

**Analysis of Courtroom Conversation in *Philadelphia* Movie**  
**Rosalin Kemala Agustina and Ayu Ida Savitri, S.S., M.Hum.**  
**English Department, Faculty of Humanity**  
**Diponegoro University, Semarang**

---

Abstrak

Bahasa memiliki peran penting bagi kehidupan manusia. Bahasa tidak hanya digunakan sebagai media komunikasi namun juga sebagai sarana untuk menunjukkan keberadaan seseorang dalam lingkungannya. Ketika seseorang berujar, seseorang tersebut tidak hanya mengujarkan sebuah kesatuan bahasa yang benar secara tata bahasa namun juga melakukan aksi melalui tuturan mereka. Kadang suatu ujaran memiliki lebih dari satu fungsi, seperti yang dapat ditemui dalam rangkaian pertanyaan dan jawaban dalam suatu percakapan. Penggunaan kalimat Tanya dapat menunjukan beberapa fungsi seperti meminta informasi, meminta izin, memberi perintah, dan meminta kejelasan. Penulis melihat pertanyaan dari segi struktur kebahasaan serta fungsi pertanyaan tersebut sesuai dengan teori Speech Act oleh Searle. Setelah memperoleh fungsi dari pertanyaan yang diujarkan oleh pengacara, penulis melihat hubungan pertanyaan dengan jawaban yang diujarkan oleh terdakwa dengan menggunakan prinsip Kerja Sama Grice. Hasil yang penulis peroleh adalah sebagian besar pertanyaan yang diajukan oleh pengacara berbentuk Yes-No question, Tag Question dan Wh-Question. Sedangkan dari sudut pandang fungsi pertanyaan, pertanyaan yang diajukan oleh pengacara memiliki fungsi Directive yakni untuk meminta informasi, meminta klarifikasi, member perintah dan untuk menguji jawaban terdakwa/saksi. Representative memiliki fungsi untuk mendeskripsikan pernyataan saksi dan mempertegas pernyataan saksi. Expressive untuk menunjukan fungsi ketidak puasan, ketidak sukaan atas jawaban saksi dan menunjukan simpati. Hasil analisis hubungan jawaban dan pertanyaan berdasarkan Prinsip Kerja Sama menunjukkan bahwa dari 90 kalimat Tanya ada 52 jawaban yang dijawab secara kooperatif oleh saksi. Sedangkan 30 jawaban menunjukan bahwa para saksi melanggar maxim yang ada dalam prinsip kerjasama tersebut. Adapun maxim yang dipatuhi oleh para saksi adalah Maxim kualitas, Maxim Kuantitas, maxim Hubungan, dan Maksim Cara.

## **1. Background of the Study**

People use utterances to convey information and to lead each other toward an interpretation of meaning and intention. In attempting to express themselves, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structure and words, they perform actions via those utterances. Sometimes we find that some utterances have more than one functions. The using of question in conversation can express several functions such as: asking information, asking permission, asking confirmation, asking explanation, repetition, or asking clarification. There is an example that shows some question and answer sequences. The conversation that happens in court room contains so many questions in order to get the truth from a certain case, expressed by the judge/the lawyer to the witness. To make it easier, the writer tries to analyze the function of questions by using theory of Speech Act. Based on the explanation above the writer is really interested in analyzing question and answer that happens in the court room. The writer will analyzes question and answer of the court room in *Philadelphia* movie. The writer wants to know the function of question that the lawyers utter to the witnesses during the trial based on the Speech Act category by Searle (1980), after that the writer will connect the answers of the witnesses whether the answers apply the Maxim in the Cooperative Principles, Grice (1975), or not.

## **2. Underlying Theory**

There are structures the talk in a conversation. I speak-you speak- I speak- you speak is the structure of conversation. We can see that structure of conversation clearly in a trial process. The circulation of conversation between the lawyer and the witness during the trial tend to be order because of a set convention for getting turns, keeping turns, or giving them away which is called as a local management system. The main aim of this thesis is to reveal the function of utterances in question form. One of the units in the Pragmatics that concerns with the analysis of utterances function is Speech Acts. Here are some theoretical frameworks that relate to the analysis of question and an answer form.

### **2.1. Classification of Question**

Questions can be divided into several major classes according to the type of reply they expect. (Quirk, 1985:807) divides them into their major classes of questions, such as: Yes- no Question, Tag Question, *Wh*-Question, Alternative Question and Exclamatory Question.

#### **2.1.1. Yes-No question**

*Yes –no* questions are usually formed by placing the operator before subject and giving the sentence a rising intonation, (Quirk, 1985:807). For example: Has the boat left?

If there is no item in the verb phrase that can function as operator, Do is introduced, as with negation, like: Do they live in Sydney?

### 2.1.2. Tag Question

The following explanations are general rules for performing the most common types of tag question, (Quirk,1985:810):

a. Tag question consists of operator and subject in the order (enclitic *n't*, if present, is attached to the operator): *is he?* , *didn't she?* , *can't I*, *will you?*

b. The operator is generally the same as the operator of the preceding statement. For example: I haven't seen you before, *have I?*

If the statement has no operator, the auxiliary *Do* is used, as for *yes-no* question in general. For example: She knows you, *doesn't she?*

c. The subject of the tag must be pronoun which either repeats, or is in coreference with, the subject of the statement, agreeing with it in number, person and gender.

d. If the statement is positive, the tag is generally negative and vice versa.

### 2.1.3. Wh-Question

The questions that typically expect a reply from an open range replies are *wh-* question. *Wh-* question are formed with the aid of one of the following simple interrogative words (who, whom, whose, what, which, when, where, how, why) Quirk, (1985:817). The *wh-* element comes first in the sentence. The *wh-* word itself takes first position in the *wh-*element. Such as: Where shall I put the glasses?

### 2.1.4. Alternative Question (Quirk, 1985:823)

Alternative Question is the question that expect as the reply one of two or

more options presented in the question. There are two types of alternative questions.

a. Alternative question resembles a *yes-no* question. Such as: Would you like chocolate, vanilla, or strawberry?

b. Alternative question resembles a *wh-* question. Like: Which ice cream would you like? Would you like chocolate, vanilla or strawberry?

### 2.1.5. Exclamatory Question (Quirk, 1985:825)

The exclamatory question is interrogative in structure, but has illocutionary force of an exclamatory assertion. Typically it is a negative *yes- no* question with a final falling instead of rising tone. Such as: Hasn't he Grown!

The classification of question is useful for the writer to compare the structural form of question with its communicative function. We know that question can function as statement, question, and command/request although its structural form is question form.

### 2.2. Speech Acts Theory

Speech Acts theory is very useful for the writer to analyze the action lies behind the utterance. In attempting to express themselves, people do not only produce utterances containing grammatical structure and words, the perform actions via those utterances (Yule, 1996:47). With reference to (Austin ,1975:22), in words, people not only saying something, but also 'doing' something. Action performed via utterances are generally called speech acts, they are: Apology,

Complaint, Compliment, Invitation, Promise (Yule, 1996:47).

### **2.2.1. Speech Event**

The speaker normally expects that his or her communicative intention will be recognized by the hearer. Both speaker and hearer are usually helped in this process by the circumstances surrounding the utterance. These circumstances, including other utterances are called Speech Event (Yule, 1996:47). It is nature of the speech event that determines the interpretation of an utterance as performing a particular speech act. Based on the speech event Austin segments the Speech Act into component acts: Locutionary Act, Illocutionary Act and Perlocutionary Act.

### **2.2.2. Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts**

“A Locutionary act involves the uttering of an expression with sense and reference, i.e. using sounds and words with meaning”, (Schiffirin, 1994:53). Mostly we do not just produce well-formed utterances with any purpose. We form an utterance with some kind of function in mind. An Illocutionary act is the act performed “in saying” the locution, such that what was said had force of that illocution, (Schiffirin, 1994:53). A Perlocutionary act is the consequential effects of an utterance on an interlocutor, i.e. what is achieved by saying something. Depending on the circumstances, you will utter on the assumption that the hearer will recognize the effect you intended.

### **2.2.3. Felicity Condition**

Speech act theory provides a framework in which to identify the condition underlying the production and understanding of an utterance as a particular linguistically realized action. Utterance performs different acts because of their circumstances (Austin) and because of their condition and rules that constitute particular acts (Searle). Searle classifies conditions and rule according to their necessity for the act. He also classifies different kinds of condition according to what aspect of text and context is focused upon in the condition of rule, different conditions also overlaps with the different components of a Speech Act. Because the main aim of this thesis is question analysis, here are some rules extracted from the condition.

1. Propositional Content Conditions: they concern reference and predication. Propositional Content rule for promises is the predication of a future act by the speaker.
2. Preparatory Condition: they seem to involve background circumstances and knowledge about S and H that must hold prior to the performance of speech act.
3. Sincerity Condition: it concerns with S’s psychological state as it is expressed in the performance of the act.
4. Essential Condition: what the utterance “count as”, i.e. the point of the act, (Searle, 1969:59).

### **2.2.4. Indirect Speech Act**

“An indirect speech act is defined as an utterance in which one illocutionary

act is performed by way of the performance of another act,”

(Searle, 1979:23). A different approach to distinguish types of Speech Acts can be made on the basis of structure. We know that there are three structural forms of a sentence (declarative, interrogative, imperative). There are also three communicative functions (statement, question, and command/request). We recognize that form of question is used to ask a question. Sometimes, some form of interrogatives has multiple functions because one act is being performed by another act. It means a question not merely used to ask question but it functions as a request. For Example: Could you pass the salt?

The form interrogative above is not only used to show asking something but it contains function of Request (Yule, 1994:56). The phenomenon is always called as Indirect Speech Act.

### 2.2.5. Speech Act Classification

Searle (1979) proposes five classes of Speech Acts:

a. Declaration: Those kinds of Speech Acts that change the world via their utterance. The speaker changes the world via words. For example: I pronounce you husband and wife.

b. Representatives: Those kinds of Speech Acts that state what the speaker believe to be the case or not. For example: The earth is flat

c. Expressive: Those kinds of Speech Acts that state what speaker feels. For example: I'm really sorry!

d. Directives: Those kinds of Speech Acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants.

For example: Could you lend me a cup of coffee please?

e. Commissives: Those kinds of Speech Acts that speaker use to commit them selves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends. For example: I'll be back. (Yule, 1996:54).

### 2.3. Cooperative Principle Grice (1975)

Grice (1975) proposes Cooperative Principle “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Yule, 1996:37). The following explanation describes each kind of Maxim.

1. The maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:

- a. Do not say what you believe to be false
- b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

2. The maxim of Quantity

- a. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

For example: R: What did you have for lunch today?

C1: baked bean on toast

C2: food

C3: I have warmed up

baked beans (although eight of them were slightly crushed) served on sliced of toast 12.7 cm by 10.3 cm. C1: is a normal answer C2: give too little information C3: give too much

information. (Cruse, 2000:356).

3. The maxim of Relevance  
Make your contribution relevant.

For example:

A: have you seen Marry today?

B: I'm breathing

The answer is not relevant with the question. (Cruse, 2000:356)

4. The maxim of Manner  
Be perspicuous and specifically:
  - a. Avoid obscurity
  - b. Avoid ambiguity
  - c. Be brief
  - d. Be orderly

### **3. Research Method**

#### **3.1. Type of Research**

Type of this research is a descriptive research in a qualitative approach. It used a descriptive method because it describes a phenomenon in area of interest systematically, factually, and accurately (Isaac and Michael 1971: 42). This research focuses on the analysis of textual data. The writer describes the phenomenon in a conversation during the trial process.

#### **3.2. Population, Samples, Sampling Method**

According to Sevilla (1993), population is the whole group as the subject of generalization. The population of the research is the utterance during the trial uttered by the Lawyers to the witness. The witness's answers as the data are also needed in this analysis. The sample of this research is the question, uttered by the lawyers that contain communicative function. The writer uses Purposive Sampling Method in this research. Purposive sampling is operated by

choosing a sample based on the aims of the research (Kerlinger in Key, 1997). In other words, Purposive Sampling groups the samples according to preselected criteria relevant to the research questions. Preselected criteria mean that the writer takes the samples from the utterances of the lawyers that contain question and answer in each sequences of conversation during the trial. Data source of this research is divided into two, they are: primary data and secondary data. To obtain the function of question the writer uses the primary data and does not need to conduct interview. All of the utterances of the courtroom conversation are primary data of this research. The data can be obtained from the movie script and supported by the movie itself entitled *Philadelphia*.

#### **3.3. Method of Collecting Data**

In this research, the writer uses *Metode Simak* in collecting the data. *Metode Simak* is a method that requires paying a good attention to the use of language (Sudaryanto 1993: 11). For the next step of this method is called as *Simak Bebas Libat Cakap*. It means that in the way the researcher observing the data, in this case is the question uttered by the lawyer, the researcher does not involve directly in producing utterances studied (Mahsun, 2005: 93).

#### **3.4. Method of Analyzing Data**

The writer uses Pragmatics Identity Method to analyze the data because the indicator device of this research is based on the reaction of the hearer as the effect of utterances uttered by the speaker (Sudaryanto, 1993:115). This Research also uses a method called

Padan Intralingual method. Padan has similar meaning with comparing. Intralingual means the characteristic that is compared is the characteristic within the language that is compared with the characteristic outside the language, for instance means and context (Mahsun, 2005:117).

#### **4. Data Analysis**

Most of the questions uttered by the lawyers are dominated by Wh-question, Yes- no question and tag question in order to reveal the truth during the trial process. In the next part there will be shown the exemplification of question form structure analysis.

#### **4.1. Classification of Question**

##### **4.1.1. Yes/No Question**

Joe Miller :Do you agree that a bologna sandwich is a satisfactory meal? Whereas caviar and champagne, duck and baked Alaska that might be considered a delightful meal?

Question above is kind of Yes/ No question. Yes/No questions are usually formed by placing the operator before the subject. The question above formed by the operator “do” that comes before the subject “You” and the verb “Agree”. Based on the rule, it is such a well-formed question and grammatically correct.

##### **Data (22)**

Joe Miller: Was Andy a good boss?

The question above is considered as a Yes/No question. That question is formed by the operator “was” and the subject “Andy”. There is no verb available. The subject is followed by

an adjective “good”. Based on the rule, it is such a well-formed question and grammatically correct.

##### **4.1.2. WH- Questions**

###### **Data (17)**

Opponent Lawyer (II): I don't understand. How do you explain the promotion of an obviously intelligent, articulate qualified African-American woman in a firm which practices discrimination as wantonly and consistently as you and Mr. Beckett claim?

Ms. Burton :I can't explain it.

The question above is kind of *Wh*-question. *Wh*- questions are formed with the aid of one of the following simple interrogative words (or *wh*-word): who/whom/whose, what, which, when, where, how, why. There is subject- operator inversion comes after the interrogative word. That question above is structured from the *wh*-word “How” that comes first in the sentence and then followed by the inversion of operator “Do” and the subject “You”. It is grammatically correct. Well-formed sentence will always have communicative purpose behind the structure. People not only produce such a well-formed sentence in uttering something. They do an action via their utterance.

##### **4.1.3. Tag Question**

###### **(Data 32)**

Joe Miller :Your Honor, everybody in this courtroom is thinking about sexual orientation, sexual preference whatever you want to call it. Who does what to whom and how they do it. They're looking at Andrew Beckett. They're thinking about it. They're looking at Mr. Wheeler, Miss Conine, even you, Your Honor. They're wondering about it. Trust me, I know they're looking at me and

thinking about it. So let's get it out in the open. Let's get it out of the closet. **Because this case is not just about AIDS, is it?** So let's talk about what this case is really all about: The general public's hatred, our loathing our fear of homosexuals and how that climate of hatred and fear translated into the firing of this particular homosexual my client, Andrew Beckett.

The question "Because this case is not just about AIDS, is it?" Is kind of Tag question. It is formed by the operator and subject in the order. The operator of that question is "Is" and the subject is "it". If the statement positive, the tag is generally negative and vice versa. The statement above is negative so that the tag question is in negative form. There is an exception on the formulation of the tag question above. The rule says that the operator is generally the same as the operator preceding statement. It can be seen that the operator of preceding statement is "This" and the operator of the tag question is "Is". It is not the same as what the rule said. However, it is still acceptable according to the syntactic rule. It is grammatically correct.

## 4.2. Speech Act Classification

### 4.2.1. Directive

#### Data (4)

Joe Miller : Do you agree that a bologna sandwich is a satisfactory meal? Whereas caviar and champagne, duck and baked Alaska that might be considered a delightful meal?

#### 1. Speech Event

The speaker normally expects that his or her communicative

intention will be recognized by the hearer. Both speaker and hearer are usually helped in this process by the circumstances surrounding the utterance. The question above is uttered under circumstances of testing of witness's previous answer. In the previous answer, the witness said that he is very pleased with the quality of Andrew Beckett. However, the reality is he fired Beckett from the company. Based on the situation, it can be said that the question is not only used to ask a question but also to test the witness answer.

## 2. Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts

### a. Locutionary Act

Locutionary act of the question above is "Do you agree that a bologna sandwich is a satisfactory meal? Whereas caviar and champagne, roast duck and baked Alaska that might be considered a delightful meal?"

### b. Illocutionary Act

In producing that question Joe Miller did an action beside he want to ask clarification, he shows any complaint via his utterance.

### c. Perlocutionary Act

In understanding the speaker intention, the witness remains silent because he knows that Joe implicitly complains about his previous answer so that he keeps silent.

## 3. Felicity Condition

Since question functions as directive to testify the answer, there are several rule lies behind the structure of question above

### a. Propositional Content:



Future act of Hearer. It means that Future act here is that the hearer, in this case witness will clarify his answer in order to tell the truth

- b. Preparatory:  
Hearer is able to do Act. It means that Speaker believes Hearer is able to do Act. Hearer is able to clarify the previous statement.
- c. Sincerity  
Speaker wants Hearer to do Act. It means that Speaker wants Hearer to clarify the statement that the speaker feels incorrect.
- d. Essential  
Counts as an attempt to get Hearer to do Act. It means that By giving a question the lawyer is attempting the witness to clarify the statement indirectly.

#### 4. Indirect Speech Act

In Joe's second question it is an example of indirect speech acts. Joe uses an idiom to reveal the truth. The question uttered by Joe's in order to get clarification, it show disappointment to the witness because Joe does not get satisfying answer. This question implicitly shows an action of complaint because the answer he got makes him curious why the witness can change his mind in a short time.

##### 4.2.2. Expressive

##### Data (17)

Opponent Lawyer (II): I don't understand. How do you explain the promotion of an obviously intelligent, articulate qualified

African-American woman in a firm which practices discrimination as wantonly and consistently as you and Mr. Beckett claim?

Ms. Burton : I can't explain it.

#### 1. Speech Event

The circumstances surrounding the utterance really help both the speaker and listener in order to achieve the communicative intention. This question is under circumstances of complaining by the lawyer because of the unintended answer of the witness. The witness state in her testimony the she feels discriminated by her boss Wyant Wheeler in the same time she got the promotion in her career as the paralegal. When the lawyer uttered the question it can be conclude that she show her dissatisfaction by using her utterance. Based on the circumstances that have been explained before, the lawyer really wants the witness to understand the intention of the question and clarify the previous statement about the discrimination.

#### 2. Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts

- a. Locutionary Act  
Locutionary act of the question above is "How do you explain the promotion of an obviously intelligent, articulate qualified African-American woman in a firm which practices discrimination as wantonly and consistently as you and Mr. Beckett claim?"
- b. Illocutionary Act  
In uttering the question the lawyer not only uses it to ask question but also he performs

dissatisfaction through the question.

**c. Perlocutionary Act**

In understanding the lawyer intention, the witness finds some difficulties in giving description. She thinks that the problem which the lawyer discussed is too sensitive so that the witness feels that the statement is too exaggerate.

**3. Felicity Condition**

All of the questions uttered by the lawyer are in question form which are needed to gain information, although in the example above has implied type of Speech Act as an Expressive to convey such dissatisfaction. The rule for this Speech Act seems similar to the rule for request, in this case request for an answer. Here are some rules:

a. **Propositional Content:**

Future act of Hearer. Future act here is that The Act that is made for the hearer. The Act here is in form of clarification.

b. **Preparatory**

Hearer is able to do Act. It means that Speaker believes Hearer is able to do Act. Hearer is able to clarify the previous statement.

c. **Sincerity**

Speaker wants Hearer to do Act. Speaker wants Hearer to clarify the discrimination issues that the lawyer feels improper to the condition of the witness who is in the recently getting promotion in the career.

d. **Essential**

Counts as an attempt to get Hearer to do Act. By giving a question the lawyer is attempting the witness to clarify the statements. The lawyer expresses such dissatisfaction in hope that the

witness can understand the intention of the lawyer's question.

**4. Indirect Speech Act**

There is indirect relationship between the structure and communicative purpose. The question that the lawyer utters is not merely used to ask a question. There is another act implies in the question. The lawyer is indirectly doing and expressing dissatisfaction because of the witness answer about the discrimination. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between structure and function, there must be an Indirect Speech Act. The question above includes to indirect Speech Act.

**4.2.3. Representative**

(Data 32)

Joe Miller :Your Honor, everybody in this courtroom is thinking about sexual orientation, sexual preference whatever you want to call it. Who does what to whom and how they do it. They're looking at Andrew Beckett. They're thinking about it. They're looking at Mr. Wheeler, Miss Conine, even you, Your Honor. They're wondering about it. Trust me, I know they're looking at me and thinking about it. So let's get it out in the open. Let's get it out of the closet. **Because this case is not just about AIDS, is it?** So let's talk about what this case is really all about: The general public's hatred, our loathing our fear of homosexuals and how that climate of hatred and fear translated into the firing of this particular homosexual my client, Andrew Beckett.

**1. Speech Event**

The question above is under the "hot" circumstances. Everyone yell each other. The lawyer brings the conversation into the mater of sexual

orientation. At the first time the lawyer asks about the missed-placed file. He changed his question because he found that the answer that the witness says does not make sense so that he connects it with the issues of sexual orientation. The question that the lawyer uttered will be recognized by the witness as an assertion because of the circumstances. The lawyer said what he believes to be the case of discrimination so that he change the topic of question from filed that being misplaced into the matter of sexual orientation in order to get the right answer of the witness.

## **2. Locutionary, Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Acts**

### **a. Locutionary Acts**

Locutionary Acts of this question is “Because this case is not just about AIDS, is it?”

### **b. Illocutionary Acts**

Based on the circumstances above there is an intention in the lawyer’s mind when he uttered the question. If it is connected to the previous question, the lawyer tends to draw the problem into the real issue about the discrimination via his utterance.

He comes into the real issues indirectly. He starts with the common problem about the reason of Beckett’s firing that lead Miller’s knowledge about the discrimination. The question he uttered express kind of Speech Act. The lawyer uttered the Speech Act that states what he believes to be the case so that the question he uttered implied assertion.

### **c. Perlocutionary Acts**

In recognizing the lawyer’s intention the witness is surprised. He tends to avoid the question by saying that he does not like what the lawyer said.

## **3. Felicity Condition**

The question that the lawyer uttered above is used to make his belief about discrimination stronger. Although the question has implied communication purpose as an assertion, it still needs an answer. It is used to make what he believes as the case tough. Here are some rules that are suitable to the question.

### **a. Propositional Content: Future Act of Hearer.**

Future Act is an Act that the hearer will do after the intention of the speaker is recognized. Kind of future act here is explaining and clarifying the statement so that what the speaker intends by uttering the question will be achieved.

**b. Preparatory:** H is able to do an Act. S believes H is able to do an Act.

Hearer is able to give information like the speaker wishes. Lawyer believes that the witness is able to clarify his answer. The rule said that it is not obvious to both speaker and Hearer that H will do A in the normal course of event of his own accord. It means that there is no clarity that the Hearer will explain the answer about discrimination and Beckett’s firing in the normal of his own accord. He provides information because he is being asked indirectly.

**c. Sincerity:** Speaker wants Hearer to do Act.

Lawyers wants the witness explain and clarify the truth about

Beckett's firing has no connection with the issues of discrimination via lawyer's utterance that is recognized as an assertion.

**d. Essential Condition**

Count as an attempt to get Hearer to do Act. The lawyer's purpose in producing an assertion behind his question is counted as an attempt to get the hearer to give more explanation about what is actually happen behind Beckett's firing and prove that there is no real implementation of discrimination that Beckett feels because of his sexual orientation.

**4. Indirect Speech Act**

After analyzing the structural and communication purpose of the question above the writer finds out that there is no direct relationship between structural form and communicative purpose of the question that he uttered. Even he uttered a question; it does not mean that the question is to ask a question.

There is another act implies behind the question he uttered. The lawyer does act via his utterance. He produces an assertion because he needs to state what he feels to be the case or not in order to get more explanation about the real issues concerning with Beckett's firing. If there is no direct relationship between structural and communicative purpose, it means that the question uttered by the lawyer is indirect Speech Act. He produces a kind of Speech Act that is Representative to show an assertion.

**4.3. The Implementation of Cooperative Principle**

**4.3.1. Maxim Quantity**

**1. Obey the Maxim Quantity**

**Data (1)**

Joe Miller : Andrew Beckett represented your company in a lawsuit in 1990. Is that correct?

Laird : That's correct.

The data above is the example of an answer that applies Quantity Maxim. The lawyer wants information about whether it is right or not that Andrew Beckett had represented his company in a law suit. It is called apply Quantity Maxim because in answering the question the witness gives his contribution as informative as is required. When the lawyer proposed a question whether it is right or not about the statement, the witness answer it correctly without any additional information that the lawyer does not need. He does not give his contribution more than it is required, so that it is suitable to the rule of maxim Quantity.

**2. Violating the Maxim Quantity**

**Data (17)**

Opponent Lawyer (II): I don't understand. How do you explain the promotion of an obviously intelligent, articulate qualified African-American woman in a firm which practices discrimination as wantonly and consistently as you and Mr. Beckett claim?

Ms. Burton: I can't explain it.

The data above is one example that the answer breaks the Maxim Quantity. It is said so, because the witness does not give her contribution as informative as it is required. When the lawyer asks about how it can be the matter of discrimination at the same time of a promotion, the witness's answer does not suitable to what the lawyer expected. The witness does not give her contribution as it is required by

answering the question. Based on the reason above, the answer is breaking the rule of maxim Quantity.

#### **4.3.2. The Maxim Quality**

##### **1. Obey The Maxim Quality**

###### **Data (16)**

Opponent Lawyer (II): Ms. Burton, weren't you recently promoted?

Ms. Burton : Yes. I'm in charge of the paralegal department.

The data above is considered apply the Maxim Quality. The purpose of the question above is to gain information about whether it is right or not; the witness is promoted to the paralegal department. The witness answer is quite informative. The answer is suitable to what the lawyer expected. She says what is believed to be true. She makes her contribution one that is true. Based on the explanation above, the answer is suitable to the rule of Quality Maxim.

##### **2. Violating the Maxim Quality**

###### **Data (4)**

Joe Miller : In that deposition, you said that you were impressed and delighted with the quality of Andrew Beckett's work. Do you recall saying that?

Laird : In all honesty, I was delighted with certain aspects of Andy's efforts. But in general, I found the work to be merely satisfactory.

The question that the lawyer uttered above has purpose to get confirmation whether the witness is pleased with the quality of Beckett or not. The answer seems to be unclear. The witness seems to be unsure with the answer he uttered. He does not say what he believes to be true. He also said that Beckett's quality is merely satisfactory. He said that which he lack adequate evidence. It is clear that he

breaks the rule of Maxim Quality. He has purpose why he breaks the rule; he breaks it perhaps he is not really sure with the quality of Beckett so that he changes his mind from pleased to disappoint.

#### **4.3.3. Relation Maxim**

##### **1. Obeying Relation Maxim**

###### **Data (44)**

Joe Miller :Andrew, can you describe the circumstances in which you joined the firm Wyant, Wheeler, Hellerman, Tetlow and Brown?

Beckett :Wyant, Wheeler aggressively recruited me. They were the most prestigious firm in Philadelphia full of opportunity. And I was impressed with the partners.

The question proposed by the lawyer has a function to ask some information about how Beckett was recruited in the Wyant Wheeler law firm. The answer that the witness uttered seems obey the rule of Relation Maxim. It can be seen that there is any correlation between the question and answer.

When the lawyer asks how the witness can be recruited in the Wyant Wheeler law firm, the witness answers it by explanation. He explains the history when he was recruited in the law firm at the first time. The witness answer seems to be relevant to what the lawyer expected via his question. For the answer is relevant to its question so that it is called obey the Relation Maxim.

##### **2. Violate the Maxim Relation**

###### **Data ( 23)**

Joe Miller :How would you characterize his work as an attorney?

Ms. O'Hara : How would I know? I just worked for him.

The question that the lawyer uttered above is answer by a question too. It is not the answer that the lawyer

expected. In that question the writer wants to gain information and explanation about the quality of Beckett. However, what the lawyer expects about the answer is different.

The witness does not answer the questions; his answer is irrelevant to the question. When the answer does not relevant, it breaks the rule of Relation Maxim. The witness does not answer the question. She does not give her contribution as much as intended. The witness uses the expression of How would I know? To indicate that she may have drifted into a discussion of some possibly non-relevant and want to stop. She emphasizes that she want to quit by her statement I just worked for him. It indicates that she does not really understand and really want to quit the question.

#### 4.3.4. Manner Maxim

##### 1. Obey the Manner Maxim

###### Data (7)

Joe Miller :Ms. Benedict, is it true you worked for Walsh, Ulmer and Brahm at the same time as Walter Kenton?

Ms. Benedict :That's correct.

Joe Miller :At that time, did Walter Kenton know the K.S. Lesions on your face and arms were caused by AIDS?

Ms. Benedict :Definitely. I told all the partners.

Manner Maxim is the rule that ask the speaker to be perspicuous. From the data above, it is recognized that the witness gives her contribution as it is required. Her answer is brief and order. There is no ambiguity found in each answer. The witness answer as informative as it is required. The witness also answers the question

orderly. When the answer is order, brief and clear (no ambiguity), it means that the answer obeys the rule in the Manner Maxim.

##### 2. Violate the Maxim Manner

###### Data (11)

Opponent Lawyer (I) : So, in your case there was no behavior on your part which caused you to be infected with the virus. It was something you were unable to avoid. Isn't that correct?

Ms. Benedict : I guess  
The data above implied that the question express ambiguity. It seems that the witness is not sure with the answer. There is no clarity information in the answer. When there is no clarity and contain ambiguity, it means that the answer violating the Manner Maxim. There must be a reason why the witness violating the Manner Maxim. It could be the witness is not sure and does not know the exact answer so that she answers the question containing ambiguity. She wants to end the question up and skip it so that the lawyer continues with the new question.

##### 5. Conclusion

Samples of question uttered by the two lawyers, structurally dominated by the form of Wh- Question, Tag Question and Yes/No question. When the writer connected the structure with their communicative function, those questions functioned as several type of Speech Act, such as: Directive, Representative and Expressive. Directive is used to ask for information and clarification, to Test the witness's answer and to command the witness to do something. Representatives function as Assertion and Description. Expressive expresses

Dissatisfaction, Dislike and Sympathy. There is no question, functions as Declaration and Commissives are found in the analysis. The connection between questions and answer show that the witnesses tend to apply the Maxim in answering the questions. Most of the answers obey the Cooperative Principle. Here are some maxims that the witness apply in the answering the lawyer's question: Maxim Quantity, Maxim Quality, Maxim Relations and Maxim Manner. Shortly, question can be analyzed from its structure and its communicative function. Most of question that appears in a courtroom is not merely function to ask question but it can also function as Directive, Representative and Expressive.

## 6. References

- Austin, J.L.1962. *How to Do Things with Words*.Oxford: The Clarendon Press
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge
- Grice, H. P. 1975. *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press
- Leech, G. 1983. *The Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group
- Mahsun. 2005. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada
- May, L. Jacob. 2001. *Pragmatics An Introduction*. Second Edition. Oxford: Blackweel Publishing
- Quirk, Randolph. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge:Blackwell Publisher
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknis Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana Univesity Press
- Yule, George.1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: University Press

