

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter exhibits the conclusion of this study, which is drawn carefully based on the formulation of problems. This chapter also presents some suggestions, for future research in exploring the same topic about violation of cooperative principle.

5.1 Conclusion

This research aims to reveal the way the defendant acts in violation of the cooperative principle in her answers to respond to the prosecutors' questions. In addition, this study also aims to examine the perlocutionary effect of violation on the prosecutors that appears during the investigation. The data are in the form of transcribed conversations between a defendant and seven prosecutors, taken from cyanide court case in the 21st court session. The data are analyzed by using Grice's (1975) theory of cooperative principle focusing on violation of cooperative principle.

With regards to the way the defendant violates the cooperative principle, the defendant violates cooperative principle by not only violating the quality maxim, some violations involve the breaches of the other maxims (quantity, relation, and manner). However, they are breached in violation as breaches forms, not as violations forms. The defendant breaches those maxims (quantity, relation and manner) in violation in order to aid the occurrence of violation of the quality maxim. Further, the study also discovers that the defendant violates the cooperative principle through eight ways: (1) Violating the quality maxim alone; (2) Violating the quality maxim, aided with the breach of quantity maxim; (3)

Violating the quality maxim, aided with the breach of relation maxim; (4) Violating the quality maxim, aided with the breach of manner maxim; (5) Violating the quality maxim, aided with the breaches of quantity and relation maxims; (6) Violating the quality maxim, aided with the breaches of quantity and manner maxims; (7) Violating the quality maxim, aided with the breaches of relation and manner maxims; (8) Violating the quality maxim, aided with the breaches of quantity, relation and manner maxims.

The result shows that the defendant mostly violates the cooperative principle through 'violating the quality maxim alone' for 97 times (49.24%) out of 197 times. By this way of violation, the defendant only violates the quality maxim without any other maxims involved. Further, it is also found that when the defendant violates quality maxim alone, she often gives negative answers 'no' and shows 'lack of memory' by saying 'forget or does not remember'. The defendant persistently gives those kinds of answers when responding to the questions that are the accusation. When the evidence is not shown to the court, the defendant prefers directly negating the truth. Meanwhile when the evidence is shown, she prefers saying 'forget or does not remember'. Such situation shows that pretending to forget may be the unostentatious way for the defendant to avoid telling the truth when the fact is displayed. Hence, either giving negative answer or stating lack of memory, both expressions can be said as the defendant's efforts to mislead the investigators. Both can be the indicators for the occurrence of violation of the quality maxim alone

The second most frequent way of violation is done through 'violating the quality maxim, aided with the breach of the relation maxim' for 28 times (14.72%) out of 197 times. Further, it is found that when the defendant violates the quality maxim and breaches the relation maxim, she gives irrelevant information. For the defendant, giving information that is not relevant to the questions may help her from not telling the truth. It may successfully direct the prosecutors to change the topic of questions that the defendant wants to avoid. In the defendant's

perspective, when violation of the quality maxim is done along with the breach of the relation maxim, it may reinforce the misleading effect.

Then the third most frequent way of violation which is done by the defendant is ‘violating quality maxim, aided with the breach of manner maxim’ for 25 times (12.69%) out of 197times. Further it is found that, when the defendant violates the quality maxim, aided with the breach of manner maxim, she often gives obscure and convoluted answers. It seems that in several exchanges, giving obscure and convoluted answers may confuse the prosecutors to catch point of information that they require. Thus in some exchanges, doing this way of violation successfully get the defendant no to tell truth.

Furthermore, regarding the perlocutionary effect of violation that appear during the investigation, it is found that the perlocutionary effects of violation result in certain responses from the prosecutors. The first response is that the prosecutors repeat their questions. The second response is that the prosecutors reveal the fact. The third response is that the prosecutors complain about the defendant’s answer. The last response is that the prosecutors direct the defendant to admit the truth. From those responses, it can be inferred that although the defendant hides a certain fact through violation of cooperative principle, it does not convince the prosecutors to believe her answers easily. The prosecutors may compare the defendant’s answers with the facts that they have found as the basis to determine whether the answer is true or false. Thus, when the defendant violates the truth, the prosecutors repeat their questions or complain about the defendant’s answers that contain violation.

Finally, although the violation cannot successfully convince the prosecutor to believe defendant’s answers, the violation may give a benefit for the defendant. For example, the defendant can avoid telling something that is the accusation. Hence, the present study acknowledges that the violation of cooperative principle in criminal investigation, specifically in a court context can be a language strategy of lying. In conclusion, violation of cooperative analysis could be a promising and objective method for detecting deception. Hopefully, this finding would improve

Maharani Riestania, 2017

VIOLATION OF THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN COURT CONTEXT

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

the understanding of the violation of the cooperative principle specifically for lying purposes and enable people to see what is behind someone's utterances.

5.2 Suggestion

Based on the result, two suggestions are proposed for further studies. The first suggestion is regarding the data analysis where this study is limited only to violation of cooperative principle analysis. Further studies are suggested to investigate violation with flouting and implicature. Furthermore, future studies may also compare which act between violation and flouting that is mostly performed by a defendant in defending him/herself during an investigation. The second suggestion is the data collection. Since this study is limited only to investigate violation performed by the defendant, future studies are suggested to investigate violation performed by a larger group of accused case with different genders or ages in different contexts. Also, future studies may investigate a comparison pattern of violation performed by different gender or ages.