relation with the question "*How are you?*" However, Ross states that information in order to show off his marriage to Rachel. The reason for his utterance is that Rachel knows that he ever loved her in the past and she rejected him. Therefore, he gives that information.

b. Violation of Maxims

A violation happens when a speaker quietly and unostentatiously violates a maxim. Grice states in Jenny that if a speaker violates a maxim, he will be liable to mislead (1995: 72). For instance, if you are not a doctor, but you say that you are a doctor, you violate the first maxim of Quality in other words you are lying. For example:

[Scene: The hospital, Ross and Monica are in Phoebe's room. Phoebe is in the bathroom and Monica notices smoke coming out from underneath the door.]

Monica : Phoebe, why is smoke coming out of the bathroom?!

Phoebe : *Oh yeah, the doctor said that could be one of the side effects.*

Monica : Phoebe! Put that cigarette out!

Phoebe : *No! It's not a cigarette! The smoke is coming out of me!*

Monica : Put it out!!

From the dialogue above, it can be seen that Phoebe has violated the maxim of quality in order to hide the truth that she is smoking. She tries to mislead Monica by giving such answer. The reason for doing this, is that, she does not want Monica knows that she is smoking while she is still sick.

c. Infringing of Maxims

It happens when a speaker who, with no intention of generating an implicature and with no intention of deceiving, fails to observe a maxim. In other words, the speaker has a lack of ability to express his intention (Thomas, 1995: 74). For instance, "*We do not want no education.*" It shows double negative.

d. Opting Out Maxims

Speaker opts out of observing a maxim by indicating unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. The speaker deliberately implicates the truth in order to obey the rules or ethic codes (Thomas, 1995:74). For example, The Conservative M.P, Teddy Tailor, had been asked a question about talk he had with Colonel Gadafy: '*Well, honestly, I can't tell you a thing, because what was said to me was told me in confidence*' (Thomas, 1995:75). Mr. Teddy opts out the first maxim of Quantity in order to preserve confidentiality. He explicitly informs that the maxim cannot be satisfied.

e. Suspending Maxims

It is hiding the truth because of the cultural code (Thomas, 1995:75). This non-observance of maxims is rarely occurred. For instance, in Indians: Mentioning a late person's name might evoke evil spirits and bring bad luck.

Furthermore, there are many ways to notice when the speaker violates the maxims (Grice, 1975:47). They are as follows:

1. Maxim of Quantity violation characteristics:
 - a. Longer than normal.
 - b. Briefer than normal.
2. Maxim of quality violation characteristics:
 - a. Briefer than usual
 - b. Less relevant
 - c. Less direct
 - d. More vague than usual.
3. Maxim of Relevance violation characteristics:
 - a. Less relevant
 - b. Less direct (going round the bush)
 - c. Having no relation to the context.
4. Maxim of manner violation characteristics:
 - a. Vaguer/ obscure.
 - b. Less clear than in normal style.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Research Design

There are many kinds of research design such as descriptive qualitative, experimental, correlation, comparative research, etc. In this case, the writer choose qualitative research. According to Patilima (2007: 588) the characteristics of qualitative research is explorative. Qualitative is a research that produces descriptive data in the form of writtten or spoken language and it more subjectice than quantitative rasearch. Descriptive research is research that deals with facts and does not involve a number. It means that the data collected is not number, for example ; words (facts or opinions), pictures, etc. Qualitative research more focuses on the process than product or result.

This research is categorized as qualitative research. It means that the research does not use statistical formula for analyzing the data. In this study the researcher uses a descriptive qualitative technique. The researcher uses qualitative research because she presented qualitative data. The data was not presented in number, but it described in form words or pictures. According to Robert (2011:3), qualitative research remains a multifaceted field of inquiry, marked by different orientations and methodologies. Typical example: interview research, with the transcribed recordings analyzed by qualitative content analysis.

This is in line with the opinion of Bogdan and Taylor (1975) in Moleong (2002:3) which states”qualitative methodology” as the procedure research that produces descriptive data in the form of words written or spoken of the people and

behaviors that can be observed. In other words, this study referred to as a qualitative research study that does not hold calculations.

As stated by Cresswell (2003:182) “qualitative research is fundamentally of the data, his means the researcher makes an interpretation on the data. This includes developing a description of individual or setting, analyzing data for themes or categories, and finally making an interpretation or drawing conclusion about its meaning personally and theoretically”. This research use the practical research as the type of research to develop the *‘skripsi’*. This research is descriptive because it will describes a situation of interest sistematically. Besides, this research also use qualitative method which results in a descriptive data.

The writer uses descriptive qualitative method in this research because the writer tries to decscribe a specific situation in details and use observation as the research tool. By using descriptive qualitative method, the writer tries to show the implicatures that occur in the utterances of Barack Obama answering or giving statement about US Intelligence and violate Grice’s Maxim.

3.2 Data (Population and Samples)

According to Hadi (1980:56), population could be defined as the whole objects of the research. Thus, the population of this research is all utterances of Barack Obama. Since the sample is a part of population that will be analyzed, the sample will be the utterances which violate the four of Grice’s maxim and the utterances that contain implicature when Barack Obama is answering questions about US Intelligence or giving statements about the case.

3.3 Method of Data Collection

The data that is analyzed in this research are qualitative data or utterances of Barack Obama answering or giving statement about US Intelligence and violate Grice's Maxim. All the utterances are taken from <http://www.heute.de/ZDF/zdfportal/blob/31540850/1/data.pdf>, a website that shows transcript of Barack Obama and Claus Kleber. Kind of the conversation is taken as the data comes from interview in news of ZDF TV. Since this research use the data that are collected from the spoken instrument but in written form, this research applies library research.

3.4 Method of Data Analysis

After all data are collected completely, the next is to analyze the data. According to Sudaryanto (1993), there are two kinds of technique in analyzing data; '*Metode Padan*' or identity method and '*Metode Agih*' or distributional method. This research applies '*Metode Padan*' as the method of data analysis that has aggregated power as differentiator reactions and hearing levels.

3.5 Research Procedure

All data in this research will be all in the form of text. Then the data is analyzed based on implicature theory and Grice's maxim theory. The analysis of the data will be all in text too. The writer analyze the data through some steps below :

- i. The data is downloaded first from www.youtube.com and <http://www.heute.de/ZDF/zdfportal/blob/31540850/1/data.pdf>.

- ii. The data is listened carefully by the writer and the writer checks the transcript and the video of Barack Obama and Claus Kleber interview.
- iii. The writer analyze all the data that have been checked and try to identify what kind of Grice's maxims that violated by Barack Obama. The maxims are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner and maxim of relevance.
- iv. Finally, the writer analyze why Barack Obama violates Grice's maxim when answering question or giving statement about US Intelligence cases.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter is the important part of the research as it contains the data analysis of the research which is conducted based on the theory presented in Chapter II in order to answer the problem statements stated in Chapter I. The data are analyzed first to describe how the maxim violations happened in the conversation between Barack Obama and Claus Kleber. The maxim violations is necessarily collected as the guide for the writer to analyze data of the research and its problem statements. After that the writer can analyze the kinds of maxim violations in the conversation.

In the previous discussion, it is stated that the aim of the research is to reveal the phenomenon of maxim violation. It covers the description of how the maxim violations happen and the meaning implied through the maxim violations employed in the conversation.

4.1 Maxim of Quantity Violation

To obey maxim of quantity, the speaker requires to contribute something that is as informative as it is required. When someone contributes more information than is required, then it can be said that he or she violates the maxim of quantity. In the data, the writer found six utterances containing maxim quantity violations done by Barack Obama. The following example shows maxim of quantity violation that has been done.

Dialog 1

Claus Kleber : *“Cooperation. You said that Angela Merkel’s cellphone will not be monitored anymore. Nice to hear. Let’s take the situation of 2002 / 2003, when Germany, France and others really tried to pull together a coalition in the United Nations, against the interests of the United States or United States policy at the time. **Would that be a good moment to hear what chancellor Schroeder at the time was saying to the French president?**”*

Barack Obama : *“You know, I have to tell you I can’t comment on what happened in 2003 / 2004. **But I understand the general point of your question which is: Is this something that chancellor Merkel or her successors can count on?** This is a presidential directive. So I am saying what I will do under my administration. My hope would be that future presidents will follow the example that I am trying to set at this point. What I can say is that chancellor Merkel and I may have disagreements on foreign policy...”*

Based on the dialogue above, Barack Obama violates the maxim of quantity because his answer is not as informative as required. Claus Kleber asked about tapping the French president but Barack Obama could not answer that because it has already happened in the past before he became the president of United States.

Furthermore, Barack Obama concludes Claus Kleber question with different words by saying *“... **But I understand the general point of your question which is: Is this something that chancellor Merkel or her successors can count on?**”* This maxim violation happens because Barack Obama did not want to mistakenly answer the question because it has already happened in the

past which is not his authority at that time. And he answered the question very carefully and also convinced not to worry about the tapping anymore to appease the hearer.

Dialog 2

Clause Kleber : *“But there are limits, even within NATO allies. We have a very difficult situation in Turkey right now. Your intelligence agencies must be interested in communications of president Erdogan. Would he be off limits because the president doesn’t want this to happen?”*

Barack Obama : *“I’m not going to comment on country by country.”*

From the dialog above, Barack Obama violates the maxim of quantity because he didn’t answer the question given by Claus Kleber. His answer is not as informative as required. It happens because as the questioner, Claus Kleber wanted to hear Barack Obama’s answer to his question. And he fails to do it.

This maxim violation happens because Barack Obama wanted to be very careful in order not to give a wrong answer. So, to save him from that, Barack Obama chose not to answer the question. To obey the maxim of quantity, Barack Obama should just answer whether he listens to president Erdogan about what happen in Turkey or not.

Dialog 3

Clause Kleber : *“...There was so much hope and expectation in the air of Berlin on that day. And today, five years into the presidency, our polls indicate this has basically melted away. A lot of disappointment in your policy and performance has established itself. **So how do you think that could happen?”***

Barack Obama : *“Well, look. I think that the nature of being president of the United States is that you are steering a massive ship. And I have a clear vision, which I described in Berlin that day and which I described in speeches that I made when I was running for office in 2008, of where I think we need to go, of how we uphold dignity and freedom of all individuals, of how countries should relate to each other, of how we should promote economic growth that is good for all people and not just those at the very top. And those values continue to drive what I do every day. Where disappointment typically comes in, and this is natural, is that people think I am driving a speed boat and that I can...”*

In the data above, Claus Kleber raised a question about how the disappointment in Obama’s policy could happen. But we could see that Barack Obama did not answer to the point. At first, he explained about the nature of being the president of the United States. Even in his final words, Obama said that those disappointment were natural to happen, but he still does not answer the actual question why it happened.

The maxim violation takes place because Obama needs to give a general explanation in the first place how it feels like to be a president who is steering a massive ship or big responsibility where not all people could accept that. He tried to make Claus Kleber and others who were disappointed by his policy could understand his position. And in his final statement, he said that this is natural to happen.

4.2 Maxim of Quality Violation

Utterances that can be said to violate maxim of quality are the ones that say something that is not true. Maxim of quality requires utterances that have enough evidence and are true. The writer found five utterances that violated the maxim of quality done by Barack Obama.

Dialog 4

Claus Kleber : *“Understood. But still, the metadata of people in Hamburg, Munich, Berlin, are somewhere stored where, with a couple of judicial steps, American authorities, your agencies have access to. That will remain.”*

Barack Obama : *“Well, I have to be careful about what details I can and cannot discuss here. But I think that it is absolutely true that US intelligence has a series of capabilities that allow us to access digital information, not just here in the United States but around the world. Those capabilities are not unique to us...”*

From the data above, Barack Obama obviously did not want to share the details of what Claus Kleber had been wondering about. He clearly stated that he had to be careful about details that he could discuss with Claus Kleber in the interview. It means that he tried to hide the truth in order to be more careful so that we will not take the wrong step.

This violation of maxim happens because Barack Obama needs to protect US Intelligence and also to obey the rules or ethic codes as the US president. The situation could be different if the interview was not broadcasted around the world and with whom he was talking to. As a president, he could not share too much

information about what his country's been doing so that he chose not to give a clear explanation to Claus Kleber.

Dialog 5

Claus Kleber : *“Cooperation. You said that Angela Merkel’s cellphone will not be monitored anymore. Nice to hear. Let’s take the situation of 2002 / 2003, when Germany, France and others really tried to pull together a coalition in the United Nations, against the interests of the United States or United States policy at the time. **Would that be a good moment to hear what chancellor Schroeder at the time was saying to the French president?**”*

Barack Obama : *“**You know, I have to tell you I can’t comment on what happened in 2003 / 2004. But I understand the general point of your question which is: Is this something that chancellor Merkel or her successors can count on? This is a presidential directive. So I am saying what I will do under my administration. My hope would be that future presidents will follow the example that I am trying to set at this point. What I can say is that chancellor Merkel and I may have disagreements on foreign policy...**”*

From the data above, we could see again that Barack Obama failed to follow maxim of quality since he did not answer Claus Kleber’s question. Here, Barack Obama even interpreted Claus Kleber’s question with another question that he made by himself.

This maxim of quality violation happens because Barack Obama needs to be careful since the question given by Claus Kleber happen in the year before he became US president. So, initiativesly, Barack Obama tried to answer it by changing the question into a more general one.

Dialog 6

Claus Kleber : *“But that is not the reason to listen in to....”*

Barack Obama : *“That is exactly right. That is what I was about to say.”*

In the data above, Barack Obama clearly violated the maxim of quality because he said in contrary to what he had been doing. It is known that the US intelligence has the authority to listen to people in order to protect its country and its allies. Thus, the US Intelligence has reasons to listen to people who they think are suspicious.

He chose to say that in order to clear the situation cornering the US Intelligence capabilities. He did not want to make other people think that the US Intelligence was spying everyone. But in fact, they had the authorities to do that. But in that condition, Barack Obama tried to dissimulate those authorities by agreeing Claus Kleber’s statement.

Dialog 7

Claus Kleber : *“But there are limits, even within NATO allies. We have a very difficult situation in Turkey right now. Your intelligence agencies must be interested in communications of president Erdogan. Would he be off limits because the president doesn’t want this to happen?”*

Barack Obama : *“I’m not going to comment on country by country.”*

Based on the data above, Barack Obama did not follow the maxim of quality since he is not been as truthful as is appropriate. He denied to answer Claus Kleber’s question about listening to president Erdogan of Turkey. He chose to do so because Claus Kleber’s raised a sensitive question since he mentioned a particular country.

As the president of US, Barack Obama needs to be careful in answering the interviewer's question because everybody around the world is listening to him, even the people who is being talked about. Because of that reason, Barack Obama chose not to answer Claus Kleber's question.

4.3 Maxim of Relevance Violation

Maxim of relevance requires relevance between the speaker and the hearer. This maxim demands the speakers to be relevant to the topic that is being talked about. There are four utterances containing the violation of maxim relevance in the data done by Barack Obama. One violation of the examples can be seen below.

Dialog 8

Claus Kleber: *“I have to say that the initial responses to your speech in Germany have been skeptical, guarded, all the way to disappointed, even from sources who are normally very pro-American. They expected more. **Does that surprise you?**”*

Barak Obama: *“No, it doesn't surprise me. Because I think that, first of all, a lot of Suspicion had been built up in Germany and, frankly, around the world, in the wake of the Snowden disclosures. And it's going to take some time to win back trust... **even as we do have to maintain the intelligence capabilities that don't just help to keep us safe, but also help to keep our friends and allies, including Germans, safe..**”*

From the data above, we clearly can see that Barack Obama violated the of relevance. Claus Kleber raised a question about whether Barack Obama feel surprise or not. Barack Obama actually response the question, but further, he was not explained about his feeling whether he is surprised or not. He explained another matter like US Intelligence capabilities.

Barack Obama failed to follow maxim of relevance because he thought that it is not enough just answering to those questions. He needs to give the explanation between what happen so that people will not misunderstand.

Dialog 9

Claus Kleber : *“But people see this immense size of the American security and spying apparatus. And they look at that, they look at your speech today, as well and they say: Listen, what I want is that no agency like that is collecting any data from people in Germany. They should just stop that, unless you have specific reasons to look for this person, like the Hamburg cell of 9/11 and so on.”*

Barack Obama : *“But of course, here’s the challenge: We don’t always know who the Hamburg cell is, until after the fact.”*

In the data above, Claus Kleber gave a statement about what people in Germany wanted, that they did not want anybody listen to them or collecting data about them without their approval unless there are specific reasons behind that like Hamburg cell of 9/11. But Barack Obama respond irrelevantly. He responded only about the unknown people behind the Hamburg cell.

We clearly can see that Barack Obama tried to switch the topic because he could not grant what the people of Germany wish. It happened because he still

had to maintain the US Intelligence authority to listen to people who is suspicious. So, he violated the maxim of relevance by switching to another topic.

Dialog 10

Claus Kleber : “***So you have to listen to everybody until then?***”

Barack Obama : “*No, well but that’s not what happens. **We are not listening to everybody....** Now, one of the things that I have said throughout the speech is: I am very sympathetic to why the German people would be concerned about this. Obviously, there is a history there with respect to East Germany that tells us what happens if you have a vast surveillance state and it turns on its own citizens. **Here in the United States, as I mentioned, there have been times where surveillance has been abused.** And I would not be in the seat I am today, were it not for figures like Dr. King who, at times, our own government spied on, in ways that were inappropriate....”*

In dialog 3, Claus Kleber raised a question whether Barack Obama listens to everybody or not. Barack Obama actually gave the appropriate answer, but he mentioned irrelevant topic to the question. He mentioned about the surveillance that had been abused in the US. That was irrelevant to Claus Kleber’s question. To follow maxim of relevance, Barack Obama should explain about the act of US Intelligence who spying on people around the world.

The violation of relevance maxim takes place when the speaker needs to clarify but he goes too far on giving the clarification. It is understood that it happened because the speaker wanted to defense himself or trying to search for a justification of what he is been doing.

Dialog 11

Claus Kleber : *“Cooperation. You said that Angela Merkel’s cellphone will not be monitored anymore. Nice to hear. Let’s take the situation of 2002 / 2003, when Germany, France and others really tried to pull together a coalition in the United Nations, against the interests of the United States or United States policy at the time. **Would that be a good moment to hear what chancellor Schroeder at the time was saying to the French president?**”*

Barack Obama : *“You know, I have to tell you I can’t comment on what happened in 2003 / 2004. **But I understand the general point of your question which is: Is this something that chancellor Merkel or her successors can count on?** This is a presidential directive. So I am saying what I will do under my administration. My hope would be that future presidents will follow the example that I am trying to set at this point. What I can say is that chancellor Merkel and I may have disagreements on foreign policy...”*

In the data above, we can see that Barack Obama violated the maxim of relevance. The actual question from Claus Kleber was about listening to the French president. But in contrast, Barack Obama switch the topic by simplifying the question that leads to another person.

Barack Obama clearly violated the maxim of relevance. He changed Claus Kleber’s question because he did not comfortable to answer Claus Kleber’s question since it was not happened in the time of his presidential era. He tried to answer the question by appeasing what the audience wanted to hear.

4.4 Maxim of Manner Violation

Maxim of manner requires contribution that is clear, brief, orderly, and unambiguous. Speakers are required to say things that avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression in order to not violate the maxim of manner. In the data, the writer found only one utterance containing the maxim of manner violation done by Barack Obama, as seen from the examples below.

Dialog 12

Claus Kleber : *“So you have to listen to everybody until then?”*

Barack Obama : *“No, well but that’s not what happens. **We are not listening to everybody.** And I think it’s very important to make that clear. And this is part of the reason why it is going to take time to win back trust, because there’s been so much sensationalism around these issues...”*

From the dialog above, it can be categorized that Barack Obama violated the maxim of manner. There is an ambiguity in his answer that he did not listen to everybody. Because in fact, the US Intelligence has the authority to listen to people around the world.

As he stated in the dialog above, he answered so because he wanted to win back trust of people who have been disappointed by the act of US spying apparatus. Even when the US Intelligence capabilities had the authority to listen to people, Barack Obama keep denying that he listened to everybody.

Dialog 13

Claus Kleber : *“But that is not the reason to listen in to....”*

Barack Obama : *“That is exactly right. That is what I was about to say.”*

Claus Kleber : *“I am a bit rushed because I feel that you are not getting to a point.”*

In the dialog above, we could clearly see that Barack Obama violated the maxim of manner because he leads Claus Kleber into obscurity. Barack Obama’s answer could be categorized as an ambiguous answer because Claus Kleber stated that the reason that Barack Obama mentioned could not be the reason to listen to somebody. Barack Obama answered by agreeing what Claus Kleber said, but Claus Kleber felt that Barack Obama was not getting into a point because he mentioned before that he had reasons to listen to somebody which is suspicious.

Barack Obama violated the maxim of manner since he knew his position as the US president. Everything that he said could affect his country and even another country.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the writer show the conclusion to the result of this research based on the analysis of maxim violations by Barack Obama in the interview between him and Claus Kleber, a German journalist, about spy intelligence and the motivation behind the maxim violations. There are thirteen utterances containing maxim violation found in the interview. The motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims is because they want to show politeness and keep other's pride or good image. They also do not want to cause offence and embarrassment by violating the maxims. Speakers choose to violate the maxims and leave their utterances to others to take the appropriate implicature of what they said.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Creswell, W. John. 2012. *Educational Research, Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Upper Saddle River: New Jersey.
- Copcava. 2012. *The Language of Conversation*. New York: Routledge.
- Cummings, Louise. 1999. *Pragmatics, A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1979. *Pragmatics, Implicature, Presupposition and Logical Form*. London: Academic Press Inc.
- Grice, H. Paul, 1975, "Logic and Conversation", in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gultom. 2013. *Teaching pragmatic to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Halliday, M.A.K.& Hasan R. 1985. *Language, Text, and Context: Aspect of Language in Social Semiotics Perspective*. Deakin University Press.
- Khosavizedehv. 2011. *TELEVISION TALK The History of The Television Talk Show*. Texas: University of Texas Press
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman Group Ltd
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Moleong, Lexy J. 1989. *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remadja Karya
CV
- Mey, Jacob. 1993. *Pragmatics an Introduction*. Blackwell Cambridge.
- Nugroho, Agus. 2008. *Conversational Principles of the Fraudulence Case Court
Session in the District Law Court of Semarang*. BA thesis. Diponegoro
University.
- Patimala. 2008. *Research Methods in Education*. USA: Routledge.
- Rahadi, Kunjana. 1980 2007. *Berkenalan dengan Ilmu Bahasa Pragmatik*.
Malang: DIOMA.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analsis Bahasa: Pengantar
Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Lingustis*. Yogyakarta: Duta
Wacana University Press.
- Thornbury, Scott. 2005. *How to Teach Speaking*. England: Pearson Education
Limited Longman.
- Welman. (2014) 'Methods of teaching inferring pragmatic from context'.*RELC
Journal*, 37(2), pp. 176-190.
- Wray, Alison., Trott, Kate., Bloomer., Aileen., Reay, Shirley. and Butler, Chris.
(1998). *PROJECTS IN LINGUISTICS: A Practical Guide to Researching
Language*. London: Arnold Publishers.
- Yule, George & Brown Gillian, 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University
Press.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.