CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents the methodology used in the present study. First, it describes the research design used in the study. Second, it describes the data collection and the procedures for collecting the data. Lastly, it describes how the data are analyzed in the study.

3.1 Research Design

In order to analyze how the defendant defends herself through a language tactic that she uses during the legal of investigation**, the present study** employs **a descriptive qualitative method.** The reason for using the qualitative method is because it deals with analyzing the data which are collected in the place where participants experience the problem (Creswell, 2009). In line with that, the study describes a social phenomenon, as reflected in a court trial, particularly when the problem in finding the truth arises because an uncooperative contribution is displayed by the defendant. Moreover, the method is used to analyze talk, text, and interaction rather than number (Silverman, 1993). It is in line with this study which is focused to analyze the defendant's verbal behavior in responding to the prosecutor's questions during the investigation. Additionally, the method is concerned with understanding how people choose to live their lives, the meaning they give to their experiences and their feelings about their condition (Newby, 2014). **Thus, the method is used in order to** describe how the defendant hides the truth through her words and action during the investigation.

To analyze the data, the study employs the theoretical framework of cooperative principle as proposed by Grice (1976). The analysis is focused on violation of conversational maxims. Within the theory, violation is outlined with other ways of non-observances such as flouting, opting out, infringing, and

suspending. However, violation is suitable for the main goal of the study which attempts to reveal how the attitude as a lie can be described through the words and action that the defendant utters and displays. Moreover, the reason for analyzing violation is because the defendant has accepted a verdict of guilty, thus some defendant's utterances might be liable to be identified as violation.

3.2 Data Collection

The data in the present study were in the form of conversations which were conducted in a court trial of cyanide case in Indonesia. The court of that case was organized for 31 sessions and aired on Metro TV and TV One. These TV media also streamed and uploaded 31 court sessions on their accounts in Youtube. Among the 31 court sessions, the 21st session which was held on 28 September 2016 was chosen and downloaded. Due to the large amount of data from the original source, which is from TV One's account, the data were downloaded from different sources. Hence, it is acknowledged that the data downloaded from the alternative sources may have been edited. However, the researcher did crosschecking with the original data from TV one's account of Youtube.

After downloading video of the 21st court session, the conversations in that session court were transcribed. However, only the conversations between the seven prosecutors and the defendant were chosen and transcribed. The next step was reducing the transcribed conversations through selecting some conversations that contain violation done by the defendant. In selecting violation, the defendant's utterances were compared with the facts of the trial that had been conveyed by the judge in the court ruling. Those facts of the trial were downloaded and transcribed early. The utterances which 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 seven prosecutors' questions and the defendant's answers that contained violations.

The conversation in cyanide court case was chosen because it was accessible as the data. Moreover, the 21st court session of cyanide case was chosen

Maharani Riestania, 2017
VIOLATION OF THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN COURT CONTEXT
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

32

because in this session the defendant was investigated through questions given by seven prosecutors and three judges. Hence, the conversation in this court session is considered as the most suitable to analyze. The conversation can be analyzed to reveal how someone accused of committing crime defends him or herself through the use of violation of cooperative principle.

3.3 Data Analysis

The process of data analysis in this study was accomplished in several steps namely identifying and categorizing the way cooperative principle is violated, calculating, interpreting findings, and identifying the perlocutionary effect of violation. The elaboration of each step is presented below.

3.3.1 Identifying and Categorizing the Way Cooperative Principle is Violated

The identification was started in the step of data reduction through identifying the defendant's utterances that contained violation of the quality maxim. In identifying the violation, the defendant's utterances were compared with the facts of the trial. The utterances which were incompatible with the facts of the trial were finally chosen and enclosed as the data.

The next step was identifying the types of the way cooperative principle was violated. It was accomplished by identifying maxims that were breached besides the quality maxim. In this step, the conversations were presented in the table that concerned the utterances which contain violations and types of maxims that were breached in violations. The table consists of columns of utterance, violation, the ways of violation, and descriptions. Under the column of violation, there are column of types of maxims which are abbreviated, QL for Quality, QN for Quantity, RL for Relation, and MN for Manner. In identifying the way the cooperative principle was violated, a checklist symbol (√) was used to mark the defendant utterances that contain violation. All the defendant's utterances that

Maharani Riestania, 2017
VIOLATION OF THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN COURT CONTEXT
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

33

contain violation were put checklists in all columns of quality. Meanwhile, the other columns of quantity, relation and manner maxims were given checklist depending on which maxims that the defendant breached. After the defendant's utterances were identified as violation, the next step was to categorize the way the defendant violated the cooperative principle based on the maxims were breached. The last step was to describe briefly the reason for the defendant's utterances were categorized as certain way of violations. Further, the following is presented the Table 3.1 concerning sample of the way cooperative principle is violated.

Table 3.1 Sample of the Ways the Cooperative Principle is Violated

Utterances	Violation QL	The breach QN	The breach RL	The breach MN	The ways of violation	Descriptions
P1 : *Seingat sodara begitu, tidak ada gerakan gerakan sodara untuk menyusun kembali paper bag?* (You guess like that, wasn't there any gesture to rearrange the position of the paper bags?)						
D : *Saya tidak merasa menyusun…Saya yang saya ingat benar paper beg ada di meja lalu pada akhirnya ada di belakang* (I don't feel that I arranged the paper bags…I…what I really remember was that the paper bags were on the table and finally they were behind)	√	√		√	Violating the quality maxim, aided with the breaches of quantity and manner maxims	Contradictory to the fact; unimportant information added; obscure expression
P1 : *Memindahkannya itu pada saat sebelum kopi disajikan ataupun setelah kopi disajikan?* (When did you move those bags? Before or after the coffee was served?)						
D : *Tidak saya tidak begitu ingat kapan.* (No, I don't really remember when I moved those bags)	√				Violating the quality maxim alone	Contradictory to the fact; Lack of memory
P1 : *Apakah sebelum cocktail disajikan atau setelah kopi disajikan?* (Before or after the coffee was served?)						
D : *Tidak saya tidak begitu ingat* (No, I don't really remember)	√				Violating the quality maxim alone	Contradictory to the fact; Lack of memory

3.3.2 Calculating frequency of the ways cooperative principle is violated

After identifying and categorizing the utterances into some ways of violation, the next step was to calculate the occurrences of the ways of violation. The results of the calculation were distributed to the table of frequency in order to find out the most frequent ways of violations that the defendant did in responding to the prosecutors' questions.

3.3.3 Identifying the Perlocutionary Effect of Violation

The next step was to identify the perlocutionary effect of violation on the prosecutors. The perlocutionary effect analysis was accomplished by observing the responses that the prosecutors gave after the defendant acted in violation of cooperative principle. The perlocutionary analysis is intended to reveal whether the effect of violation on the prosecutors corresponds with the defendant's purpose.

3.3.4 Interpreting Findings

The last step was to interpret the patterns. The interpretation was intended to answer two research questions about: (1) How does the defendant act in violation of the cooperative principle in her answers to respond to the prosecutors' questions? (2) What is the perlocutionary effect of violation that appears during the investigation?

In answering the first research problem, the data were interpreted based on the type of the way cooperative principle was violated. It was determined by whether the defendant mostly violated cooperative principle through the breach of quality maxim alone or aided with other maxims. Next, the occurrences of pattern were interpreted based on how the defendant acted in violation in her answers to respond to the prosecutors' questions. In interpreting that matter, the study was focused on the way the defendant violated the cooperative principle. It was determined by whether the violation was done by giving more or less information or many other ways.

In answering the second research question, the data were interpreted based on whether the perlocutionary effect of violation corresponds to the defendant's purpose or not. The interpretation was seen from what responses that the prosecutors gave after the defendant acted in violation of cooperative principle. For example, it was seen from whether the prosecutors complained about the answers that contained violation or accepted the answers.

Maharani Riestania, 2017
VIOLATION OF THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN COURT CONTEXT
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

37