



Cooperative Principles in the 2019 Indonesian Presidential Debate: Grice's Maxims Analysis

 Nur Azim Laila,¹

¹Yogyakarta State University,
Yogyakarta, *Indonesia*

Corresponding Author: Nur Azim Laila

Phone: 082334494807

e-mail: nurazmi.2018@student.uny.ac.id

Article citation: Laila, N. A. (2020). Cooperative principles in the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate: Grice's maxims analysis, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 4(1): 14–22.

Received Date: May 15, 2019

Accepted Date: November 14, 2019

Online Date: January 5, 2020

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2018 Applied Linguistics Research Journal

E-ISSN: 2651-2629

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to analyze the types of maxims of the cooperative principle that were used and also violated in the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate. A descriptive method was applied to examine the research questions. The data of this study were the conversations that fulfilled and violated the cooperative principle based on four maxims of cooperative principles: Maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, maxim of manner, and maxim of quality. The results of this qualitative study revealed that the two maxims violated by the candidates in the 2019 Indonesian presidential debates were the maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. The maxim of manner was the mostly violated maxim by the candidates. The candidates not only violated but also fulfilled the maxims of the cooperative principle. They fulfilled the maxim of relevance, maxim of manner, and maxim of quality. Furthermore, the maxim of quality was the maxim that was mostly fulfilled by the candidates in the 2019 Indonesian Presidential Debates.

Keywords: Cooperative principles; Presidential debate; Grice's maxims.

1. Introduction

Language is an important tool in human interactions. It is because language is the media of communication. Through language, we can express our feeling, deliver our ideas, ask for help, apologize, etc. Language is also used to convey someone's messages to others. Without language, people will get difficulties to interact and communicate with one another. Amanda (2017) states, "Language helps a large number of purposes in our lives; it enables us to do things" (p. 41). People usually interact and communicate with one another in the form of conversations. A good conversation means speaker and speaking partner understand what they are talking about. One indicator that shows about it is the response of the speaking partner relates to what the speaker said.

In conducting a good conversation, people must follow cooperative principles. The theory of cooperative principle was introduced by H. Paul Grice. He stated that the participants in a

conversation usually try to be informative, truthful, relevant, and clear. It means each participant must give contributions in the conversation as required (Zebua, Rukmini, & Saleh, 2017). Grice proposed four maxims in cooperative principle. They are the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. All of maxims must be obeyed by each speaker. It is because speech act will be run well if the speaker and speaking partner obeyed this principle.

A study about cooperative principles can be done on all kinds of utterances that exist in our life. One of them is the utterances in a debate. The newest debate that became the hottest topic in Indonesia was the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate. The election of president and vice president in 2019 was one of the elections with very tight competitions because there were only two pair candidates of president and vice president. Through debate, the two pairs of candidates tried to prove to all Indonesians people that they deserved to be elected as the president and vice president.

In the debate, the candidates must answer some questions from the moderator and the other candidates. They should not only answer the questions but also respond to the other candidate's statements. Their answer and their response must be relevant, based on the data, unambiguous, etc. In short, the way they answer the question and giving response to the other candidate statement must follow cooperative principles that consisting of four maxims as stated by Grice. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the types of cooperative principles that used and also violated in the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate.

2. Literature Review

Pragmatic is the branch of linguistics. Birner (2013) states that "Pragmatic is the study of language use in context" (p. 2). "It is the study of language use in human communication based on the context of society" (Mey, 2001, p. 6). From the definitions of pragmatics, we can know that pragmatics discusses the use of language in communication and investigate the context and meaning of speech in communication. In each process of communication, there are speech event and speech act. Speech act is an action that performed via utterances, and the circumstances surrounding the utterances we called as speech event.

Speech act was formulated by Austin. He divided speech act into three. First, locutionary act is the act of saying something. Second, illocutionary act is the act in saying something. And the third, perlocutionary act is an act by saying something. (Leech, 1983, p. 199). Searle classified illocutionary act into five categories: Representative (or assertive) is a speech act that commits speakers to the truth of some proposition such as stating, claiming, reporting, announcing, etc. Then, Directive is a speech act that brings about some effect through the action of hearer such as requesting, ordering, demanding, etc. After that, Expressive is a speech act as the expression of some psychological state such as thanking, apologizing, congratulating, etc. The next category is Comisive, according to Akinwotu (2013) "comisive is a speech act that commit speakers to some future action such as promising, offering, swearing, etc. to do something" (p. 45). The last is Declarative, Dylgjeri (2017) said, "Declarative used to say something and make it so, such as pronouncing someone guilty and declaring a war" (p. 22).

Speech act will be run well if the speaker and speaking partner obey the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle was first put forward by the philosopher H. Paul Grice in a series of his lectures in 1967. This principle provides the basis for why humans can communicate with each other. Grice enumerates the following four maxims which according to him characterize the cooperative principle. The first is the maxim of quantity: This maxim is concerned with the amount of information which we expect from any conversational exchange. When we speak to someone, we feel obliged to give them enough detail to make them understand us. The second is the maxim of relation; it directs us to organize our utterances to ensure the relevance to the conversational exchange. The third, the maxim of manner obliges us to organize our utterances in an order to provide information that can be assimilated by the listener. The last maxim is the maxim of quality, it assumes that we speak what we believe to be true (Finch, 2003, p.157-159).

In everyday communications sometimes people violate the cooperative principle. They

are violating the cooperative principle if their speech act is not suitable with the maxims in the cooperative principle. The first is violation of the maxim of quantity: The maxim of quantity requires each participant to provide enough contributions or as much as needed. So, violations in this maxim occur when the speaker does not give enough information or detail to the speaking partner. Violation can also occur when the speaker provides unnecessary information. Second is the maxim of relation. In this maxim, we are expected to provide information that is relevant to the purpose of the conversation. So, the violation of maxim of relation occurs when the participants convey information that is not relevant to the topic being discussed. The third is violation of the maxim of manner. This maxim requires speakers and speaking partners to speak directly, not blurred, unambiguous, not excessive and coherent. So, violations in this maxim occur when speakers and speaking partner provide unclear information so that it can lead to unclear interpretations. The last is violation of the maxim of quality, this maxim leads people not to say what they think is not true, and we also should not say something that has no proof. So, violations in this maxim occur when the participant does not say the truth, which is the thing that matches with facts and data.

3. Method

The research design used in this study was qualitative. The qualitative research deals with the data that are in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers and statistics (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2010, p. 424). This study used descriptive method to describe the findings of the research. Data of this study were the conversations of both Indonesian candidates of president and vice president that fulfilled and violated the maxims of cooperative principle. Data source was from the conversations in the presidential debate that published on January 17, 2019, on YouTube by Tv One News. The title of that video was [Full] Debat Capres dan Cawapres Pilpres 2019. Then, the duration of the video was 1 hour 43 minutes 57 seconds.

To analyze the data in this study, some steps were used. The first, the researcher downloaded the videos of the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate and watched the videos that were downloaded. After that, we transcribed the speech act that were used and violated the cooperative principle. The next step was classifying the acts into the maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, maxim of manner, and the maxim of quality. Finally, the data that were classified were analyzed and described.

4. Results and Discussion

The presidential debate that was analyzed in this study was the first debate in 2019 election. There were two candidates who were the candidate number one and the candidate number two. The candidate number one was Joko Widodo (Jokowi) as the presidential candidate and Ma'ruf Amin as the vice president candidate. The candidate number two was Prabowo Subianto as the presidential candidate and Sandiaga Uno as the vice president candidate. The theme of the debate was law, human rights, corruption, and terrorism. The questions and answers were in Indonesian but the researcher translated it into English. The questions were always read by the moderator.

The analysis of cooperative principles in the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate is as follows:

The first theme: Law

Question: Legal certainty is very important for citizens, business people, and the government but it turns out that many laws and regulations overlap and not harmonious at the central and regional levels, what is your strategy to resolve that problem?

Prabowo: We will empower national legal development agencies; we will strengthen with the best legal experts. To synchronize, the law, regulations at the center do not collide with regulations in the area. This is difficult, this is a big job but we have to do it so that there is legal certainty so that everyone knows the legal system in Indonesia and the law works for all.

Analysis: Prabowo's answer is suitable for maxim of relevance. It is because his answer is suitable to the question that has given, not too long but it can answer the question. He is also not adding inappropriate information that is irrelevant to the question. So we can say it fulfills the maxim of relevance.

(Sandiaga add Prabowo answer)

Sandiaga: Public participation is also very important. We will involve experts, both from universities at the central and regional levels, because there are a lot of legal products issued by the local government and the DPRD (Regional People's Representative Assembly). So we will ensure that this big work must be led by the main leaders, namely the president and vice president. We will be responsible for ensuring this harmonization and synchronization can bring legal certainty so that legal certainty can be felt, presenting justice, not only for the rich but also for all levels of society. We also want to make sure that the law can present an opportunity to invest, in open employment opportunities. This rich country, this extraordinary country still leaves many problems. Employment is difficult to handle. Business opportunities are difficult for the community because of legal uncertainty. Under Prabowo - Sandi the law must be enforced and in a short time, we must synchronize and create harmonization. Legal certainty will increase investment, employment will be created, and prosperity will be felt by the community. We commit this legal certainty to be a top priority under Indonesia's win. Prabowo - Sandi, fair, prosperous in 2019 - 2024.

Analysis: In general, Sandiaga's speech to add Prabowo answer is relevance to the question but at the end of his answer he adds a statement that is irrelevant to the question. He said "Prabowo - Sandi, fair, prosperous in 2019 – 2024", this statement is irrelevant to the question that was given. That is why we can say that his answer is violating the maxim of relevance.

(Jokowi responds to Prabowo and Sandiaga's answers)

Jokowi: We are different from Mr. Prabowo and Mr. Sandi. It is very important to harmonize our regulations; therefore, we will combine the legislative functions in BPHN (National Legal Development Agency), is the Director-General, legislation and, functions of legislations in all ministries we will combine them in the National Legislation Center so that it is directly controlled by the president, directly controlled by the president, one door, so there is no overlap. Local regulations in the regions must also be consulted so as not to overlap consultations with national legislation centers. The second, we will simplify everything. So, if there is an overlap immediately visible, we can do revisions properly.

Analysis: Mr. Jokowi said, "We are different from Mr. Prabowo and Mr. Sandi". This statement is violating the maxim of manner because it is not clear enough what is the difference between Jokowi and Prabowo – Sandiaga. The word "different" can mean many things. So it is violating the maxim of manner.

(Prabowo responded to Jokowi)

Prabowo: Okay, thank you. For me, I don't see the difference? Because indeed the government is responsible for carrying out the alignment and also to make improvements and also produce the products. This is the duty of the government, the president is the fifth law enforcement officer, is the person in charge of implementation and law enforcement. That is the responsibility of the president. So I didn't question it, but the reality now overlaps, piling up so many regulations. There needs to be help from experts to help the government accelerate the entire problem. We want acceleration, there are always too many problems in Indonesia, and the problems are

too big. We want a breakthrough, there must be a breakthrough. That's my answer.

Analysis: Prabowo's responds to Jokowi fulfills the maxim of manner. It is because his answer is clear enough. He explains his statements so that there is no ambiguity, his answer also is coherent and not excessive.

The second theme: Human rights

Question: Groups of persons with disabilities often experience discrimination related to the welfare of public facilities and political rights. How do you understand the disability issue and what is your program to ensure the fulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities?

Jokowi: After the law about persons with disabilities came out in 2016. I saw that the paradigm of these persons with disabilities had changed, which previously was social assistance, the generosity that we had to give them but which now with the new law we see the paradigm is fulfillment of rights. The government, we have provided facilities for fulfilling that right both fulfillment of the right to work, for housing, for public facilities that are disability-friendly even though there are only in a few cities but we have started. Then also about equality, I can give an example in the Asian Para games, this is the biggest disability event in Asia. We also give the same bonus as athletes competing in Asian games, for example for those who get gold we gave them 1,5 billion, those who can get silver, 500 million, those who can give us a bronze, 250 million, the same as athletes who compete at Asian games. This means that we give equality to the disabled people who from now on we continue to pay attention to them.

Analysis: Jokowi answer is based on the fact and using the data. He gives an example about bonus of Asian Para Games athletes when they can get gold, silver, and bronze medal. The speech act that based on the fact and data is suitable to the maxim of quality. In short, Jokowi's answer fulfills the maxim of quality.

(Sandiaga responds to Jokowi's answers)

Sandiaga: Zulfan Dewantara a disabled friend we met is an inspiration to Prabowo - Sandi. He is not looking for employment but provides employment. He became an online business mentor and hundreds of students. Equality is not only equality of infrastructure access or access to education and health but also access to being able to get an opportunity to open employment opportunities. Prabowo-Sandi is committed; we will ensure the disabled people live to fulfill their potential. They are not a burden at all. They do not need mercy, they need equality, we ensure that they can get employment opportunities, opportunities for a better life, and opportunities to make their families become prosperous families. Thank you

Analysis: Sandiaga gives a concrete example; he tells about Zulfan Dewantara, he is a disabled person. As explained before, a speech act fulfills the maxim of quality if it is based on the fact and the data. So, Sandiaga's response is suitable regarding the maxim of manner.

(Jokowi responds to Sandiaga's answer)

Jokowi: Yes, I think the examples like what Mr. Sandi said were a lot. Not only in one area but many fields of disability can be equal. This means that we appreciate all the achievements they have done and also the results of the work they have done. I think that what Mr. Sandi had said was similar to what I said earlier.

Analysis: Jokowi said that what Sandiaga said was similar to what he said, this statement is not clear enough because he does not explain his statement that is similar to Sandiaga statement, the explanation is needed because Jokowi has said so

many things before. Because his statement is not clear enough, his answer is violating the maxim of manner.

(Ma'ruf adds to Jokowi's answer)

Ma'ruf: Yes, I think the important thing is to build a culture of society to pay respect to disable groups, equating treatment to both disabled and non-disabled.

Analysis: What Ma'ruf said to add to Jokowi's answer is still related to the question and Jokowi's answer. So it is fulfilling the maxim of relevance.

The third theme: Corruption

Question: To occupy a public position, very high costs are often needed so that after occupying the position, a corruption behavior is often unavoidable. What is your strategy for overcoming these high-cost politics?

Jokowi: The recruitment must be based on competence not financial and not nepotism. Therefore, for bureaucratic officials, recruitment must be transparent, simple, with clear standards, and for political positions a simplification of the system is needed. So, the election becomes cheap, officials are not burdened by election costs. We expect we can cut money politics, cut bribes, cut corruption and can get public officials who have integrity, who have good capacity, and we hope that with recruitment, good positions, the regent, whether it's the mayor, whether it's the governor or so on. We will get the best people because indeed the recruitment runs transparently, accountably, and everyone can see and now we have done that, for example, our ASN (state civil apparatus) recruitment, it is openly conducted, all can be checked, the results can also be checked, my child cannot be accepted there because she did not pass it. Thanks

Analysis: Jokowi uses ASN recruitment that has been done before as an example. It means he said the real thing, a thing that is suitable to the fact. Then, we can say that he follows the maxim of quality.

(Prabowo responds to Jokowi's answer)

Prabowo: Yes, so we think it is necessary to have more concrete, practical and immediate steps. For example, how can a governor earn only 8 million? then he runs the province, for example, Central Java, which is bigger than Malaysia, with a large budget, so this is unrealistic. So I think ahead of government, an executive, if we want to improve it, we must immediately dare to make breakthroughs so that the income of public officials is very large. Then we cut all the needs of the campaign. For example, TV is owned by cyberspace people so we shouldn't pay too much to appear on TV, as well as radio, as well as billboards in the cities.

Analysis: Prabowo responds to Jokowi's answer is fulfilling the maxim of quality, he gives information about governor income. It means what he said is based on the fact and data.

(Jokowi responds to Prabowo's answer)

Jokowi: Yes, as I mentioned before that recruitment based on competence and not finance is the key. I give my own experience as an example during the mayoral election; I use a very small budget. However, during the Governor's election in Jakarta I did not spend money at all. Pak Prabowo also knew about it. Indeed, it requires a long process. It requires a long process, meaning whether the political movement can be started from volunteers, it can be started from the public's desire to get a good leader without prioritizing finance.

Analysis: Like the other answer, Jokowi also uses an example based on the fact. He uses his own experience during the mayoral election. So, Jokowi's response is also suitable concerning the maxim of quality.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the form of fulfillment and violation of the cooperative principle in the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate and classified it into the four maxims of cooperative principle: The maxim of quantity, relation, manner, and quality. Based on the analysis of the fulfillment and violation of the cooperative principle in the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate, three maxims of relevance, manner, and quality were applied. The result revealed that the 2019 presidential debate fulfilled the maxim of relevance, maxim of manner, and maxim of quality. Then, maxims that were violated were the maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. The violation happen not only when the participants added an explanation that was not relevant with the question but also when the participant did not provide clear statement that could lead to the ambiguity. The fulfillment and the violation of those maxims show that in the debate, the conversations were based on the data, the answer must be relevant with the question, and the explanation must be clear and unambiguous.

References

- Akinwotu, A. S. (2013). A speech act analysis of the acceptance of nomination speeches of Chief Obafemi Awolowo and Chief M. K. O. Abiola. *English Linguistics Research*. Vol. 2, No. 1, p. 43 – 51.
<https://doi.org/10.5430/elr.v2n1p43>
- Amanda, E. (2017). Metaphor, metonymy, and voice in political debates: A discourse analysis study. *Applied linguistics Research Journal*. Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 41 – 48.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. Canada: Wadsworth Cengage Learning
- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Dylgjeri, A. (2017). Analysis of speech acts in political speeches. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*. Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 19-26.
- Finch, G. (2003). *How to study linguistics: A guide to understanding language*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-80213-1>
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatic*. NewYork: Longman.
- Mey, J. L. (2004). *Pragmatics*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.
- Zebua, E., Rukmini, D., & Saleh, M. (2017). The violation and flouting of cooperative principles in the Ellen Degeneres talk show. *Journal of Language and Literature*. Vol. 12, No. 1, 1-11.

REVISION NOTE

1.I change some sentences on my article to make it better but the meaning of the sentences is same.

2.I have revised my grammatical error from the abstract till the end of the article.

3.I also revised the odd sentence on page 9

4.I have revised my direct quotations on the article based on APA 6th edition.

5.I have paraphrasing some of my quotations on the article that are too long

6.I also add the explanation for the some abbreviations on my article, such as DPRD and BPHN.

For the conclusion of my article, I have added some explanations to show the implications of the findings.