

## **The implication of violation of cooperative principle in discourse on corruption of Indonesia Lawyers Club**

**Mangatur Sinaga  
Dahnilsyah**

Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Riau  
Pekanbaru, 28293, Indonesia  
Email: mangatur.sinaga83162@gmail.com

**Abstract.** This article discusses the violation implicature of cooperative principle of discourse on corruption of Indonesia Lawyers Club. The applied theories are: (1) Searle's speech acts (1969); (2) Austin's Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary (1962); (3) Grice's conversational implicatures and cooperative principles (in Leech,1993); (4) Levinson's pragmatics and semantic deviation (1983), Parker's pragmatics (in Rahardi, 2005;48); (5) Spencer and Wilson's relevance theory (in Rahardi, 2010). Data were gathered by means of listening and recording. The speeches were analyzed by employing the maxim violation and implicatures theories. The violation of cooperative principle implies (1) the speakers fully comprehend the speech, (2) Government has insufficient budget to pay the judges of regional anti-corruption court, (3) Government seems skeptical about the regional judge selection test, (4) The speakers are fully confident that they possess capability of eradicating corruption, (5) Both payment and allowance of the regional judge of anti-corruption court do not receive scholarly attention that have made difficult for them to work as law enforcers and as justice enforcers, (6) Some negative effects emerged by virtue of the poor planning of the establishment of the regional court, (7) The anti-corruption court lost dignity; The role of Judicial commission is not effective in providing guidances to the judges, (9) All elements have committed corruption like termites keep encircling nation, (10) issues on corruption are not seriously discussed (11) regional elections indirectly trigger corruption.

**Keywords:** *Implicature, Cooperative principle, Corruption discourse.*

### **1 Introduction**

In the course of conversation, the real intention of the speaker's speeches are often impliedly conveyed. The speeches which implicitly express the meaning is usually called implicature. Implicature refers to the speakers' speeches. On the other hand, implication is defined as the direct impact of the speeches. Following are the examples:

---

A: “ At 14:00 tomorrow, we will have meeting for SM-3T preparation, at Senate room, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.

B: “Oh no, I get lesson at Civil Engineering”

A: “O.K. Sir. You may have the minutes the day after tomorrow.”

B’s implicature is that he can not attend the SM-3T meeting at 14.00 as he was scheduled to teach at Civic Engineering. Even though B did not say directly that he couldn’t attend the meeting, his speeches had already said “Oh no, I get lesson at civic engineering” A could get the point of B, he therefore says “O.K. Sir, you may have the minutes the day after tomorrow.” The implication of speeches of A and B indicates that B should meet A to obtain the minutes one day after the meeting.

This article describe and explain The pragmatic of the violation of cooperative principles of discourse on corruption of *Indonesia Lawyers Club*. This study is based on the theory of Cooperative principles

The applied theories in this study: (1) Searle’s speech acts (1969); (2) Austin’s locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act (1962) i; (3) Grice’s Maxim and Implicatures, Cooperative Principle (1975) and (in Leech, 1993); (4) Levinson’s Pragmatics and the deviation of semantic sentence (1983),; Parker’s definition of pragmatics (in Rahardi, 2005:48); (5) Spencer and Wilson’s relevance theory (inRahardi, 2010) tentang teori relevansi.

Levinson (1983:9) says *pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language*. The definition of pragmatic of Levinson is made in Indonesian version by Rahardi (2005:48): a study of language which learn the language relation with its context. Konteks meliputi tuturan-tuturan sebelumnya (konteks wacana), peserta di dalam tuturan, The context covers the previous utterances of the speakers in the course of the speech process: knowledge, purpose, social background and physical at the time the interaction occurs (Cruse, 2006:136-137) and Baskoro (2014:76).

According to Parker (in Rahardi, 2005:48), pragmatics is the branch of linguistics which externally study of the language structure. It implies how a certain unit of lingua is applied in a real communication.Parker in this respect separates pragmatic and the study of language structure. The former is tightly connected with context and the latter is concerned with the details of language in internal scope.

The term implicature was adopted by Grice (1975) to explain what has been interpreted, suggested, or intended by the speaker are different with what had been said (Brown and Yule, 1996). According to Levinson (1983), conversational implicature is a deviation of semantic loading of a sentence.

---

Implication is a consequence or direct impact of something. Something here refers to utterance. It is also interpreted as something which is implied, involved or existed but is not explicitly conveyed. Some words which indicates the same meaning with implications are connection, involvement, effect, impact, intention, relevance, association, cause, connotation, and suggestion. In brief, implication is the direct effect of something.

An understanding towards a conversational implicature is inseparable with the cooperative principle introduced by Grice (Brown and Yule, 1996:31-32). "*The cooperative principle makes our contribution as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which we are engaged.*" The general principles according to Nurkamto (2000) can be reflected from the four types of maxims: (1) The maxim of quantity: try to make your contribution as informative as is required. In other words, do not make your contribution more or less informative than it is required, (2) The maxim of quality: try to make your contribution one that is true. At this point, to make your utterances understandable, you have to avoid saying something that you believe to be false or lack of adequate evidence, (3) The maxim of relevance: try to make your contributions relevant. It means that you have to say some information which is related to the topic, (4) The maxim of manner: try to make your utterance as clear, as brief, and as orderly as one can in what one says, and avoid obscurity and ambiguity

Such studies had been done by Mangatur et al entitled: The speech acts in the *Indonesia Lawyers Club Dialogue*. It had been published in *Jurnal Bahas*, vol. 8, no. 1, April 2013. The objective of the study was to describe the forms of locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary acts and the violation of politeness principles which had been observed in the speech acts of the three episodes of *Indonesia Lawyers Club: Hukum untuk Kaum Sendal Jepit (HKSJ)*, *Setelah Angie, Anas Dibidik (SAAD)*, and *Angie Oh Angie (AA)*. Unlike the previous study which merely analysed and described the types of speech acts, and the violation of politeness principles, this study provides accounts for the pragmatics implication as a consequence of the cooperative principles.

The speaker violated the cooperative principle with certain intentions. In some cases, such violations may lead to implication for the addressee. Such Implication is identified by observing the addressee's reaction towards the speaker

---

---

## 2. Methodology

Sources of data in this study are four discourses on corruption of *Indonesia Lawyers Club*: (1) *Korupsi Bebas Pengadilan Bubar* (KBPB), (2) *Angie Oh Angie* (AOA), (3) and (4) *Korupsi Meruyak, Negara Sekarat* (KMNS).

The listening technique was applied to grasp the speeches of the dialogue of participants derived from you tube video. Meanwhile, the recording technique was aimed at recording the speeches which violated the maxim of quantity, quality, relevance and manner which are the four maxims of cooperative principles. To identify the implications, the speeches were divided in to the speech events. From such events, the implicatures were discovered which posses implications. The implications were then formulated based on the speeches, implicatures and contexts.

## 3. Results and Discussion

Referring to the four analysis objects, there are 15 speech events are discovered related to the discourse on corruption. 7 speech events are available in KBPB, 2 speech events in AOA, 3 speech events are observed in CHI-MJKB, and the other 3 speech events are identified in KMNS. Of the speech in the 15 speech act events, there were 17 implications of violation of the cooperative principle. Following are the implications of violation of cooperative principle referring to the quantity, quality, relevance and manner maxims.

### The Implication of Violation of the Cooperative Principle

The form of pragmatic-contained speeches are implied propositions which were expressed due to the maxim violation of cooperative principle. Maxim quantity expects someone to provide information as informative as is required. In other words, he/she does not make your contribution more or less informative than it is required

1. The Ministry of Law and Human Rights (Amir Syamsuddin) lost his faith in the judges of regional anti-corruption courts

Amir syamsuddin started the talk show by addressing the issue of the judges of regional anti-corruption courts/Ad Hoc judges. According to Amir Syamsuddin, the case of the judge of anti-corruption court should be taken seriously as two famous mass media: Tempo and Gatra exposed the history, and recruitment procedures of the Ad hoc judge.

Amir Syamsuddin thought that the intergrity of the judges of the regional anti-corruption court/the Ad Hoc judges is questionable. Amir Syamsuddin

---

---

used expressive or evaluative speech acts that is the speaker's speeches are interpreted as an evaluation and are intended to an evaluation of something which has been conveyed. The element of evaluative speech acts is to blame on someone/something

## 2. The Judges and Chairman of Corruption Eradication Commission are committed to combat corruption

The speeches conveyed by Syamsul Rakan Caniago seemed to have been overstated in responding to Amir Syamsuddin's argument who had lost faith in the work performance of the regional judges. The violation of maxim quantity occurred when Syamsul Rakan Caniago expressed his views towards Amir Syamsuddin's, he told about the complaints made by the regional court judges whose life had been drowned in the region; they have neither house nor vehicle. In Surabaya, there was a story where the judges were provided car which were not worth driving.

Based on the interview of Karni Ilyas with Abraham Samad, it revealed his commitment to eradicate corruption. With the explanations which had violated the maxim quantity, he promised to tackle the big cases by saying "*Insyallah saya akan menyelesaikan kasus-kasus besar dan ...yang jelas janji saya bahwa diantara kasus-kasus yang tadi Bang Karni, Pak Karni sebutkan, insyaallah ada salah satunya selesai dalam satu tahun.*" (*"Insyallah, I will complete the big cases and.. one thing for a certain is that from the big cases brother Karni had already mentioned, Insya Allah they will be accomplished within one year.*)

## 3. Government is not serious in combatting corruption

The pragmatic implication of the utterance *government is not serious in combatting corruption* occurred in regards to the speeches of Syamsul Rakan Caniago. His speeches had violated the maxim quantity as it had exaggerated the information as requested. The information which violated the maxim quantity was aimed at revealing that the government is not serious in combatting corruption. Such less integrity was observed with the intention of Amir Syamsuddin as the minister of Law and Human Rights to dissolve the judges of regional anti-corruption courts.

## 4. Abraham Samad is ready to bear mandate as the chairman of Corruption Eradication Committee.

The readiness of Abraham Samad to serve as the chairman of Corruption Eradication Committee is based on his accounts: his background as an advocate, comprehending the investigation and inquiry process, filing of a court file, gathering evidences and data verification process. Abraham's willingness was supported with the appointment of volume 3

---

---

commissioners: Bambang, Pandu, Zulkarnain, and Busro. Abraham Samad's willingness was comprehensively expressed which had violated the quantity maxim.

5. The work performance of law practitioners are not good

Sahetapy's speeches is related with the statement of Karni Ilyas saying that 91,7% of public have lost their faith in the court, including to the advocates. Sahetapy's arguments seemed to be excessively and was not informative as expected. Over all, his speeches was expressive or evaluative, which blamed the supreme court

The pragmatic implication in Sahetapy's speeches therefore is that the law apparatus have not worked professionally and effectively.

6. The work performance of regional judges are still low.

The weakness of regional anticorruption court was conveyed by Hotman Paris Hupatea by violating the quantity maxim. He criticised sahetapy's statement saying that the advocates were not good. According to Hotman, corruption eradication program can not be done merely with conscience. What Hotman Paris expected was how to keep the honor of the regional anti-corruption through professional judges. The pragmatic implication of his speeches was to convey opinion on increasing the dignity and honor of the judges of the regional anti corruption court.

7. KPK failed to tackle mega corruptions which had allegedly been committed by people in the inner circles

The implication of violation of quantity maxim was observed from Permadi's speeches who said that KPK's failure to tackle mega corruption cases committed by some persons in the inner circle. What Permadi referred to Mega corruption, among others is the century case.

8. Abraham Samad are not confident to eradicate corruption.

He says: " Explicitly that's the way. The words would be like that if there is not much I can do to tackle corruption, I had better go back to my hometown. According to Samad, his strong commitment and capability to investigate and tackle corruption cases was in responding to Mrs. Dewi Asmara's question (Law maker) who said whether he would be ready to resign or not if he could not tackle corruption cases within one year."

9. Sahetapy criticized the talk show participants of ILC who were not competent and impolite

---

---

The violation of relevance maxim was indicated by Sahetapy's speeches which were not related to the topic. The statements irrelevant to the topic theoretically indicate certain implications. Sahetapy says: "Look Mr. Karni, The honorable Mr. Karni, I got mixed up looking at people who are debating like this. In Dutch language means *chicken without head*. Going here and there without knowing where to go."

10. Soetan Bathoegana tried to give answers without making jokes to avoid and save his party's credibility

The violation of manner maxim was done by Soetan Bathoegana. Karni Ilyas asked Soetan Bathoegana's opinion about Angie whether she lied or not on her corruption. His responses were not relevant to the question. "TV ONE should have been grateful. Yes, in the past eight months, some persons of democrat have been headlines. We wholeheartedly accept it, it is a part of good deeds. Second, I would like to tell Mr. Hotman Paris, He said that he was a lucky person. Your name is Hotman Paris. Bad hotman but is in demand. How lucky you are. You should be grateful. Lie or not lie is not our domain Mr. Karni."

#### 4. Conclusion

The analysis towards cooperative principle of the discourse of Indonesia Lawyers Club on Corruption topic has resulted in implication. The implication was obtained due to the speeches that violate the quantity, quality, relevance and manner maxims. Implikasi terbanyak didapati akibat pelanggaran maksim kuantitas. Artinya, tuturan yang melanggar maksim kuantitas akan menimbulkan sejumlah implikatur, yang selanjutnya akan menimbulkan implikasi yang banyak pula. The majority of maxim occurs caused by the quantity maxim. It implies that the speeches which violate the quantity maxim may lead to implicatures, and consequently, afterwards, it may cause many implication.

#### References

- Brown, Gillian., George, Y., 1996, Analisis Wacana (edisi terjemahan oleh I. Soetikno), Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Kress, G.R., 1976, Halliday: System and Function in Language, London: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G., 1983, Principle of Pragmatic, London: Longman (terj. Oka, MDD, Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia).
-

- 
- Nababan, P.W.J., 1987, Ilmu Pragmatik (Teori dan Penerapannya). Jakarta: Dirjen Pendidikan Tinggi.
- Nadar, F.X., 2009, Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik, Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Rahardi, R., Kunjana., 2005, Pragmatik Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia, Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Rustono., 1998, Implikatur Percakapan Sebagai Penunjang Pengungkapan Humor di dalam Wacana Humor Verbal Lisan Berbahasa Indonesia, Semarang: Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya Universitas Indonesia.
- Searle, J.R., 1969, Speech Act. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinaga, M., 2013, The Non-Compliance with the Principle of Cooperation and the Political Implication: a Pragmatic Review, *Asian Social Science Special Issue*, 9(12), 156.
-