



## The Violation of Maxims in Indonesian Speech of Mental Retardation Child

**Ira Eko Retnosari**

*Universitas Negeri Surabaya*

*e-mail: ira.17070956006@unesa.ac.id*

**Kisyani**

*Universitas Negeri Surabaya*

*e-mail: kisyani@unesa.ac.id*

**Bambang Yulianto**

*Universitas Negeri Surabaya*

*e-mail: bambangyulianto@unesa.ac.id*

### **Abstract:**

*This article aims to describe the violations of the maxims in the Indonesian speech of mentally retarded children. This study used a descriptive qualitative method. The data source of this study is one mild mental retardation child. The data of this research are words, phrases, and sentences that contain violations of the maxims in the principle of cooperation. Data collection techniques in this study were observation, stimulating, recording, and field recording. Data collection procedures in this study include entering the field, making observations, recording speeches, transcribing field records, entering data in tables, validating data that has been collected. In analyzing the data, a pragmatic equivalent analysis method is used. Data analysis procedures in this study are reducing data, presenting data, interpreting data, and concluding. In analyzing the data, a pragmatic equivalent analysis method is used. Data analysis procedures in this study are reducing data, presenting data, interpreting data, and concluding. The results of the data analysis of this study are the maxima violation that most children with mental retardation are the maxim of relations. That is because the research subject often changes the topic of speech. The research subject often changes the topic because he is not interested in talking about topics.*

**Keywords:** *mental retardation children, utterances, violations of the maxims*

## **1. Introduction**

One phenomenon of child development is that children are born unnaturally. That causes delays in children's development. The delay requires action that is different from other children. Children who experience slowness are called extraordinary children or children with special needs (ABK). One of the special needs is mental retardation, which is a child who is experiencing obstacles and retardation of mental development far below the average (IQ below 70) so that he experiences difficulties in academics, communication, and social tasks. Besides that Somantri (2007) said that the low IQ of mild mentally retarded children has an impact on their inability to consider something, differentiate between good and bad, and distinguish right from wrong.

Mental retardation is a decrease in overall intellectual function that is significant and directly causes impaired social adaptation and manifests during development (Sularyo & Kadim, 2016). According to Humaira et al. (2012), the number of people with mental retardation in Indonesia ranges from 1-3%. The percentage is 85% of people with mild mental retardation, 10% of patients with moderate mental retardation, 4% of people with severe mental retardation, and 1-2% of people with very severe mental retardation. Mental retarded children usually have difficulty communicating with others. In a conversation, a speaker and a hearer are supposed to respond to each other in their turn and exchange the needed information that benefits both of them (Crowley & Mitchell, 1994). In the fairness of communication, there is a process between the speaker and the speech partner articulating the speech to facilitate the delivery of the message or information to be communicated. Thus, the speaker tries to keep his speech always related to the context. The speaker's context must be clear, concise, easy to understand, and following the topic of the speech. If successful in maintaining context, the speaker will not waste time talking to the speech partner.

In general, children's speech mental retardation can be understood by looking at the context. Some children's speech mental retardation violates the principle of cooperation. One of the principles in pragmatics is the principle of cooperation (Grice, 1975), namely the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner.

Grice (1975) said that reasonable discourse can occur if speech participants are compliant with the principle of cooperation. The principle of cooperation is the principle that regulates so that the conversation conducted by the speech participants has coherence. The principle of cooperation can be implemented well if the speaker and the speech partner comply with the maxims contained in the principle of cooperation. However, not all communication meets the principles of cooperation or all four principles in their conversation. People fail to fulfill or observe maxims in many contexts of daily life and on many occasions (Massanga & Msuya, 2017). There are many reasons for not complying with these principles, for example, some people are unable to speak clearly because they are nervous, scared, stuttering, anxious, do not know the culture or are not fluent or because someone wants to lie deliberately or for other reasons. This article will focus on the form of maxims violations and the factors that cause maxims violations in Indonesian children's speech mentally retarded. This is motivated by an interest in the uniqueness of Indonesian children's speech mental retardation. Zebua et al. (2017) said that the violation of maxim is the condition in which the speakers do not purposefully fulfill or obey the four sub-maxims. Speakers can be said to

violate a maxim when they know that the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words.

Mental retardation is a condition of children who have limitations or inability to develop cognitive functions and adaptive behavior (Staff, 2008). Then, Lumbantobing (2006) adds the notion of mental retardation, which is a child who has mental retardation without having to experience mental and physical disorders. In general, mentally retarded children will experience violations of the maxims in speech when communicating with speech partners. This is also experienced by the research subjects in this article. The causes of violations of children's retardation mental maxims are intellectual or cognitive, social roles in speech, mental or emotional conditions, and environmental context. Based on the description, a child who has a mental retardation condition is a condition or condition of the child that is different from a normal child. This is due to children experiencing mental retardation characterized by a period of mental development that is lacking. Besides, mental retardation is also marked to involve a decrease in intellectual ability and social role in the environment that is very little or reduced.

Here is an article about the violation of maxims. Hidayati (2018) wrote an article about the violation of maxims (flouting maxim) in the narrative of the film radio film upset FM: a pragmatic study. He explained that in the FM radio film there was a violation of maxims. The violations of maxims found were quantity, quality, relevance, and method. Of the four violations of the maxims, every finding of violations of the maxims has a hidden meaning or implicature.

Saputri (2017) wrote articles about violations of the maxims of cooperation in Facebook conversations. He concluded that of the four maxims contained in the principle of cooperation (PK) the most often not fulfilled in conversations, especially those that were non-formal, was the maxim of means. The research is almost the same as the article written by Septiani & Sandi, et al. Septiani & Sandi (2020) explained that in his research, the interaction of village staff with the community often experienced misunderstandings, which led to violations of maxims. The results of all of them are four violations of maxims, namely quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The violation of maxims that are often found in the violation of manner maxims.

Nugraheni (2015) explained that there was an identity crisis in the communication between teachers and students, resulting in violations of maxims and violations of the principle of politeness. More clearly, the main factors that cause violations are environmental factors, technology, and age development. Then, the results of all were violations of the maxims of quantity and quality and found violations of the principle of impoliteness. The results of this study are almost the same as the articles written by Sulistyowati (2014) and Setiawan et al. (2017). Sulistyowati (2014) explained the results of the themes, namely that there were four violations of the maxims of 130 utterances. Among the four violations of maxims, the most dominant violations of quantity maxims were found in as many as 56 utterances. From the data findings, the causes of maximal violation are the contextual factors of language use and language politeness. As well as Sulistyowati (2014). Setiawan et al. (2017) explained the results of all of them, namely, there were four violations of the maxims of 130 utterances. Among the four violations of maxims, the most dominant violations of quantity maxims

were found in as many as 56 utterances. From the data findings, the causes of maximal violation are the contextual factors of language use and language politeness.

The articles above are different from the articles written by Chikita et al., n.d. concluded that there was a violation of maxims. The violations of maxims that are often encountered are violations of the maxims of quantity and violations that are found at least in violations of the maxims of quality and method.

In other words, children are mentally retarded despite having limited intellectual abilities and social roles. Mental retarded children have abilities that are similar to normal children in general. That is, mentally retarded children can still master several subjects at school and socialize with their peers.

Astuty & Wulandari (2019) said research on speech in children with mild mental retardation is generally carried out from a phonological perspective. This is what encourages researchers to conduct this research.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Mental Retardation**

Mental retardation is a group of heterogeneous conditions characterized by cognitive limitations due to organic brain dysfunction when aged no later than 18;0-22;0 (Wilson, 1997). The definition of mental retardation is also based on functional limitations in areas that include daily living skills, social skills, and communication (Staff, 2008). Mental retardation can be interpreted as an inability characterized by significant limitations both in intellectual functioning and adjustment behavior expressed in conceptual self, social, and adaptability. Pujiyasari et al. (2014) said that mental retardation is someone's inability to adapt and does not yet have independence. Therefore, people with mental retardation require special treatment.

Cummings (2013) argues that mental retardation provides five assumptions, namely (1) knowledgeableability, (2) adaptive behavior, (3) involvement, communication relationships, and social roles, (4) mental and physical health, (5) environmental context and culture. Although a mentally retarded child has several limitations, the child can obtain the same abilities as other normal children. This was supported by Lumbantobing (2006). He believes that children who experience mild mental retardation are a group called educable or can be educated. In line with Lumbantobing, Abdurrahman (1999) states that even though mentally retarded children have a subnormal mental level, the child still has the potential to master subjects at the elementary school level.

Muttaqin (2009) argues that mental retardation is one of the mental disorders that occur in children. Mental retardation is a condition characterized by low intelligence that causes the inability of individuals to learn and adapt to the demands of society for abilities that are considered normal and inability in social interactions. Child mental retardation leads to limitations of some intellectual functions that are very below average and is accompanied by (plus an emphasis on) limitations related to two or more areas of application of adaptation abilities, such as communication, academic functions, leisure, and work. Besides, mental retardation children are also unable to adapt and do not have independence (Pujiyasari et al., 2014).

Several factors cause mental retardation in children, namely genetic factors, prenatal factors, prenatal factors, and postnatal factors. However, mental retardation often occurs in children due to genetic factors (Muttaqin, 2009). Developmental disorders in children with mental retardation can be seen through the results of psychological tests Intelligence Quotient (IQ) under 70 and the child's ability to do independence is not optimal (Hidayat, 2007). Based on the clinical view, mental retardation is divided into four namely, mild mental retardation (IQ <70) with criteria for children who can educate and train in carrying out skills with the guidance of others, moderate mental retardation (IQ <49) has criteria for children who can train on grade two elementary school skills, while severe retardation (IQ <34), and very heavy mental retardation (IQ <20) have criteria for children who have comorbid disorders and depend on others (Semiun, 2006; Hidayat, 2007).

## **2.2 The Violation of Maxim**

The speaker is said to violate a maxim when he knows that the speaker does not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of words. Speakers deliberately convey information ineffectively, irrelevance, or meaningless taxa, and speakers assume incorrectly that speakers work together (Cutting, 2005). Violations of these maxims can occur in all four maxims in the cooperative principle. The explanation is as follows (1) violation of the quantity maxim, speakers do not provide enough information to speakers because they do not want speakers to know the contents of the information as a whole; (2) violation of quality maxims, speakers violate the quality maxim if one of the speakers says is a lie, not actually, or just predicting; (3) violation of relation maxim, the speaker violates the maxim of the relation when the speaker changes the subject; (3) violation of manner maxim, the speaker commits violations of the maxim of the way if the speaker stops the speech (Cutting, 2005).

From this explanation, there are two ways speakers fail in speaking. The failure is done by breaking it and choosing one. Speakers violate a maxim because of imperfections in linguistic use. This happens because the speaker experiences a certain condition, such as nervousness, drunk, angry or foreign learners. Also, some speakers experience cognitive imperfections such as autistic people or speakers who are unable to speak clearly (Grice, 1975 in (Cutting, 2005). However, if the speaker does not use the maxim, the speaker is indicated to be non-cooperative in speaking. Cutting (2005) refers to this phenomenon in terms of the non-observed maxims (other forms of non-observances of maxims).

Grice (1975) in (Tupan & Natalia, 2008) gives the criteria of violation of maxims used as distinguished guidelines. Here are the guidelines (1) maxim of quantity violation: (a) the speaker does circumlocution or not to the point, (b) the speaker is uninformative, (c) the speaker talks too short, (d) The speaker talks too much, (e) The speaker repeats certain words; (2) maxim of quality violation: (a) the speaker lies or says something that is believed to be false, (b) the speaker does irony or makes an ironic and sarcastic statement, (c) the speaker denies something, (d) the speaker distorts information, (3) maxim of relation violation: (a) the speaker makes the conversation unmatched with the topic, (b) the speaker changes the conversation topic abruptly, (c) the speaker avoids talking about something, (d) the speaker hides something or hides a fact, (e) the speaker does the wrong causality; (4) maxim of manner violation: (a) the speaker uses ambiguous language, (b) the speaker

exaggerates thing, (c) the speaker uses slang in front of people who do not understand it, (d) the speaker's voice is not loud enough.

### **3. Research Methodology**

#### **3.1 Data and Source of Data**

The source of the data for this study was one child with mild mental retardation (IQ=60) (hereinafter abbreviated as V). Selection of one research subject because ABK has different characteristics. The data of this research are words, phrases, and sentences that contain violations of the principle of cooperation. Data collection techniques in this research were observation, stimulation, recording, and field notes. Data collection procedures in this research include entering the field, making observations, recording speeches, transcribing field notes, entering data in tables, and validating collected data. In analyzing data, pragmatic equivalent analysis methods are used.

#### **3.2 Instruments**

The instrument in collecting research data was verbal and visual media. Verbal-shaped media, such as various sentences, both news sentences, questions, and commands, cards, games, and so on. Visual media, such as pictures, toys, photos, and so on. Real media, such as fruit, drinks, food, and so on. The instrument was chosen because the source of research data has limited speech and knowledge. The instrument would be used as a tool for the elicitation of children so that the necessary data is collected.

Data analyzing instruments in this study are tables. The table is a data analysis instrument when doing (a) data reduction to see data units; (b) the data presentation to see the data as a whole. With a table, researchers can more easily see data on each aspect studied along with the relationship between aspects making it easier to interpret. Then, the results of the interpretation are used to make conclusions.

#### **3.2 Data Analysis Procedures**

There are several stages in analyzing data. The stages are carried out as follows (1) reducing data. This activity is carried out after transcribing data. This means that the compilation of data in units according to the focus of research. Data reduction aims to make it easier for researchers to know the violations of the maxims. The preparation of these units uses sorting or sorting techniques and data analysis instruments in the form of tables; (2) presenting data. This activity is carried out by entering data in a format. It is intended that the data in the reduction of data only in the form of units can be seen as a whole making it easier to see the violations of the maxims in the Indonesian speech of mentally retarded children who are the source of the data; (3) interpret data. This activity is carried out by giving an interpretation of the data. After displaying the data, it can be seen as whole data so that it can be easier for researchers to continue the data analysis by interpreting; (4) conclude. This activity is carried out after interpreting the data. Researchers have obtained meaning in each data and relationship between data. Furthermore, the meaning is concluded so that it can answer the focus of the problem.

### **4. Findings**

The results of this study are in the form of a description of violations of the maxims, namely violations of the quantity maxims, violations of the quality maxims, violations of the

relations of the maxims, and violations of the manner of the maxim of mentally retarded children. Then, this study also describes the causes of the violation of the principle of cooperation in the speech of mentally retarded children. The following are the results of the research.

#### 4.1 Violation of quantity maxim

Data 1

Context	
In the room, V is learning to read thematic books. Then, V flipped through the pages of the book to the last page. Since V hasn't found his home job yet, P asks V.	
Data	Interpretation
P: (a) Tematiknya dibuka! Tematik dari Bu Al itu lo.	P: Buku tematiknya dibuka! Buku tematik dari Bu Al itu lo.
V: (b) Ini.	V: Ini.
P: (c) Ada PR apa ndak?	P: Ada PR apa tidak?
V: (d) Pakai ini, pakai ini, pakai ini, lo entek Ma? (Membolak-balikkan buku sampai halaman terakhir) Entek.	V: Pakai ini, pakai ini, pakai ini, lo habis Ma? (Membolak-balikkan buku sampai halaman terakhir) Habis.
P: (e) Ada PR apa ndak?	P: <i>Ada PR apa tidak?</i>
V: (f) <b>Ndak, engkok wae.</b> (Menaruh buku ke sebelah kanan)	V: <b><i>Tidak, nanti saja.</i></b> (Menaruh buku ke sebelah kanan)
P: (g) Ya sudah ayo dirapikan!	Ya sudah ayo dirapikan!

The above speech occurred while P and V were in the bedroom. At that time, at 19.54 WIB, V was studying accompanied by P. P began his speech by ordering V as in speech (a). V responds to P's speech by speaking as in (b). Then, P asks V as in speech (c). V does not hear P's speech and speaks as in (d) looks for an empty page. Since there is no response from V, P asks V as in speech (e). The response shown by V in speech (f) answers the question P. Because there is no homework, P commands V as in speech (g).

The data (1) above shows that speech V has violated the maximal quantity. The violation of the maximal quantity is shown in (f), namely *Ndak, engkok wae*. Speech *Ndak, engkok wae* was considered too excessive in providing the information needed by speaker P. Supposedly, V simply answers no to show the maximal quantity because it is not considered excessive in providing information to P.

The V in (f) above indicates that emotional factors. It happened when V changing the subject. V tends to switch topics because he is dealing with an object he likes. When V likes or has a desire to write, all questions asked by P are ignored. V will focus on the object he likes.

#### 4.2 Violation of quality maxims

Data 2

Context	
V conducts therapy with TW (speech therapist) at the therapy site. TW shows a picture to V. V guesses the picture pointed to by TW.	
Data	Interpretation
TW: (a) Iya, siapa yang mancing?	TW: <i>Iya, siapa yang mancing?</i>
V: (b) Aku.	V: <i>Aku.</i>

TW:	(c)	Hah, Verda yang mancing. Mancing di mana?	TW:	<i>Hah, Verda yang mancing. Mancing di mana?</i>
V:	(d)	<b>Lumaku.</b> (melihat wajah TW kemudian melihat <i>puzzle</i> )	V:	<i>Rumahku.</i> (melihat wajah TW kemudian melihat <i>puzzle</i> )
TW:	(e)	Hah.	TW:	<i>Hah.</i>
V:	(f)	<b>Lumaku.</b> (melihat wajah TW)	V:	<i>Rumahku.</i> (melihat wajah TW)
TW:	(g)	Di rumah. Mancing di mana?	TW:	<i>Di rumah. Mancing di mana?</i>
V:	(h)	<b>Lumaku.</b> (melihat wajah TW)	V:	<i>Rumahku.</i> (melihat wajah TW)

The speech above occurs when TW responds to V in the therapy room. TW prepared a second therapeutic kit in the form of a picture card, while V was seen holding a picture card. After TW prepared a picture card, he lured V into talking. TW shows a fishing picture card and asks V as in utterance (a). V answers TW questions as in speech (b). TW looks surprised by V's statement as in speech (c). Then, V answers TW's question as in utterance (d). TW was surprised again by statement V and spoke as in (e). V repeats the answer to the TW question as in utterance (f). TW still has not received the statement V. Then, TW asked V again as in the statement (g). V answers TW questions as in utterance (h).

The data (2) shows speech V experiencing violations of the quality maxim that is in speech (d), (f), and (h). The contribution of speech V is not based on the available evidence. When TW asked *mancing di mana?* V answered TW's question, *lumaku*. The word *lumaku* in the context of speech above experiences violations of quality maxims. This can be proven by the fact that there is a condition in house V that does not have facilities for fishing. Around V's house, there are public roads and houses. It can be said that speech V does not provide true information to TW. Thus, speech V experiences a violation of quality maxim. If speech V in (d), (f), n (h) does not violate quality maxim, it can be changed as follows.

TW : *Iya, siapa yang mancing?*  
 V : *Aku*  
 TW : *Hah, Verda yang mancing. Mancing di mana?*  
 V : *Karang Ploso*

The speech V above to answer TW's question according to the available evidence. So, TW understands V's point that Karang Ploso exists for fishing.

Speech V in (d), (f), and (h) there is a violation of the quality maxims due to cognitive factor V. This is because V still has not received and fully understood the information TW questions. V cognitive capacity in processing words and vocabulary is still experiencing limitations. So, when TW asked V, he answered carelessly and caused V's speech to experience a violation of the quality maxim.

### 4.3 Violation of relation maxim

Data 3

Context	
V and P are studying in the bedroom. V sat on the floor with P. V wrote on a piece of paper. P is recording.	
Data	Interpretation
P: (a) Lek upacara ngapain aja, Ver?	P: <i>Kalau upacara melakukan apa saja, Ver?</i>
V: (b) <b>Tulis.</b> (Menulis di kertas HVS)	V: <i>Menulis.</i> (Menulis di kertas HVS)
P: (c) Hem, kamu kalau upacara ngapain saja?	P: <i>Hem, kamu kalau upacara melakukan apa saja?</i>
V: (d) <b>Nulis.</b> Rena?	V: <i>Menulis.</i> Rena?



The speech above occurs when V and P are studying in the bedroom. V is writing on a piece of paper on the floor. A few minutes later, P asked V as in utterance (a). Speech V in (b) answers P questions. P feels that V's answers are incorrect. P asks back to V as in speech (c). Speech V in (d) answers the question P and V asks P.

The data (3) is a violation of the relation maxim. Violation of relation maxim is seen in speech V in (b). V violated P because the answer did not fit the context of the speech. Speech V in (b) answers *tulis*. *Tulis* word is not the answer desired by P. The contribution spoken by V does not fit the context of the question P. V only focuses on the activity that is being done, which is writing on paper.

In line with the description above, speech V in (d) also experienced a violation of the relation maxim. *Nulis* word and *Rena?* is a form of topic transfer that is spoken by V when P asks V. Even though the purpose of speech V is understood by P, V still experiences violations of the maxim of the relation because it changes the topic of speech and V still does not answer P's question correctly. If speech V in (b) does not violation of relation maxim, it can be changed as follows.

P : *Lek upacara ngapain aja Ver?*  
 V : *baris*

The speech V above seems to answer P's question according to the topic of conversation. So, P understands what V means that the line is one of the activities during the flag ceremony.

Of the two utterances, V above is at speech (b) and (d). V experiences emotional factors when changing the subject. V tends to switch topics because he is dealing with an object he likes. When V likes or has a desire to write, all questions asked by P are ignored. V will focus on the object he likes.

Data 4

Context	
The speech occurred in the corridor in front of the room between P, V, and N (V's grandmother). V approached N to see the writing N. Then, V returned to P and saw the writing.	
Data	Interpretation
V: (a) Ma, minta penya Mamanya? Lihat ini lho, Ma!	V: <i>Ma, minta hpnya Mamanya? Lihat ini, Ma!</i>
P: (b) Lihat apa?	P: <i>Lihat apa?</i>
V: (c) <b>Ambil hp.</b>	V: <i>Ambil hp.</i>
P: (d) Ndak bisa, dipakai Mama.	P: <i>Tidak bisa, dipakai Mama.</i>
V: (e) <b>Ini.</b> (Menunjuk ke kertas hvs) Ah, hp-ne wae wes.	V: <i>Ini. (Menunjuk ke kertas hvs) Ah, hp-nya saja.</i>

The speech above statement occurs in the corridor in front of the room between P, V, and N. When V finished writing, V approaches N (grandmother) to see the writing N. After V goes to N, V returns to P and sees the writing. When V sees his writing, V asks and commands P as in utterance (a). Speech V in (a) is poorly understood by P. To emphasize V's request to P, P asks V as in speech (b). V answers P questions by commanding P as in speech (c). P understands the purpose of V and P tells (d) answers the request V. V responds to P's answer by pointing to the hvs paper and answering as in speech (e).

The data (4) above shows speech V in (c) experiencing violations of relation maxim. The contribution spoken by V is not continuous with the context of the question P. The discontinuity of the context of speech V causes P to not understand the purpose of speech V and causes V to experience violations of relation maxim. Speech P in (b) is answered by V as in utterance (c) by commanding it to P like the *ambil cellphone* sentence. V does not answer the question P and V instead commands P to ask the *cellphone* in P's room.

Then, speech V in (e) which is *ini* word does not contribute to the statement P as in the speech *ndak bisa, dipakai mama*. Speech V refers to the writing made by V and does not contribute to the previous utterance. So, V is seen to change the subject when P states V. If speech V in (c) does not violation of relation maxim, it can be changed as follows.

V : *Ma, minta penya Mamanya? Lihat ini lho, Ma!*

P : *Lihat apa?*

V : *foto (dalam fitur) cellphone*

V's speech above to answer P's question according to the topic of conversation. So, P understands what V means that features are one of the applications on a cellphone.

The two utterances (c) and (d) seem to be experiencing emotional factors. The emotional factor that influenced V's speech was due to V's desire to photograph his writing with the *cellphone* in the room. However, at that time V was studying with P so that V could not hold the *cellphone* while studying. It is this emotional factor of pleasure that causes V to change the subject when P asks V.

#### Data 5

Context	
After V wrote, V tried to find the cellphone around the bed. Meanwhile, P sat in front of V. Because he still couldn't find his cellphone, V made a conversation with P.	
Data	Interpretation
V: (a) Mama nepon Papa. Eeh, duduk waduh. (Melihat ke bawah)	V: <i>Mama telepon Papa. Eeh, bukan. (Melihat ke bawah)</i>
P: (b) Apa? Ver liat, Ver jendelanya itu loh.	P: <i>Apa? Ver lihat, Ver lihat jendela!</i>
V: (c) Opo? (melihat ke jendela)	V: <i>Ada apa Ma? (melihat ke jendela)</i>
P: (d) Gelap opo terang? Lihaten!	P: <i>Gelap apa terang? Lihat!</i>
V: (e) <b>Loh Ma, mobilnya iki, Ma.</b>	V: <b><i>Loh Ma, mobil ini, Ma.</i></b>
P: (f) Ver.	P: Ver.
V: (g) He.	V: He.

The above speech took place in bed. V seems to have finished writing assignments. Meanwhile, P sat in front of V to see the results of his writing. After V wrote, he looked for cellphones around the bed. It didn't last long, V asked P for help and spoke as in (a) while looking at the notebook. P felt that he did not hear V's speech. Then, P asked V as in speech (b). V understands the meaning of P's speech and he speaks as in speech (c) to P.

After that, V saw the window next to him. After V sees the window, P asks V as in speech (d). However, V did not respond to P's question and saw the car parked in the garage of the house. Then, V says as in (e) to P. Since V doesn't respond to P's question, P says as in (f). The response shown by V to P is as in (g).

Data (5) above shows that speech V violates the maxim of relevance. Speech V to (a) *Mama nepon Papa. Eeh, duduk waduh* is V's command to P. The speech *Mama nepon Papa* is proof V ordered P to call Ay However, P's speech was not responded to by P so he spoke as in (b), namely *Apa? Ver liat, Ver jendelanya itu loh* tells V to see the window in the bedroom. The response shown by V follows the command P so that it tells (c), namely *opo?* After V looked at the window, V was surprised by the command P.

Then, P said in (d), namely *Gelap opo terang? Lihaten!* Look! P said in (d) because it was already night. After getting orders from P, V tells (e), namely *Loh Ma, mobilnya iki, Ma*. The car's speech is quite telling. The word car means a four-wheeled vehicle. However, the utterance is a violation of the maxim of relevance because it does not contribute as expected P. This is evidenced by V tends to shift the topic of the narrative with P.

P's speech in (f), namely *Ver* still asks for V's response to P's question in (d). However, P does not yet get V's answer as in (g), namely *he*.

#### 4.4 Violation of manner maxim

Data 6

Context	
The speech occurred when R and V are playing on the bed. While they were playing, P did a chat with V.	
Data	Interpretation
P: (a) <i>Ver, Verda pramuka diajari apa saja?</i>	P: <i>Ver, Verda pramuka diajari apa saja?</i>
R: (b) <i>Embek..., embek... (Menirukan suara hewan dan menghampiri V)</i>	R: <i>Embek..., embek... (Menirukan suara hewan dan menghampiri V)</i>
V: (c) <b><i>Ma, Ma, belino ijo!</i></b>	V: <b><i>Ma, Ma, belikan hijau!</i></b>
P: (d) <i>Hijau apa?</i>	P: <i>Hijau apa?</i>
V: (e) <b><i>Ijo itu lumput.</i></b>	V: <b><i>Hijau itu rumput.</i></b>
P: (f) <i>Hah?</i>	P: <i>Hah?</i>

The above speech occurs when R and V play, imitating animal sounds in the bedroom. Meanwhile, P was seen leaning back on the bed. R imitates animal sounds, while V is scared and hides under the pillow. When they play, P asks V as in speech (a). Suddenly, R spoke to V as in (b) scared V. Then, V was seen hiding under the pillow. Then, V spoke as in speech (c) gave orders to P. However, P did not understand the meaning of speech V and asked him like in speech (d). V answers question P as in speech (e). The response shown by P is to ask V again as in speech (f) because P still does not understand the meaning of V's speech.

Data (6) above shows that speech V has violated its manner maxim. P's speech in (a), namely *Ver, Verda pramuka diajari apa saja?* is a question P to V to find out the activity of the scout. However, P's speech in (a) was responded to by R in (b), namely *Embek..., Embek...* because R was looking at a card with a picture of a goat. Then, V spoke to (c) namely *Ma, Ma, belino ijo* because he was reminded of the scouting duties. The word green means green. However, if it is connoted with the meaning of V's speech, the scout book is green in color. Therefore, these utterances are considered taxa and indicate a violation of the maxims of implementation. Since P does not understand V's speech in (c), P says in (d), which is *Green?* to ask for an explanation of the meaning of V's speech. However, V's response to P's speech by telling (e) that *Ijo* is that grass also has taxa meaning. The utterance if denoted has the correct meaning and is not a taxa. However, if it is adapted to the context of the speech, the speech has a connotative meaning. The word green means

standby scout pocketbook. V spoke grass because of his spontaneity in making it easier to answer P's question. Speech V interpreted the meaning of green inappropriately, causing a violation of the manner maxim. Because it has an unclear meaning, the speech violates the manner maxims.

From the explanation above, V commits the violation as in speech (c) and (e) due to cognitive factors. V violates the maxim of manner because the speech that is delivered creates many meanings. This happened because of limited thinking and understanding of vocabulary.

#### Data 7

Context	
V and P are in V's room. V prepares to wear neat clothes. Then, P did the story with V.	
Data	Interpretation
P: (a) Verda mau kemana?	P: <i>Verda mau kemana?</i>
V: (b) Teapi.	V: <i>Terapi.</i>
P: (c) Terapi sama siapa?	P: <i>Terapi sama siapa?</i>
V: (d) <b>Ma, uda Ma.</b> (sambil tersenyum)	V: <b>Ma sudah Ma.</b> (sambil tersenyum)
P: (e) Sama siapa?	P: <i>Sama siapa?</i>
V: (f) Tami.	V: <i>Tami.</i>

The speech occurred in the bedroom between P and V. At that time, V was getting ready to go to therapy with P. When V was preparing to go to therapy, P did a speech with V as in speech (a). Speech V in (b) answers P's question by sitting in the bedroom. The speech P asks V as in (c). The response shown by V in (d) is to stand up and head towards the corridor telling P to immediately go to therapy. Because V has not answered P's question, then P emphasizes his question to V as in speech (e). Finally, V says as in (f) answers the question P.

The data (7) above is a violation of manner maxims. The violation of the maxim manner is shown in (d). In *Ma, uda Ma* is seen responding to P's question in (c) by stopping the speech. V is not cooperative with P in providing contribution in the form of clear information to P. The word *uda* has a very high inaccuracy. If it is not explained in the narrative, the word has various interpretations.

### 5. Discussion

Based on data analysis, the mentally retarded child violated four maxims. This is the same as the article written by Hidayati . However, the difference between the results of the analysis in this study is a violation of maxims occurs because of changes in the topic of speech. On the results of research by (Hidayati, 2018), the four violations of the maxims, every finding of violations of the maxims have a hidden meaning or implicature.

The results of data analysis regarding the violation of the maxims written by Saputri (2017), Setiawan et al. (2017), n Chikita et al., n.d. different from this research. The most violations of maxims in their research are a violation of manner maxims.

The results of data analysis which are almost the same as this study are written articles by Raharja & Rosyidha (2019) and Wahyuniyanto et al. (2020). The results of the data analysis of articles written by Raharja & Rosyidha (2019) were the most dominant type of violation is the maxim of the relation because Dodit Mulyanto conveyed too many messages that did not match the topic or change topics of conversation suddenly or did the wrong causality.

Research written by Raharja & Rosyidha (2019) has different research subjects. Similar research subjects are written by Wahyunianto et al. (2020). Wahyunianto et al. (2020) which examines the violation of the cooperative principle in children with autism, explains that autistic children tend to violate at least one maxim in each word. The maxim that has been violated the most is the maxim of relevance. This is the same as the results of this study, namely the maximal violation of the maxims is the relation maxim and the research subject is children with special needs.

Based on the results of the research that has been obtained, The maxims violation that most children with mental retardation are the maxim of relations. That is because V often changes the topic of speech. V often changes the topic because he is not interested in talking about topics.

Furthermore, the violation found in speech V is the violation of the maxim of the manner. Violation of the maxim of the manner is caused by the unclear information that is spoken V. Speech V which is often vague or unclear causes the speech partner to ask V to clarify the information. Meanwhile, the maxim of quantity and quality is a violation of the maxim that does not dominate in V speech. It indicates V speech that avoids the production of words that are not by their capacity and truth.

Second, among the four violations of the maxims above, the factor that most dominated speech V experienced violations was cognitive factors. This is because V is a mental retardation child (IQ=60). The ability to think V in receiving and processing information about speech is still lacking. Then, another factor causing speech V to experience violations is social and emotional. Social factors are caused by the contextual context of speech which causes V to not be interested in the conversation with the speech partner. Meanwhile, emotional factors because there is an attraction to an object that is liked V makes the speech not go well. Of the three factors, there is speech V who experiences a double factor. These dual factors are cognitive and emotional in speech V.

## **6. Conclusion**

Based on these explanations, it can be concluded that a violation committed by V against the speech partner not only violates the maxim but also is caused by the factors that cause the violation to occur. Thus, every V utterance that experiences violations of the maxims has a contributing factor.

## **References**

- Abdurrahman, M. (1999). Pendidikan Bagi Anak Berkesulitan Belajar: Teori. *Diagnosis, Dan Remediasinya*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Astuty, A., & Wulandari, A. (2019). A Syntactico-Pragmatic Study of the Speech of Mild Mentally Retarded Children. *The Journal of Educational Development*, 7(2), 98–103.
- Chikita, L. A. V. V., Patriantoro, P., & Sanulita, H. (n.d.). Pelanggaran Maksim Dalam Film 3 Srikandi Karya Iman Brotoseno. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 7(7).
- Crowley, D. J., & Mitchell, D. (1994). *Communication theory today*. Stanford University Press.
- Cummings, L. (2013). *Pragmatics: A multidisciplinary perspective*. Routledge.
- Cutting, J. (2005). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.

- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Brill.
- Hidayat, A. A. (2007). Metode penelitian keperawatan dan teknik analisis data. *Jakarta: Salemba Medika*.
- Hidayati, N. N. (2018). Pelanggaran Maksim (Flouting Maxim) Dalam Tuturan Tokoh Film Radio Galau Fm: Sebuah Kajian Pragmatik. *An-Nas*, 2(2), 248–263.
- Humaira, D., Fatmawati, F., & Zulmiyetri, Z. (2012). Pelaksanaan pembelajaran bahasa indonesia bagi anak tunagrahita ringan kelas iii di slb sabiluna pariaman. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Khusus*, 1(3).
- Lumbantobing, S. M. (2006). *Anak dengan mental terbelakang: Retardasi mental, gangguan belajar, gangguan pemusatan perhatian*. Jakarta: Balai Penerbit FK-UI.
- Massanga, M., & Msuya, E. A. (2017). The observance of Gricean Conversational Maxims by Tanzanian Politicians in TV Hosted Interviews. *English Literature and Language Review*, 3(9), 82–90.
- Muttaqin, A. (2009). *Pengantar Asuhan Keperawatan Dgn Gangguan Sistem Persarafan*. Penerbit Salemba.
- Nugraheni, M. W. (2015). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerjasama dan Kesantunan Berbahasa Siswa terhadap Guru melalui Tindak Tutur Verbal di SMP Ma'arif Tlogomulyo-Temanggung (Kajian Sosiopragmatik). *Transformatika: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 11(2), 108–123.
- Pujiyasari, S., Asih, S. H. M., & Nurullita, U. (2014). Pengaruh metode latihan menggosok gigi dengan kemandirian menggosok gigi anak retardasi mental usia sekolah. *Karya Ilmiah*.
- Raharja, A. U. S., & Rosyidha, A. (2019). Maxim of Cooperative Principle Violation by Dodit Mulyanto in Stand-up Comedy Indonesia Season 4. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(1), 62–77.
- Saputri, R. (2017). Analisis Percakapan di Media Facebook: Pelanggaran Maksim Kerja Sama (PK) Model Grice dalam Percakapan Facebook. *Jurnalistrendi: Jurnal Linguistik, Sastra, dan Pendidikan*, 2(2).
- Semiun, Y. (2006). Kesehatan mental 2. *Yogyakarta: Kanisius*, 46.
- Septiani, D., & Sandi, K. (2020). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Staf Desa Cisereh, Tangerang (Kajian Pragmatik). *Jurnal Pena Indonesia*, 6(1), 12–30.
- Setiawan, A., Basuki, R., & Rahayu, N. (2017). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Percakapan Dalam Acara Mata Najwa Di Metro Tv. *Jurnal Ilmiah KORPUS*, 1(1), 1–9.
- Somantri, S. (2007). *Anak Tunagrahita*. Yogyakarta: Kanwa Publisher.
- Staff. (2008). AAMR, American Association on Mental Retardation. *Encyclopedia of Special Education*, 1.
- Sularyo, T. S., & Kadim, M. (2016). Retardasi mental. *Sari Pediatri*, 2(3), 170–177.
- Sulistyowati, W. (2014). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dan Implikatur Percakapan dalam Film Petualangan Sherina Karya Riri Riza. *Skripsi. Universitas Airlangga*.
- Tupan, A. H., & Natalia, H. (2008). The multiple violations of conversational maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of Desperate Housewives. *K@ Ta Lama*, 10(1), 63–78.
- Wahyunianto, D., Djatmika, D., & Purnanto, D. (2020). Grice's Cooperative Principles Violation In The Communication Of Children With Autism. *Sosiohumaniora*, 22(1), 36–45.
- Wilson, G. N. (1997). *Developmental Disabilities In Infancy and Childhood*, 2nd Ed., vols. I, II.

- Arnold J. Capute and Pasquale J. Accardo, editors. Paul H. Brookes Publishing, Baltimore, MD, 1996, 1159pp, . *American Journal of Medical Genetics*. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1096-8628\(19970414\)69:4<435::aid-ajmg22>3.o.co;2-n](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1096-8628(19970414)69:4<435::aid-ajmg22>3.o.co;2-n)
- Zebua, E., Rukmini, D., & Saleh, M. (2017). The violation and flouting of cooperative principles in the ellen degeneres talk show. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 12(1), 103–113.