

The Non-Compliance with the Principle of Cooperation and the Political Implication: A Pragmatic Review

Mangatur Sinaga¹

¹ Faculty of Education, The University of Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

Correspondence: Mangatur Sinaga, The University of Riau Pekanbaru, Indonesia. E-mail: mangatur.sinaga@yahoo.com

Received: August 1, 2013 Accepted: August 16, 2013 Online Published: August 30, 2013

doi:10.5539/ass.v9n12p156

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n12p156>

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the form of the non-compliance with the principle of cooperation, factors causing the non-compliance, and the political implicature of the discourse in the dialogue of *Corruption-Free* and *Court-Dismissed*. The topic *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed* was one of the titles included for the dialogue in the TV One program “*Indonesia Lawyers Club*”, which was aired in November 2012. The research sample consisted of the participants’ of the TV One dialogue which was recorded in form of VCD. Accordingly, the sample was randomly selected from the discussion session among the dialogue participants who did not comply with the principle of cooperation. The qualitative research design was employed using the pragmatic approach. The findings of the study showed that the non-compliance with the principle of cooperation of the topic *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed* occurred in four fundamental aspects encompassing (1) quantity, (2) quality, (3) relevance, and (4) manner. The intensity of the non-compliance took place in the aspect of quantity and quality. The factor causing the non-compliance was the negligence or reluctance to have cooperation and respect. The research findings imply that there is a need to guard against the non-compliance with principles in the conferences which involves the media that is viewed by the public. In addition, the control measures should be taken especially by the television broadcast rights institutionalization party of the state.

Keywords: non-compliance, principles, discussion, politics

1. Introduction

The interaction done by the speakers and their interlocutors entails certain methods. This was claimed by Levinson (1992) as the principle of cooperation, with a number of statements in the claim focusing on what could be done by the members of the conversation in order to speak efficiently, rationally, and cooperatively. Being related to speech acts, the Principle of Cooperation and the implicature of the discussion by the *Indonesia Lawyers Club* with the theme of *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed* can be investigated. The “*Indonesia Lawyers Club*” dialogue *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed* had its own uniqueness especially in terms of the forms of speech that violated the Principle of Cooperation which were able to lead to the political implicature. The emergence of the implicature was caused by the existence of the non-compliance with the Principle of Cooperation in the speech acts. The Principle of Cooperation in this speech event was deliberately violated to produce the effects of the appeal to and critique of political issues. The significance of the speech was the political criticism and solution gained from the political issues discussed. This study examined the non-compliance with the Principle of Cooperation and the implicature of the non-compliance with the Principle of Cooperation in the topic *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed*, which was one of themes presented in the discussion attended by the *Indonesia Lawyers Club*. The pragmatics theory and implicature based on the views of Yule (2006), Chaer (2010), Levinson (1992), Leech (1993), Rahardi (2005), and Sudaryat (2009) were used for the purpose of the research; which was to explain the existence of the non-compliance with the Principle of Cooperation, factors causing the non-compliance, and the implicature generated from the *Indonesia Lawyers Club* conference under the theme of *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed*.

Speech in communication requires the speakers and their interlocutors to have the same interpretation of meaning. The interpretation of meaning contextually and textually determines and constructs the discourse done by the speakers and their collocutors. In linguistics research, this matter was mentioned pragmatically. Yule (2006) stated that pragmatics is a study about the speech conveyed by the speaker (or writer) and interpreted by

the listener (or reader). Similarly, Rahardi (2003) in Gunardi claimed that pragmatics in fact investigates the meaning delivered by the speaker in specific situational and socio-cultural contexts. Since what is being studied in pragmatics is the meaning intended by the speaker from his/her speech, it can be said that pragmatics in various aspects is in line with semantics, which is a branch of linguistics that deals with the language meaning; however, only the meaning of language (in semantics) is studied rather internally. Thus, pragmatics is defined as a branch of linguistics which studies the interpretation of meaning from the speech produced by the speaker and his/her interlocutor.

A spoken discourse is clearly a form of cooperation in daily communication. When the speaker delivers his/her speech, it is received in form of interpreted meaning by the interlocutor and is responded with the replying speech from that listener. This activity is simply considered as a small cooperation in a conversation between two people. A conversation can also involve more than two persons unless the speech only involves one speaker.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Principle of Quantity

According to Rahardi (2005), in terms of quantity, the speaker is hoped to give a speech that is sufficient in information, adequately relative, and informative. The same thing was mentioned by Charlina and Mangatur Sinaga (2007) who stated that the principle of quantity demands every speaker to give contributions that are sufficient or appropriate as needed by his/her collocutor. The information given should not be beyond what is expected or too exaggerative compared to what was intended to convey, since this is considered to be unnecessary in a conversation.

The conversation in the following example has violated the principle of quantity as there was uninformative information given. In the situation of the conversation, the only information required was "*Nazaruddin becomes a suspect*", as this part of the discourse contained a very informative content. It could be easily understood by the interlocutor. The remarks "*Nazaruddin who is the treasurer of the Democratic Party becomes a suspect*" provided excessive information which was beyond what was necessary. Based on the explanation, it can be concluded that the principle of quantity associates with a cooperative communication where every participant gives the necessary information as required by his/her collocutor.

2.2 The Principle of Quality

Just as stated by Rahardi (2005), regarding quality, the participants of a discourse are expected to deliver something that is clear and relevant to the real facts in their speech. Likewise, Sudaryat (2009) suggested that the principle of quality determines the sentence uttered by the speaker in terms of revealing the truth.

The conversation in the following example did not comply with the principle of quality as the information provided was not relevant to the actual facts, as in the remark from the dialogue "*just accept the envelope, if you want to be jailed*". This sentence was awkward and inappropriate since it suggested the interlocutor to receive the envelope if he/she was willing to bear the risk of being jailed. To put in a right way, the advice should be given as "*do not receive the envelope, otherwise you will be jailed*". The second suggestion is more relevant to be conveyed to the interlocutor since it suited the absolute facts. According to the explanation, it can be concluded that the principle of quality relates to a form of a cooperative communication which provides information that is relevant to the facts and evidence.

2.3 The Principle of Relevance

According to Rahardi (2005), the principle of relevance is suggested so that there will be a good cooperation between the speaker and his/her interlocutor, enabling them to give relevant contributions to the topic being discussed. This was supported by Sudaryat (2009) who affirmed that the principle of relevance determines the sentences uttered to be relevant to the issues debated. During the conversation, there should be certain matters that are talked about which are relevant or closely-related to the speaker who delivers the speech and his/her interlocutor who receives the speech. Providing the information which is not associated with the speaker and his/her collocutor will contravene the Principle of Cooperation in relation to relevance.

The conversation in the example presented did not conform to the Principle of Cooperation since the response given failed to answer the question asked. In the dialogue it was asked "*Is it the law enforcer who is arrested?*", yet it was answered with a strayed answer "*if he is arrested we will have to rent the prisons in other countries since the ones we have in our country are not enough*". This answer was not relevant to what was being asked. The proper answer should be "*whether or not the law enforcer is arrested*". Furthermore, this sample sentence also proved that the rule was intentionally contradicted with the aim of imparting certain message or information. The contribution in the speaker's speech and his/her interlocutor's must be intelligible to both parties in order to

produce a relevant discourse. Hence, it is understood that the principle of relevance concerns with a form of a cooperative communication which provides mutual contribution to construct a relevant conversation about the problems discussed.

2.4 The Principle of Manner

The principle of manner is also known as the principle of implementation. Rahadi (2005) was of the opinion that the principle of manner requires the participants of the discourse to speak directly, clearly and without any obscurity. Likewise, Sudaryat (2009) asserted that the principle of manner ensures the speech delivered by the speaker is direct, not causing confusion, and not exaggerated.

"Now he becomes the witness as well as the suspect, and has been convicted"

(A person giving information about a criminal)

The dialogue above violated the principle of manner as the information imparted was discontinuous and unclear in meaning, causing the details given to sound vague and uncertain. The dialogue was actually a recount about the process of investigating a person who had committed a crime. Nevertheless, the story presented was too brief that the storyline became uncertain and its interpretation was likely to produce multiple meanings. When the interlocutor received the information from the speaker; he/she did not manage to digest the meaning. This was the factor which led to obscurity and thus causing the discourse to oppose the principle of manner. To conclude, the principle of manner is related to a form of a cooperative communication where the speech is delivered directly, with no unclear meaning, and without exaggeration. Based on the explanation of the four fundamentals, Cummings (2007) and Yule (2006) simplified the concept of the Grice Principle of Cooperation into four terms, which were:

Quantity:

1. Give the contribution that is informative as required in the discussion that is taking place.
2. Do not give contributions that is excessively informative than what is needed.

Quality: try to deliver only the information that is true.

1. Do not tell anything you believe is wrong.
2. Do not say something which is lacking in evidence.

Relevance: make your contribution as relevant as possible.

Implementation:

1. Avoid obscurity.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Avoid convoluted sentences.
4. Be well-organized.

2.5 Implicature

As suggested by Charlina and Mangatur Sinaga (2007), the term implicature is used to consider that what is suggested or intended by the speaker is different from what is said literally. This stance was maintained by Grice in Charlina and Mangatur Sinaga (2007) who claimed that implicature is used for explaining that what can be possibly meant, suggested, or intended by the speaker is not the same as what is uttered by the speaker. Thus, implicature is the interpretation or the implicit meaning of the speech delivered by the speaker.

2.5.1 Conventional Implicature

Charlina and Mangatur Sinaga (2007) proposed that conventional implicature is the implicature of a speech which has given a connotation conventionally. For example, *"Since he/she is a Batak, he/she must be very assertive"*. The dialogue indirectly gave a conventional implicature that a Batak owned a conventional implicature of being assertive. This can be understood from the speech delivered when the interpretation of the sentence is made in addition to its literal or primary meaning. If the implicature does not match, it means that the implicature is erroneous and neither of the speaker or interlocutor should be blamed for the mismatch.

2.5.2 Conversational Implicature

According to Yule (2006), conversational implicature is the meaning derived from the information contributed in the discourse which is not from the literal speech. In a word; there is certain meaning intended by the speaker in the speech he/she delivers which is expected for the interlocutor to understand. Consider the following examples:

A : I feel like drinking.

B : (immediately provides the drinks to the speaker)

In this example, what is done by B is the action that is desired by A based on what he/she means from his/her speech. This indicates the norm of providing water when someone is thirsty.

A: This room is so hot.

B: (immediately turns the fan on and point it to A)

Similarly, in the second example, the act of turning the fan on immediately is what is hoped by A according to his/her literal speech. This describes the custom of pointing the fan to the speaker who is feeling warm in order to cool him/her. Therefore, a conversational implicature is referred to as an interpretation from the information provided which demands reciprocation from the collocutor.

3. Methodology

The population of this study was part of the discourse under the title *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed*, an “Indonesia Lawyers Club” event held on 15 November 2012 which addressed the issues of the non-compliance with the Principle of Cooperation. The study sampling was done using the *Purposive Sampling* technique. The data for this study was sourced from the VCD containing the recording of the “Indonesia Lawyers Club” discourse entitled *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed*. The data collection was carried out using the read and record technique. The record technique was done by recording data on the card and then immediately proceeding with the data classification. The data collection processes were executed as the following. First, the entire discourse of the “Indonesia Lawyers Club” event with the topic *Corruption-Free, Court-Dismissed* was read and revised. After that, some parts of the text were recorded in order to help the researcher understand the overall text better. The data analysis technique used was the descriptive qualitative approach; which involved the identification of problems, data classification based on the research objectives, and explanation and elaboration of data interpretation in the formal language as the results of the analysis.

4. Findings and Discussion

It should be mentioned that all the participants’ names presented in this section are pseudonym.

4.1 The Non-compliance with the Principle of Quantity

The non-compliance with the principle of quantity which occurred in the dialogue can be observed in the following excerpt.

Bambang : Mr. Muttaqim, why did you think that the Corruption Trial in this area should be dismissed or taken back to Jakarta?”

Muttaqim : *During the discussion two weeks ago, I just reacted spontaneously. That applied to the others as well. However, we had seen later that the discourse was evolving, and there were several other options coming up after that. Yet, I thought that this was not a small matter, there were two big media, there were two big weekly media yesterday which had clearly lowered the Time and Slots, how the history goes, how the story goes regarding the recruitment of the Ad Hoc Judge.*

The speech of Muttaqim above violated the principle of quantity as he gave excessive information, which was beyond what was needed. Bambang as the asker only hoped for an answer in regard to the reason why Muttaqim suddenly claimed that the corruption trial in that area should be dismissed. Muttaqim’s answer was exaggerated and dragged to focus on the consequences of the suggestion he made, and the articles in the mass media which published the news on how the false recruitment had become the cause of the weakness of the Corruption Judges’ performance. Muttaqim’s statement raised the political implicature of requesting supports to back him up. Muttaqim did not want to be blamed as the first person who suggested for the corruption trial of the area to be dismissed. Therefore, he gave as many excuses as possible by mentioning the flaws of the judges of the corruption trial. The findings implied that language users were able to provide various arguments and justifications in order to overthrow other parties. The speaker did not comply with the regulations in speaking which was to consider some aspects such as the speaker, the place and the time which the speech took place. This was in line with a statement by Kunjana Rahardi (2005) who claims that the context in which the speech is delivered is highly important to comprehend the meaning and determine the message contained in a discourse.

4.2 The Non-compliance with the Principle of Quality

The non-compliance with the principle of quality which occurred in the dialogue can be observed in the following excerpt.

Muttaqim : " Thank you, from the perspective of sociology there are study materials about the social change related to this law.

Bambang : "What laws in sociology did you just learn from the lessons every week?"

Bambang' question "what laws in sociology did you just learn from the lessons every week?" did not mean as it was literally uttered. The collocutor who was a lawyer did not just gain his/her sociology lessons recently; however, Bambang felt that the statement using the sociological perspective was not appropriate to be argued among the discussion members. Accordingly, the above statement contradicted the Principle of Cooperation concerning the aspect of quality. The implicature of the above utterance was to suggest. Bambang intended to suggest that the interlocutor provide commentaries that were shorter, more compact, and clearer, without having to argue on a certain knowledge first, as the discussion was about to finish. Based on the findings, it could be seen that there needed to be a condition where the language elements were semantically interrelated. This supported Kushantanti et al. (2009) who defined cohesion as the language elements which were interconnected and having mutual references.

4.3 The Non-compliance with the Principle of Relevance

The non-compliance with the principle of quality which occurred in the dialogue can be observed in the following excerpt.

Bambang : " So, the recruitment was faulty. Is this all that is to be discovered, or is there anything else?"

Muttaqim : "I consider that if the laws are implemented, the judge must be provided with thousands of temporary judges"

The dialogue contravened the Principle of Cooperation in terms of relevance since the information given was not relevant with what was being asked. The question was "is this all that is to be discovered, or is there anything else?" and it was replied with a completely irrelevant response " I consider that if the laws are implemented, the judge must be provided with thousands of temporary judges". Rather than adding the unnecessary information, the more accurate answer for the question should be "there are no other issues". The findings was in line with a statement by Julia Sarah (2011) that the errors occurred because the respondent wanted to change the topic of the discussion by giving irrelevant information as a distraction.

4.4 The Non-compliance with the Principle of Manner

The non-compliance with the principle of quality which occurred in the dialogue can be observed in the following excerpt.

Bambang : "Ad Hoc." (Feeling unconfident with the term Ad Hoc)

Muttaqim : "Ad Hoc, yes, and there we see that it's not the court that is ugly. We should not evaluate the judgment, instead the people who handle the judiciary. If we observe and read the stories presented by the two media, it is obviously true that the positions of judges in this area are capable of being filled with the job-seekers whose qualification records are really very questionable, yes, very questionable."

The last sentence from Muttaqim in the above statements violated the Principle of Cooperation in the aspect of manner. The sentence "If we observe and read the stories presented by the two media, it is obviously true that the positions of judges in this area are capable of being filled with the job seekers whose qualification records are really very questionable, yes, very questionable." contained language errors since the content was excessively amplified. If we observe, the phrase *really very* was exaggerated since *really* itself already means *very*. The political implicature in the speech above was to ask for support. The non-compliance of the principle of manner in Muttaqim's speech produced the implicature that he was not wrong when he claimed that the corruption trial of the area should be dismissed as there had been so many problems caused by the judiciary. The findings are consistent with the research conducted by Julia Sarah (2011) which discovered that the respondents of the study did not comply with the Principle of Cooperation in terms of manner, causing them to be considered as also violating the proverbial principle.

5. Implication and Recommendation

The implications produced as a result of the non-compliance with the Principle of Cooperation when conversing with each other include (a) the tendency for the collocutor to spend a long time to understand the meaning conveyed by the speaker, (b) the failure of the collocutor in understanding the meaning conveyed by the speaker, which consequently the participants of a discourse contradict each other. The non-compliance in a conversation takes place in every aspect of it, which consists of the elements of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. The

non-compliance occurs when the respondents provide excessive and exaggerated contributions for giving answers. It is hoped that in using words during discussions the respondents would be modest and humble as well as avoid overthrowing the members of the discussion.

6. Conclusion

There were a lot of non-compliances with the Principle of Cooperation in the speech delivered in the *Indonesia Lawyers Club* dialogue entitled *Corruption Free, Court Dismissed*. The non-compliance of the Principle of Cooperation which comprised the fundamentals of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, has invoked the implicatures of the sentences uttered. The conversational implicatures in the topic encompassed the purposes of (a) informing, (b) suggesting, (c) encouraging cooperation, (d) asking for support, (e) critiquing, (f) expressing disappointment, and (g) supporting or agreeing with the statements from others.

References

- Chaer, A. (2010). *Kesantunan Berbahasa*. Jakarta: PT. Rineke Cipta.
- Cummings, L. (2007). *Pragmatik: Sebuah Perspektif Multidisipliner*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Gunardi, G. (2009). *Maknadan Kesantunan dalam Wawangsalan Bahasa Sunda*. Bandung: Unpad Press.
- Kushartanti. (2009). *Pesona Bahasa: Langkah Awal Memahami Linguistik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Leech, G. (1993). *PrinsipPragmatik*. Malaysia: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Levinson, S. (n. d.). *Pragmatik*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rahardi, K. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Rahardi, K. (2010). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta. Erlangga.
- Sarah, J. (2009). *Pematuhan dan pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama dan prinsip kesantunan dalam facebook*. Skripsi. Fakultas Pendidikan Universiti Indonesia.
- Sinaga, C. M. (2007). *Pragmatik*. Pekanbaru: Cindikia Insani.
- Sudaryat, Y. (2009). *Maknadalam Wacana*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).