

EXPLORING IMPLICATURE OF MAXIM VIOLATION IN THE U.S. VICE PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

Ela Martisa¹, Siti Munawwarah², Rahmawati Azi³, La Ino⁴
Universitas Halu Oleo, Kendari Indonesia
E-mail: ¹ela.martisa@uho.ac.id, ²sitimunawwarah12@gmail.com
³rahmawatiuchy@gmail.com, ⁴laino@uho.ac.id

ABSTRACT

In political communication, maxim violation as well as its implicature are inevitable. It shows a dynamic of communication particularly how to influence audience perception through argumentative strategies. This study tries to explore the maxim violation and implicature performed by Mike Pence and Kamala Harris in the U.S. Vice Presidential Debate in 2020. The study applied the cooperative principle theory particularly maxim violation and implicature by Paul Grice. Descriptive qualitative method was employed through the research. The main source of the data are the utterances of both vice Presidents' candidates which contain violation of maxim and implicature. The result shows that during the debate, there were 10 data of maxim quantity, 3 data of maxim quality, 6 maxim of relevance, and 1 data of maxim of manner. Violation of the maxim of quantity is the most common in the debate. because the candidates giving answers that seem exaggerated to, giving answers that are somewhat not so clear and irrelevant answers to distract the public. It also reveals that generalized conversational implicature is dominant used because political communication is highly context-dependent, and politicians frequently need to convey nuanced messages without being too direct.

Keywords: *conversational implicature, debate, violation maxim.*

INTRODUCTION

The study of language and communication has long been fascinated by the complexities and subtleties of human interaction. In everyday situation, people frequently encounter both successful conversations and, on other occasion, poorly executed ones that may even resulted into conflicts due to miscommunication. Miscommunication can be occurred because of several factors such as lack of common ground, asymmetry in knowledge, information overload, physical and psychological barriers, differences in interpretation, and emotional (Mustajoki, 2012). To avoid such thing, communicator need to obey cooperative principle.

The cooperative principle plays a foundational role in effective communication. It is based on the idea that people generally strive to communicate

in a way that is cooperative and mutually beneficial, making their contributions as helpful and relevant as possible (Grice, 1975). It enables people to have successful and effective communication in a clear, concise, and mutually-understandable way. In other words, the cooperative principle helps us to avoid misunderstandings and misinterpretations (Herawati, 2013)

However, in everyday communication, people often rely on more than just the literal meaning of words to convey or interpret messages. In daily life, people communicate beyond the literal meaning of their words because natural languages are context-bound, and speakers often use language in ways that are influenced by their background knowledge, social situation, shared assumptions, and interpersonal expectations. Additionally, people use language not only to exchange information but also to establish social relationships, assert power, express emotions, convey attitudes, negotiate meaning, and create social effects (Senft, 2014). Meanwhile conversations are assumed to follow cooperative principles, they frequently deviate from expected norms. This phenomenon plays a crucial role in shaping how we understand indirect meaning or implicature.

Maxim violation occurs when speakers deliberately breach the conversational rules, not to mislead but to prompt the listener to infer additional layers of meaning. Mostly, it happened during a conversation between speakers when one or more speakers modify the conversation by indirectly creating a new structure of meaning and comprehension through the language used (Andi & Ambalegin, 2019). The violation can be in form of irony, sarcasm, or strategic omission to achieve conversational goal.

The use of maxim violation can happened in many occasion such in political situation as in vice presidential debate. In debates, maxim violations are quite common due to the competitive nature of the interaction, where speakers often prioritize persuasion over strict adherence to conversational norms. Ideally, speakers are expected to follow four maxims to communicate effectively: quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. However, debaters might intentionally or unintentionally violate these maxims to achieve rhetorical goals

The 2020 vice presidential debate between Kamala Harris and Mike Pence, held on October 7, 2020, was a significant event in the United States political landscape. The debate, moderated by Susan Page, saw both candidates engage in a lively discussion on various issues, including the coronavirus pandemic, healthcare, and tax policies. One notable aspect of the debate was the frequent interruptions by Mike Pence, which were met with assertive responses from Kamala Harris. This dynamic highlights the importance of understanding the implicature of maxim violation in political debates.

Several studies about the acts of implicature as well as violation maxim have been conducted. (Eso et al., 2020) studied about the violation of maxim in paranoid schizophrenia patients conversation. This research explores the utterances of paranoid schizophrenia patients in their conversation with the doctor in Heal Mental Hospital which contain violation of maxim. Similarly, Safitri & Martisa (2021) conduct a research on The Flouting and Violation of Maxims In Deadpool 2 Movie Script. It is focused on identifying the utterances of the main character 's use of floating and violation the maxim. Other research on implicature was done by Hamsah et.al (2022) which try to figure out the Conversational Implicature in "Burnt" Movie involved by the main character. Different from previous researches, this current study focuses to see the implicature of violation maxim in argumentative genre particularly vice presidential debate between Kamalla Haris and Mike Pence.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cooperative Principle

Cooperative Principle is a rough general principle which participants are expected to observe in a conversation. It is a set of rules that is needed to be obeyed during communication process in order to achieve conversational goal. It states that participants should make their conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which they are (Grice, 1975). It has four maxims: the maxim of quantity (provide the right amount of information, neither too much nor too little), the

maxim of quality (do not provide false or unsupported information), the maxim of relation (make your contribution relevant to the conversation), and the maxim of manner (be clear, avoid ambiguity, and be orderly in your communication). Following these maxims ensures that conversation partners provide truthful, sufficient, relevant, and clear information, leading to successful communication (Davies, 2000).

Maxim Violations and Implicature

Violating a maxim is when a speaker deviates from one of the four sub-maxims of the Cooperative Principle (i.e., Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner). There are four ways one can violate them: one can be unable to fulfill the maxim, a clash between two or more maxims can occur, one can opt out of the conversation, and one can flout a maxim. Flouting a maxim refers to intentionally violating a maxim by means of exaggerated overblown statements, rhetorical questions, or the use of figurative language in order to make an impression or convey a certain message indirectly. Violating a maxim is often instrumental in generating conversational implicatures. (Grice, 1975).

Implicature occurs because of the gap or mismatch between the conventional meaning of an utterance and the meaning that is intended by the speaker in a specific context. This mismatch can be due to several factors, including conversational implicatures, which rely on shared knowledge and assumptions between the speaker and the listener, and conventional implicatures, which depend on the conventional meaning of certain words. The process of implicature involves the derivation of information that goes beyond the literal meaning of an utterance ((Renacati, 2003).

Maxim violation in political discourse

Politicians are expected to communicate with politeness because they are role models for society. However, not all politicians use language appropriately and not a few of the politicians violate the maxims in the principle of politeness (Pangestika & Manaf, 2018). The political discourse is characterized by manipulative feature for the purpose of conducting propaganda and ideological

conflict(Kenzhekanova et al., 2015). It is done through the use of various linguistic units and violation of maxim.

In political discourse, communication goes beyond its literal meaning as it serves multiple functions, such as communication, influence, and impact. The main function of political communication seems to be the incentive function, which consists of influencing the audience in order to gain and retain power (Farangiz, 2022).

Politicians and public figures use these violations to manipulate information, persuade audiences, avoid uncomfortable questions, or shape public perception. Rather than being simple breakdowns in communication, maxim violations in political discourse are usually deliberate and calculated, designed to achieve rhetorical goals such as deflection, misdirection, or emotional appeal.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs descriptive qualitative method. A qualitative method involves evaluating or researching a problem without using statistical processes. According to Creswell (2014) in (Ishtiaq, 2019), descriptive qualitative research aims to describe a situation, event, or phenomena in its natural context. In this stage, researchers collect the data from youtube channel, watch it and screenshot the scenes which contain maxim violation and implicature. Then, classify the data based on cooperative principle theory, analyze it, and draw conclusions from data analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Below are the finding of the research as well as its interpretation

Table 1. Data and its interpretation

No. of Data	Violation Maxim	Types of Conversational Implicature	Data Interpretation
			The data shows violation in maxim of quality because Kamala's utterance seems to give exaggerated information and to create a stronger emotional

No. of Data	Violation Maxim	Types of Conversational Implicature	Data Interpretation
1.	Quality	Generalized	appeal. Kamala aims to cast doubt on the American people by saying that the Trump administration did not help against the pandemic, this brings down her debate opponent. The type of implicature in Kamala's utterance is <u>generalized conversational implicature</u> .
2.	Quality	Generalized	It violates the maxim of quality, Kamala's utterance is actually exaggerating and creating a stronger emotional. She wants to influence the beliefs, opinions of the American people by saying that in fact what the Government is doing is not helping at all. Kamala's utterance raises conversational implicature, namely Generalized conversational because Kamala's utterance does not need a specific context to be understood, this is because Kamala's utterance can be understood by looking at the meaning of the words
3.	Quantity	Generalized	The data shows violation the maxim of quantity because Mike speaks too much of what he should respond to, the Panelist gives Mike the opportunity to respond to the argument of his debate opponent, Kamala Harris, who says that what the government has done to deal with the pandemic is not working. Mike's purpose of violation maxim quantity is that he wants the American people to know that he cares about what his people are going through. Mike's utterance is included in conversational implicature, namely <u>generalized conversational</u> .
4.	Quantity	Generalized	The data violates the maxim of quantity because it blatantly gives more answers than the listener needs. Mike Pence could have easily said that those officials before attending the Rose Garden event had actually been tested for corona, but Mike did not do so. Mike's purpose in violation the maxim of quantity is to defend himself and to convince the public that at the event Mike complied with pandemic health regulations. The type of conversational implicature contained in Mike's utterance is <u>generalized conversational implicature</u> .
5.	Quantity	Generalized	The data shows violation the maxim of quantity because Mike provides information that is not too relevant to the Panelist's question. This is to divert attention that when it comes to failures in government, Joe Biden is included. Mike should have answered whether he has an agreement with President Trump on protections or procedures related to presidential disability issues. He chose not to answer on purpose. The meaning of Mike's utterance is that he tries to counter the argument of his debate opponent, by describing when Joe Biden, who in 2009 served as vice president of America, failed to cope with the swine flu pandemic, causing America to lose 2 million lives.

No. of Data	Violation Maxim	Types of Conversational Implicature	Data Interpretation
6.	Quantity	Generalized	The data shows violation the maxim of quantity. Here, Mike provides less information. Mike's purpose of violation the maxim of quantity is to divert attention, because President Trump giving misleading health information is not a good thing for Mike and Trump. The type of implicature in Mike's utterance is generalized conversational implicature,
7.	Quantity	Generalized	The data shows violation the maxim of quantity, Mike gave more answers than necessary, Mike said that he was grateful to Kamala Harris and Joe Biden for their concern for President Trump. Mike's purpose in violation the maxim of quantity is that he wants to give a good image to voters or the American people that Mike Pence is a humble person, grateful to his debate opponents. Mike's utterance is included in conversational implicature, namely generalized conversational implicature.
8.	Quantity	Generalized	The data shows violation the maxim of quantity because although Kamala answered that Joe Biden is a transparent person, Kamala's next sentence is a sentence that is not so relevant to the question given by the panelist, namely whether the American people have the right to know detailed information about the health of their presidential candidates, especially the president. Kamala's purpose is also to create doubts in the American people that President Trump is not a transparent person. The sentence is generalized conversational implicature.
9.	Quantity	Generalized	The data categorized as violation the maxim of quantity. Kamala provided a lot of information based on questions from the panelist, namely regarding whether Kamala and Biden will raise taxes. Kamala's purpose in violation the maxim of quantity is that she wants to bring down her debate opponent by saying that President Trump is not implementing what he says, namely regarding infrastructure investment. In conversational implicature, Kamala's utterance is included in the generalized conversational implicature
10.	Quantity	Generalized	Mike's utterance shows that he violates the maxim of quantity by giving an answer that lacks detail and is not very clear based on the question given by the Panelist, namely Mike's opinion on whether the terrible climate change is man-made. This is included in Red Herring which is diverting the conversation, mentioning a new argument until the previous argument is not discussed. The sentence include generalized conversational implicature.
			The data is violation the maxim of quality. This is because Kamala's utterance seems exaggerated. Kamala's purpose of violation maxim of quality is to raise doubts in the public as well as to change their view that this time under Trump's leadership is the

No. of Data	Violation Maxim	Types of Conversational Implicature	Data Interpretation
11.	Quality	Generalized	biggest failure in the history of the United States. The sentence included generalized conversational implicature.
12.	Relevance	Generalized	The data violates the maxim of relevance because Mike's utterance has nothing at all to do with the topic being discussed, namely the role of American leadership in 2020. Mike's goal in violation the maxim of relevance is to divert the conversation because in Kamala's argument, Kamala said Trump's leadership was detrimental to the United States. At the same time to raise doubts in the American people and to change their perception that Biden is not a leader who will carry out what he has promised. Mike's utterance is included in conversational implicature, namely generalized conversational implicature.
13.	Quantity	Generalized	According to Grice's theory, the data above violation the maxim of quantity, because Kamala's statement does not really answer Mike's question, namely, if Judge Amy Coney Barreett is confirmed as United States Supreme Court Justice, will Kamala Harris and Joe Biden pack the Supreme Court to get what they want, namely additional a seat on the Supreme Court if they win this presidential election. Kamal's aim in violation the maxim of quantity is to divert attention that Kamala wants additional seats on the Supreme Court for her party by saying that this is the choice of the American people. Kamala's utterance is included in generalized conversational implicature.
14.	Quantity	Generalized	The data is Kamala's utterance violates the maxim of quantity because Kamala's utterance is not very clear, namely the meaning of the word values that Kamala upholds. It seems that she leaves out certain facts or only present partial truths to make her point more convincing. Kamala answered the panelist's question about whether there was justice in the Breonna Taylor case. Kamala replied that she did not believe there was justice in the Breonna Taylor case. Kamala's utterance is included in the conversational implicature, which is generalized conversational implicature.
15.	Manner	Particularized	The data is violation the maxim of manner Because Kamala gave an answer that had nothing to do with the question asked by the panelist. Kamala gave an ambiguous answer, and seemed to provide unnecessary information. The meaning of this utterance is to tell the audience that Kamala and Biden are the best choice for president, in other words Kamala is actually promoting herself and Biden. Kamala's utterance included particularized conversational implicature.

No. of Data	Violation Maxim	Types of Conversational Implicature	Data Interpretation
16.	Relevance	Particularized	The data is violation maxim of relevant. It seems that the answer shift the focus away from a weak point in his argument to steer the conversation toward more favorable ground when the panellist asks him about whether the American people should get ready for an economic revival that will take a long time. The type of implicature contained in Mike's utterance is particularized conversational implicature.
17.	Relevance	Particularized	The data shows violation maxim of relevance because it is not relevant to the topic being asked by the panelist. To be relevant, Mike should answer about if he has an agreement with President Trump about protections or procedures related to presidential disability issues. He chose not to answer intentionally. This utterance aims to influence the audience as well as persuade them not to vote for Biden. The type of implicature in Mike's utterance Is particularized conversational implicature.
18.	Relevance	Particularized	The data violates the maxim of relevance, Mike Pence tries to avoid answering tough questions and distracts the audience from key issues. Pence deliberately violation maxim of relevance, it is known that he wants to respond to the argument of his debate opponent. this requires a deeper understanding of the context to know the meaning of Mike's utterance. The type of implicature of Mike's utterance is particularized conversational implicature
19.	Relevance	Particularized	The data violates the maxim of relevance because Kamala Harris tries to shift the focus away from a weak point in her argument to steer the conversation to her convenience. The meaning of Kamala's utterance is that she wants to persuade the American people to vote for her and Biden. The type of implicature in Kamala's utterance is particularized conversational implicature
20.	Relevance	Particularized	The data is violation maxim of relevance because Mike's utterance has nothing to do with the panelist's question. Mike should have explained how his and Trump's administration will protect Americans and provide access to affordable insurance if the Affordable Care Act is repealed, but he did not. type of implicature in Mike Pence's utterance is particularized conversational implicature,

Table above shows the frequency of maxim violation as well as its implicature used in the debate of vice presidents' candidates. Violation of maxim quantity appears dominantly with 50 % of percentage. It shows in data that there are 10 times candidates use this violation particularly in data 3, 4, 5,

6,7,8,9,10,13,14. Those data tell that in answering the questions, both candidates try to give too much or too little information to persuade audience to agree with them. Several statements are vague and give audience chance to interpret it rather than saying it directly.

The table above also reveals that the generalized implicatures becomes the most frequently used in that forum. During the debate, the candidates use 16 times (70 %) of generalized implicature. Both candidates maintaining ambiguity and flexibility, managing public perception, and using strategy of vagueness to avoid commitments that could later be used against them if they use it directly.

CONCLUSION

In the USA vice debate 2020 between Kamala Harris from Republic Party and Mike Pence from Democrat Party, Maxim violation and Implicature are really exist. The use of Quantity maxim violation is dominant during the debate as an effort to maximize their influence, control the narrative, and minimize the risks for saying statements plainly. Generalized conversational implicatures is the most used of implicature to achieve their objectives because political communication is highly context-dependent, and politicians frequently need to convey nuanced messages without being too direct.

REFERENCES

- Andi, & Ambalegin. (2019). Maxims Violation On “ Night At The Museum .” *Basis*, 6(2), 215–224.
- Davies, B. (2000). Grice’s cooperative principle: getting the meaning across. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics*, 8(1962), 1–26.
- Eso, A., Martisa, E., & Raf, J. (2020). *Violation of Maxim in Paranoid Schizophrenia Patients ’ Conversation*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.15-11-2019.2296436>
- Farangiz, R. K. (2022). the Concept of “Political Discourse.” *European Scholar Journal (ESJ)*, 3(3), 88–91. <https://www.scholarzest.com>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Elsevier Inc.
- Herawati, A. (2013). The Cooperative Principle : Is Grice ’ S Theory Suitable To Indonesian Language Culture ? *Lingua Cultura*, 7(1), 43–48.
- Ishtiaq, M. (2019). Book Review Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *English Language Teaching*, 12(5), 40. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n5p40>
- Kenzhekanova, K., Zhanabekova, M., & Konyrbekova, T. (2015). Manipulation In

- Political Discourse Of Mass Media. *Mediterranean Journal Of Social Sciences*, 6(4S1), 325–332. <https://doi.org/10.5901/Mjss.2015.V6n4s1p325>
- Mustajoki, A. (2012). A Speaker-Oriented Multidimensional Approach To Risks And Causes Of Miscommunication. *Language And Dialogue*, 2(2), 216–243. <https://doi.org/10.1075/Ld.2.2.03mus>
- Pangestika, W., & Manaf, N. A. (2018). *Violation of Maxim Principles by Politicians in the Discourse of Jakarta Election 2017 at Online Portal News*. 263(Iclle), 382–385.
- Recanati, Fran,cois. Literal Meaning. 2003. <ijn 00000326>
- Safitri, R., & Martisa, E. (2021). The Flouting and Violating Maxims in Deadpool 2 Movie Script. *ELITE JOURNAL*, 6(1), 1–11.
- Senft, G. (2014). Understanding pragmatics. In *Understanding Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203776476>