

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter gives detailed information about the methodology that was used in this current study. The first part describes the research design that was used in the study. The second part explains the data collection and the processes of collecting the data. The last part explains how the data were analyzed in this research.

#### **3.1. Research Design**

This study was conducted by using a descriptive qualitative method because it dealt with the description of each result for the data. As stated by Croker (2009) and Trotter (2012), the qualitative method requires the data to be collected and later examined by using interpretative analysis. This method was also more suitable because the data were in the form of transcribed conversations, and they were more likely to be various instead of in an exact form of a number. Thus, the qualitative method was required in this research.

#### **3.2. Data Collection**

The data were a video of question and answer during the trial between the judge, the prosecutor, and Miryam as a defendant in a courtroom. The video was taken from the video-sharing platform, YouTube, and was published on March 30, 2017. The video is titled “*JPU Cecar Kesaksian Miryam Dalam Sidang Kasus E-KTP*” (Prosecutors rain down Miryam’s testimony on E-KTP case with questions), and it was uploaded by the official account of CNN Indonesia. The main reason why this study used the data was because it had the major potential in having maxims violations. To assist the ease of this study, Miryam, in this case, was referred to as a defendant even though her status during the trial was still a witness.

Then, the video was transcribed to help facilitate the analysis. However, the conversations that were transcribed were only the potential lines that consisted of violations which were committed by the defendant. The utterances that were

incompatible with the facts of the trial were identified as violations and enclosed as the data. Finally, the data were in the form of script of the questions and answers between the prosecutor, the judge, and Miryam. After finding what types of maxims violation that occurred in the defendant's statements, this study also discussed the implied meaning, but only in sentences or statements that have the potential to have the hidden meaning.

### **3.3. Data Analysis**

After the data were collected in the form of script, they were then analyzed by using four rules of Cooperative Principle from Grice (1975). To discuss the data, this study provided excerpts of the questions and answers conversation between the judge, the prosecutor and the defendant which consisted of the maxim violations. The analysis was conducted in several steps. The first step was identifying the potential lines that consisted of any violation committed by the defendant. Then, the second step was categorizing those utterances whether the defendant violated maxim of quantity, quality, relation, or manner by using the theory. The next step was interpreting each excerpt which probable of having the implied meaning. Finally, after all the steps were done, the conclusions were drawn.

The process of analyzing the data in the discussion section was carried out sequentially following the highest number of maxim violation committed by the witness. The sequence started with maxim of relation, followed by maxim of quantity, and the last one is maxim of manner. Then, abbreviation techniques were used when writing each name during the analysis process in the discussion section, where Miryam became M, the judge became J, and the prosecutor became P.

### 3.4. Data Example

The data that were categorized are presented in the attached table below.

**Table 3.1 Transcribed Conversations of Miryam’s Investigatory with Prosecutors**

Names	Data Utterances	Violation				The Ways of Violation	Descriptions
		QL	QN	RL	MN		
Jaksa	<i>Ya komentarnya Bu Diah apa?</i> (0:34)						
Miryam	What comment that Mrs. Diah has stated? <i>Dia bilang itu ada komentar Bu Diah katanya. Saya gak terlalu baca banget.</i> (0:40)			x	x	Violating maxims of <b>relation</b> and <b>manner</b>	<b>Giving irrelevant</b> and <b>ambiguous</b> answer
	She said that there was a comment from Mrs. Diah. I did not really take a clear look on it.						

After doing the analysis on the as presented in table 3.1, it can be seen that the defendant, Miryam, did several violations in her statement. Each violation committed by Miryam was also marked by different color in order to distinguish a violation that occurred during her testimony in a courtroom. The first column showed the conversation between Miryam, the judge, and the prosecutor. The table also provided the type of violations by giving different marks on each violation in which to give the reader understanding of how the defendant violated it. After distinguishing each violation, then a description of each violation of the maxims was explained.

Then afterwards, the statements were further analyzed to uncover the implied meaning. In table 3.2 below, the statement was categorized once more whether it falls to

the generalized conversational implicature (G.C.I.) or particularized conversational implicature (P.C.I.). Interpretations were drawn so that underlying meaning of the texts was able to be deciphered.

**Table 3.2 Implicature analysis on Miryam’s statements**

No	Utterances	Maxim Types	Non-observance	Types of Implicature	Hidden Meaning
1	<p>P: What was the comment that Mrs. Diah has stated?</p> <p>M: She said that there was a comment from Mrs. Diah. I did not really take a clear look on it.</p> <p>P: I see. (clarifying the answer)</p>	Relation, manner	Violation	P.C.I.	<p>In the beginning, the prosecutor’s question is overlaid with the reporter’s voice. However, after some explanation from Miryam, the prosecutor gives another question with a rising tone indicating that they are the same and the second is used as an emphasis to the previous question. With that being said, Miryam’s previous answer when combined with the data put in the table, it is clear that Miryam deliberately confused the prosecutor in order to hold the comment from a character named Elsa. Instead of answering with sentence such as “I forgot what Mrs. Elsa said,” she instead gave another answer in a convoluted way.</p>