

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the description of the current study. It consists of several parts which include the background of the study, the statement of the problems, the purpose of the study, the scope and limitation of the study, the significance of the study, the clarification of key terms, and the organization of the paper.

1.1. Background of the Study

People are engaged in an activity called conversation to connect with others. In a conversation, language is utilized by people in order to convey their ideas or feelings whether directly or indirectly. Therefore, the use of the language in a conversation is said to be a dynamic process where it accommodates both the speakers' intention and hearers' interpretation (Marmaridou, 2000). Regarding the speakers' intention, they may produce direct or indirect meaning of utterances. When the speaker conveys the meaning directly, the hearer will be able to easily understand the speaker's intention. In contrast, in indirect meaning, the hearer needs to examine the context of the conversation in order to interpret or understand the intended meaning.

Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975) is believed to be one way to clarify the meaning of direct or indirect utterances by the speakers. In addition, it contains an explanation of how people manage their utterances in exchanging messages. Grice (1975) argues that people's behavior in conversational exchanges could be considered as cooperative and uncooperative. The speakers are said to be cooperative when they follow a certain set of communication principles. The principles are also labeled as maxims. These maxims comprise maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

Meanwhile, the speakers are said to be uncooperative contributors when they do not adhere to the maxims. In certain cases, they fail to observe the maxims. The

way they fail to observe the maxims is called the non-observance of the maxims (Thomas, 1995). It can be divided into several types such as flouting a maxim, violating a maxim, infringing a maxim, opting-out of a maxim, and suspending a maxim. In brief, flouting a maxim occurs when a speaker deliberately answers questions indirectly and it does not answer specifically in order to generate an implicature. On the other hand, a violation occurs when speakers intentionally tell lies to the hearer, but the hearer cannot see through it. Infringing takes place when speakers have inadequate linguistic competence so that they do not speak clearly. Opting-out of maxims occurs when speakers avoid responding to the hearer's demand to provide information. Lastly, suspending occurs when speakers fail to observe a maxim because of a cultural code.

From the five non-observances mentioned above, the most potential way that is suitable for telling lies is the non-observance of violation. As stated in Grice (1975), speakers who violate the maxims are liable to mislead the hearer which means that they are capable of deceiving others. By violating the maxims, the hearer may not realize when the speakers attempt to tell lies. One particular instance in which speakers potentially tell lies and violates the cooperative principle is in a court context. From that context, the speakers' utterances are potentially misleading (Yule, 1996). Therefore, examining the violation of maxim in an investigatory interview context is intriguing and significant.

To date, there have been many studies conducted to investigate violation of maxims in law context, for instance, Tajabadi, Dowlatabadi, and Mehri in 2014 studied Grice's four maxims of conversation in oral disputes in the Iranian Dispute Settlement Council. They found that one of the reasons for violating Grice's principle is "the general nature of the legislative and legal writing that results from the general function of the law system". Meanwhile, Khoyi and Behnam (2014) presented their research which provides an insight of how language operates in the legal setting by building bridges between cooperative principles and speech acts in forensic linguistics. A study from Ceballos and Sosas (2018) which employed forensic linguistic analysis revealed the occurrences of violation on conversational maxims in

court proceedings. Several maxim violations in those previous studies were deliberately committed for certain purposes.

In contrast to the previous studies, this study examines an example of a courtroom setting hearing in the Indonesian E-KTP corruption issue, particularly Miryam S. Haryani's testimonies. The testimonies used as the data were taken when she was still a defendant. The defendant now resides in Rutan Pondok Bambu all female prison as a convict (Amalia, 2019). The main reason why it is investigated is that the corruption issue itself is considered to be one of the biggest scandals in Indonesian's cases. The local media even dubbed it as a 'megacorruption' issue. Furthermore, the estimated value of money lost to this case is approximately 2.3 trillion Indonesian rupiah with some claims to be as far as 2.5 (Hidayat, 2017; Amalia, 2019).

In addition to its significance in Indonesian's law history, the previous studies discussed earlier only focused solely on maxim violations; they did not discuss in detail on the implied meaning of the maxim violations. As known on every violation in a conversation, it mostly has a deeper meaning in understanding the speaker's intention. Thus, in addition to examining the types of violation occurred, this study was conducted to investigate the implied meaning. To analyze the data, theoretical frameworks from Grice (1975) on Cooperative Principle and Implicature are used.

1.2. Statements of Problems

As discussed earlier, this study is conducted to find out how the cooperative principle is violated by Miryam in her statements where she is summoned to the court as a defendant in the E-KTP issue. Therefore, this research is conducted based on these two research questions:

1. What types of maxim violations are committed by the defendant in answering the questions?
2. What meanings do the maxim violations imply?

1.3. Purposes of the Study

This study analyzes the violation of maxims in the defendant's statements which take place in a court. Since there have been many incidents regarding public deception by politicians to the people, the issue spurred this study. Furthermore, it has become a common knowledge that people know politicians tend to lie or cover up things, but said politicians did it over and over again nonetheless. Moreover, this study attempts to examine the types of maxims violation occurred in the defendant's answers. To be more specific, this study tries to answer both of the research questions above.

1.4. Scope and Limitation of the Study

This current study is based on the Grice's (1975) theory of cooperative principle. More specifically, this study focuses on the violation of maxims in law case context. In addition, this study covers the strategies of maxim violation and the implied meaning in Miryam's statements as a defendant to the E-KTP corruption case.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The results of the present study are expected to contribute to the development of the field of pragmatics, specifically to the study of cooperative principle theory focusing in linguistic forensic. Moreover, this research is expected to increase knowledge about the non-observance maxims. Furthermore, this research will be useful to be used as a reference when examining problems in the field of linguistic forensics in future studies.

1.6. Clarification of Key Terms

The following terms are clarified to guide the study in order to avoid misconception:

1. Cooperative Principle

Cooperative Principle is a principle or a rule where the contribution of the speaker and the hearer is fulfilled as is required in communication. By applying this principle, interlocutors can build meaningful conversations (Grice, 1975).

2. Conversational Maxims

Conversational Maxims are unstated assumptions in conversations (Yule, 1996). There are four categories of maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner (Grice, 1975). The maxims are proposed by Paul Grice.

3. Non-Observance of Maxims

Non-observance of maxims is an act of failing to observe a situation where maxims are violated by the speaker. There are five ways of non-observances such as flouting a maxim, violating a maxim, infringing a maxim, opting-out a maxim, and suspending a maxim. (Thomas, 1995).

4. Violation of Maxims

Violation of maxim is a condition where a speaker fails to observe the maxims in a way that it will mislead the interlocutor (Grice, 1975).

5. Implicature

It is a situation where there is a difference between what the words in an utterance mean and what the speaker intended meaning (Davies, 2000).

1.7. Organization of the Paper

This paper is divided into five parts. The first chapter presents the basis of this research. There are several parts, namely the background, the statements of problems, purposes of the study, the scope of the study, the significance of the study, the clarification of key terms, and the organization of the paper. The second chapter explains the relevant theoretical frameworks that are used in this research as well as the relevant studies that support the current research. The third chapter describes the methods used, such as the research design, the data collection, and the data analysis.

The fourth chapter explains and discusses in details regarding the results of the analysis that answers the research questions. The last chapter consists of conclusions from the results of the study. This chapter also provides suggestions from the author for further research.