Conversational Maxims in Constitutional Court

Siti Khodijah
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Jember
sikodsiti@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper discussed conversational Maxims in Constituional Court that related to the general election 2019 in Indonesia. However, this reseach focused on the flouted maxims that is used by the witness in constitutional court in answering the judge's questions. In this paper, the writer choose the utterances that is produced by the witness in constitutional court, since there are many maxims that are flouted by the witness in giving his answer. In analyzing this conversation, the writer used Grice's theory which established four maxims, they are maxims of quantity, maxims of quality, maxims of relevance, and amxims of manner. In addition, this research used descriptive qualitative approach. Since, the data are in the form of sentences. The analysis revelas some findings. It's found that mostly the witness flouted the maxims of relevance.

Keywords: *Conversational Maxims, Flouting, Maxims.*

INTRODUCTION

This research analyzes the flouting maxims that is used by witnesses of the candidates of president, Prabowo and Sandi, in constitutional court. Fourteen witnesses came to the court to explain what they knew about the deceitfulness that happened in general election. All of the witnesses were oathed to tell the truth.

They told their story to the judges and others in the court by expressing their language which include their intonation and expression, even talking nonsense. The aim of this research was to take the witnesses' utterances; the utterances that were produced by the witnesses was valued flouted maxims. Since they could not prove their explanation. In addition, the witnesses had the unique intonation and expression when they answered the judge's questions. During the witnesses' speech, I identified the flouting maxims happened. The witness flouted to reach the certain goal. It can be intentionally or unintentionally. Hence, I was interested to analyze it by using flouting of conversational maxim's theory. Since, the theory of conversational maxim has been used to analyze social communication studies (Alduals, 2012)

In conversation analysis, the speaker uttered his/her idea to the hearer. Both of them should have cooperative principle in order that their conversation there is no misunderstanding and connected each other. The formulation of general principle in using of language is proposed by Grice (1975:45). Then it is called by cooperative principle. In this principle, the speaker should speak based on their needed and the aim which they are occured. In addition, this principle has four maxims, they are: maxims of quantity, maxims of quality, maxims of relevance, and maxims of manner. Each maxim has their own principle in conversation. Such as maxims of quantity. In this maxims, the speaker must give the information as infromative as required. Then, the speaker does not make contribution more informative than is required. It means, in this maxims the speaker is not allowed to give the information more than the hearer's expect. The second maxim is maxims quality. In this maxims, the speaker should say what he/she believes to be false and lack adequate evidence. In this maxims, the speaker must say the truth, then he/she is not allowed to say the true while he/she cannot bring the evidence. Next is maxims of relevance, it means that what speaker said has to be relevant. The last is maxims of manner. In this maxims, when conversation happens, he/she avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief, and be orderly. In this maxims, the speaker should say clearly without making the hearer confused.

Related to the theory above, in conversation, it is common the floating occured. It happens when the speaker does not obey the cooperative principle. As what Wijana (1996) stated that if

people do not follow the rules, it may leads misunderstanding. Furthermore, Grice (1975) defined the flouting maxims is a flouted maxims that is conducted intentionally by the speaker in order that the hearer will understand the implicit meaning. So, the speaker will say something implicitly. It detected as flouting maxim. In addition, it happens when the speaker failed clearly in producing the utterance to the hearer. It is conducted intentionally by the speaker, since the speaker wants the hearer to look for another meaning from that utterance. Again, it is detected as flouting maxims.

Based on the theory above, this research tried to investigate the conversation that happened between the witnesses and the judges in constitutional court which related to the general election. In expressing the story, most of them flouted the maxim. They made the judges and audiences got misunderstanding. Since, the witnesses did not tell explicitly. They did not say it clearly. Hence, itwas interested to be studied.

Method

This research was descriprive qualitative. Since, it is used to get in-depth understanding of the witness's speech and behavior when the judges asked some questions to which related to the deceitfulness in general election in 17th April 2019. In addition, the theory that is used is theory of cooperative principle which is proposed by Grice (1975), which has four maxims, they are maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. The data of this paper was in the from of utterances that are produced by the witnesses, and it was gotten from youtube. In collecting the data, Iwatched the video first, then transcript and typed it. There are many data that had been collected, yet I just choose some data which represent and show on how the utterances of the witnesses flouting the maxims in their conversation.

Result and Discussion

In this discussion, I found there were many maxims that were flouted by some witnesses in constitutional court related to the dispute the result in general election on 17th April 2019. The finding found that the conversation which occured between judge, witnesses, petitioner, respondent, and related parties were still able to run smoothly, even there were some maxims that were flouted.

In addition, in choosing the data, I took the data that were indicated flouting maxim. For further discussions, the data are presented in teh discussion below.

Context 1: The conversation occured between the first witness and the judge in the Constituional Court. In this case, the judge asked about the role of the witness in general election 2019.

Judge 1:	Baik. Saudara saksi apakah saudara dalam memberikan keterangan, saudara tidak mendapat tekanan atau ancaman dari pihak manapun? (*Mr. Witness, do you get the pressure or threat in giving information from another side?*)
Witness A:	Eh.. sebelumnya kami ada ancaman itu. (*eh.. we got it before*)
Judge:	Ancaman dalam bentuk apa yang saudara alami? (*in what form you got that threat?*)
Witness A:	Saya mohon maaf tidak menjelaskan disini secara terbuka. (*I'm sorry I cannot explain it here openly*)
Judge:	Loh,,tidak bisa..ini pengadilan terbuka untuk umum biar didengar dan disaksikan oleh semua rakyat Indonesia. (*No, you cannot do this. This court is open for the public. All of Indonesian people must hear and know it*)
Witness A:	Ancaman itu pernah sampek kepada saya dan juga kepada keluarga saya dan juga sudah tersebar beritanya tentang ancaman pembunuhan.(*that threat had arrived to me and my family. Furhter, it had spread out about murder*)
Judge:	Siapa yangmelakukan pengancaman? (*who do that?*)
Witness A:	Mohon maaf yang itu yang kami tidak ingin menyampaikan karena menurut saya itu akan menimbulkan persoalan yang lebih keras kepada saya. Jadi cukup saya sampaikan itu saja. (*I'm sorry, I cannot say it, since I think it will make the problem harder than before to me. So, I think it's enough to say it*)
Judge:	Baik. Kalau saudara tidak mau menyampaikan siapa pengancamnya, kapan saudara diancam? (*all right, if you dont want to explain it, who is the threatener, and when were you threatened?*)

Witness A:	Sekitar bulan april. Mendekati bulan april. Diawal april. (*It's about April. Next to April. The First of April*)
Judge:	April, berarti ketika itu saudara belum ketahuan akan menjadi saksi. Tidak kan? (*April. It means that you got it before you will be the witness. Isn't it?*)
Witness A:	Oh iya..makanya tidak berkaitan..eh berkaitan dengan DPT. (*Yes. It was not related ...oh it was related to DPT*)
Judge:	Jadi bukan, saudara bukan mendapatkan ancamannya keterkaitanya dengan memberikan keterangannya didepan persidangan mahkamah. (*So, no. You don't get menacing which related to give explanation infront of constitutional court*)
Witness A:	Iya..tidak. (*Yes... No*)

From the first context, it can be seen that the judge and the witness do communications related to the witness' position in general election. However, the conversation was not effective since one of them flouted the maxims. It can be seen from the first answer from the witness when the judge asked about the threat by saying "we got it before". The witness A used the word "we", where the judge asked him, but he answered by using the lexical which showed plural. That lexical identified that someone who got threat were more than one. It is indicated as flouted maxim of relevance. In fact, the judge just asked to the witness. Further, the witness used opting out a maxim. It is proved in the conversation above, when the judge asked the witness about the form of the threat. The witness did not want to tell it by saying " I'm sorry I cannot explain it openly". In one side the witness A said that he got the threat, but in another side he did not tell it. The judge asked him to tell it, but he refused to tell it. The witness in this part flouted the maxims. It is identified as flouted maxims of relevance. In addition, the witness flouted the maxim of manner in the conversation above. It is proved when the judge asked about when he got the threat. The witness' answer is not clear by saying "It's about April. Next to April. The First of April". He flouted the maxims by saying unclearly. He said in April, then switch to the next April, then switch again in the first of April. He did not have certain answer. His answer invited the judge and the audiences to be confused. The flouted maxims happened again in the last conversation.

In the last conversation, the judge stated that the witness got the threat before he will be the witness in Constitutional Court. The witness' answer was doubt.The first sentence he said " yes, it was not related". It means, he agreed with the judge statement that he got the threat before he become the witness in Constitutional Court, then he said that it was related to DPT (the list of permanent elector). He flouted the maxims of relevance. The judge asked his threat related to his position as the witness, not in another position. Yet, the witness added the information which is related to another case. It was not relevant and not related to the judge's statement. From this conversation above, it can be seen that the conversation was going on even though there are many maxims that is flouted by the witness. They are maxim of relevance which occured three times. The other is opting out maxim that occured one time, and the last is maxim of manner. It also occured one time.

Context 2   : This conversation still occured between the first witness and the judge. In this context, the judge asked the witness about the total of DPT. (*the list permanent elector*)

Judge:	Saudara saksi apakah saudara masih ingat berapa yang dicek kira-kira jumlahnya? (*Do you still remember, how many DPT that have you checked it?*)
Witness A:	Ada banyak yang kami laporkan. (*There are many DPT that we reported*)
Judge:	Iyabanyaknya seberapa? (*yes, how many?*)
Witness A:	Ada lebih dari satu juta KK. Misalnya dengan yok kamimenyebutnya lebih dari limaratus ribu. (*More than one million family card. For example more than five hundred thousands*)
Judge:	Mekanisme yang saudara gunakan untuk mengecek ke lapangan itu apa pak? (*What kinds of mechanism that have you used in the field, Sir?*)
Witness A:	Ya, kami punya tim. Tim itu datang ke lapangan untuk mnegecek apakah orang itu punya KK atau tidak, ternyata punya KK. Dan kemudian kami datang ke dukcapil bertemu dengan bapak dirjen dukcapil dan kami membuka data kependudukan dukcapil, dan ternyata kami mendapati bahwa semua data yang tercantum disitu kebanyakn bahkan punya no KK

bahkan kami mendapatkan informasi dari bapak disana itudi PTHP 1 yang pernah diserahkan KPU kepada dukcapil itu kemudian dilengkapi dengan KK banyak sekali. Sementara di DPTHP sampai DPTHP 2 yang kami terima itu tidak ada KK nya. Dan itu kemudian kami laporkan kepada KPU bahwa hal ini mohon bisa dilengkapi Kknya karena ini berkaitan dengan dokumen yang tidak legkap. Dan bagi saya ini berari KPUtidak melakukan coklit ke tempat ini. Sehingga kemudian pemutakhiran data diimana KPU nya dimana daftar pemilihnya memiliki KK itu tidak termutakhir kan. (*Yes, we have team. That team comes to the field to check whether that one has KK (family card) or not, the result he/she has KK. Then we come to the dukcapil and meet with dircetor general of dukcapil, then we open the data of demography dukcapil. Then we get that the data that is exist there has KK number, moreover, we got information from someone there that in PHTP1 which is given by KPU to dukcapil is completed by many KK. While in DPHTP to DPHTP 2 that we received was no KK. Then we reported it to the KPU, please this file is completed by KK since this is related to the document that did not complete. For me, it menas that KPU did not check that place*)

Judge: Baik, setelah saudara melakukan, saya pertegas kembali, setelah saudara melakukan apakah saudara mengkonfirmasi kembali ke KPU? Dan apa respon KPU? (*All right. After you did, I affirm you, did you confirm back to KPU? What is KPU respond?*)

Witness A: Oh iya. Respon KPU pada waktu itu mengatakan bertahan bahwa itu merupakan data lapangan. (*The respond of KPU at that time said that it was data field*)

From the conversation above, the witness flouted the maxims again. When the judge asked about the total of the DPT, the witness flouted the maxim by saying "*There are many DPT that we reported*". He was not directly stated the total of the DPT. He just said "*many*" without mention the detail number. It is identified as flouted maxim of quantity. Since the judge asked about the total,

so the witness should mention the number. Then, the judge repeat his questions. Again, the witness flouted the maxim of quality. The witness stated one million of family card, then he said "*for example more than five hundred thousands*". He used the word "*for example*" which identified that he was not sure with the total. Another flouted maxim also found in the conversation above. It can be seen when the judge asked about the mechanism. The witness said more than what the judge expected. The question is simple, but the answer is so long, further it could not answer the question. It flouted the maxim of quantity. It can be continued in the conversation below.

Judge: Pak perlu penegasan. jumlah KTP palsu yang saudara maksud itu ada berapa banyak? (*It meeds affirmation, Sir. How many fake identity cards*?)

Witness A: Lebih dari satu juta pak. (*More than one million, Sir*)

Judge: Saudara tidak mengetahui angka pastinya? (*Don't you know the certain number?*)

Witness A: Ya, karena kami tidak melakukan rekapsecara keseluruhan. Kami hanya menampilkan beberapa saja. (*Yes, we did not do the whole recapitulation.we just perform some of them*)

From the data above, the judge said by using the word " *penegasan (affirmation)*". It's uttered, since the judge did not find the answer about his question. The judge wanted to know the certain number of identity card. Then, the witness mentioned the number without giving the data. He just said " *more than one million*" but he did not know the exact number, since he did not do the whole recapitulation. He said something that he was not sure with the data. It identified that what he said is not really true, since he could not prove it. It identified flouted maxim of quality. He said for which he lack adequate evidence. Then in the next data, he confessed that he just brought some of it.

Judge: Baik. Ada tidak sample saudara bahwa warga yang berKTP palsu atau KTP palsu itu masuk di daftar pemilih tetap?(*All right. Do you have sample that the society that has fake identity card is in the list of permanent elector?*)

Witness A: Ada. (*Yes*)

Judge: Berapa DPT (*How many DPT*)

Witness A: Didalam DPTHP 2 yang kami laporkan itu rinciannya, kami tidak merekap Pak, tapi rinciannya lebih dari 1 juta pak. Yang kami laporkan itu rinciannya. Kamitidak merekap pak, tapi totalnya lebih dari satu juta pak. (*In DPTHP 2 which we reported is the detail. We did not do recapitulation, but the detail is more than one million, Sir)*

Judge: Baik, kita sudah paham itu pak, pertanyaan kami adalah apakah KTP-KTP yang invalid itu saudara ketahui bahwa memang dia masuk di DPTPH2? Berapa banyak yang masuk?*(All right, we understand it, Sir. Our question is are the invalid identity cards that you have known is in DPTPH2? How many identity cards that include?)*

Agus: Iya betul. Itu kami peroleh kan dari DPTPH2 yang diberikan KPU ke pasangan capres. (*Yes. We got it from DPTPH2 that is given by KPU to the candidate of president)*

Judge: Berapa banyak? (*How many?)*

Agus: Ok, yang khusus DPTHP2, eh yang husus pada 17,5 jt ini jumlahnya adalah sekitar 239 rbu. Tadi sebelumini saya buka. Eh.. jumlahnya adalah itu. Tapi kalau total termasuk juga yang invalid pd 5 provinsi itu lebih dari 1 jt.*(Ok, especially DPTHP2, eh especially on 17,5 million is around 239 thousands.last time, I opened it. Eh.. the total is, but if it included 5 provinces the total is more than one million)*

The data above showed the witness flouted the maxims. It can be seen when the judge asked about how many which identified with the number, yet the witness did not mention the total directly. It flouted the maxims of quantity. Since the witness gave the information more than the judge's question. It happened three times in the conversation above. First, when the judge asked about the number of DPT, the witness told the story and gave information which is not needed. Next, the judge asked again with the same question. In this case, there is no siginfcant between the question and answer. The judge asked about "*how many*" which is indicated with the number, and the witness said "*yes, right. We got it from DPTPH2....*" it is totally different with judge's question. The witness

flouted the maxims of relevant. There is no relevancy between question and answer. Then, the judge asked again about the total. Again, the witness flouted the maxim of quantity. Further, it can be identifed as flouted maxim of manner, since he expressed the obscurity answer. It can be seen from his utterance by using the word "eh" which identified uncertainty answer. In this coversation, the witness looked so inconsequential. He told the story but he did not realized that he did not know what he said. It can be seen from his answers that he did not do the recapitulation.

Judge: Baik saya pertegas lagi, mekanisme untuk menentukan jumlah KTP yang invalid itu masuk di DPTHP2 atau daftar pemilih tetap, apa mekanisme yang saudara gunakan untuk mengetahui halitu? Mengetahui bahwa KTP invalid itu ada di DPTHP2 (*Ok, I affirm again, the mechanism to decide the total of invalid identity card include DPTHP 2 of DPT, what kind of mechanism that you used toknow it? Knowing that invalid identity card in DPTHP2*)

Agus: Ya, karena data itu kami ambil dari…. (*Yes, because that data we taken from…….*)

Judge: Tidak tidak..mekanisme yang sudah anda gunakan (*No, no… the mechanism that have you used*)

Agus: Oh ya..kami menganalisanya dengan excel pak. Dan kemudian kami bisa seperti yang kami tampilkan itu. Itu yang kode 60 30 dan lainnya Itu kan berasal dari DPTHP2, berarti otomatis dia itu sudah ada di DPT. (*we analyzed it by excel, Sir. The we can as we perform that. That code 60 30 and others came from DPTHP2, automatically he/she is DPT*)

In the data above, the judge asked about the mechanism how to decide the total of invalid identity card. Moreover, the judge used the lexical "saya pertegas lagi (*I affirmed more….*) it means that the judge asked the witness to understand and answer the questions. The judge used that word showed that the judge resentful with the witness' answer. Since he never answered the questions to the point. In addition, after the judge used that word, again, the witness said by saying "yes.. because that data we take from…" which flouted maxim of relevance. The witness did not

answer the judge question. Before the witness finished his statement, the judge cut it, since his statement did not answer his questions. So, in this conversation,the witness flouted the maxims of relevance.

Judge 2:   Saudara saksi kan menerangkan mengenai proses ya. Proses bagaimana menetapkan sampai DPT. Sekarang begini, saudara tahu nggak, DPT akhir dari nasional itu berapa? (*You explain about the process. How is the process to decide DPT. Do you know how many the final DPT from national?*)

Agus: DPT akhir dari nasional itu tidak jelas pak, jadi sebenarnya harus ditetapkan pada tanggal 17 Maret.(*the final DPT from national is not clear, Sir. It should be decided on 17th March*)

Judge 2:   kemudian yang dipakai dasar untuk menentukan pileg dan pilpres itu DPT nya berapa? (*then how many DPT that is used to decide pileg and pilpres*)

Agus: DPT yang kami tahu itu berbeda-beda dan berubah-ubah. Jadi misalnya pada tanggal..(*DPT that we known is different and changeable. So, for example on the date... *)

Judge 2:   Sekarang stop. Sudahh cukup ya. Sekarang saya kroscek ke KPU. KPU, DPT nasional itu berapa? (*Now, stop! It's enough. I'd like to check to KPU. KPU, howmany DPT national?*)

KPU: jumlah DPT yang kita gunakan 192.770.611 pemilih. (*the total of DPT that we used is 192.770.611 electors*)

In the context above showed that the judge asked about the total of the DPT. The conversation was not effective since the witness flouted the maxim. We can see from the data above. It started from the first question when the judge asked about the total of DPT toward the witness, the witness did not answered the question. Moreover, he stated that DPT is not clear. In this case, the witness flouted maxim of relevance. When the judge asked about thenumber, thewitness did not mention the number, moreover he sadi something that is not relevant with the questions. In the middle of conversation, the judges stopped it, since he felt that teh conversation was not effective anymore. He asked the witness to stop it, then he switched to ask to the KPU. Another maxim that is

flouted by the witness is maxim of manner. He expressed something that obscured and too long. So, from the conversation above, the winess flouted two maxims, they aremaxim of relevanceand maxims of manner.

Judge 3:	Tadi ditemukan sekitar 1000 an invalid menurut bahasanya saksi. Seribu berapatadi?*(You said that you found invalid data around 1000. Isn't it?)*
Agus:	1117333 KK untuk 5 kabupaten (*1117333 family card for 5 regencies)*
Judge 3:	Ok. Berhenti disitu. Itu kalau dijumlahkan orangnya kira2 berapa? Yang berkorelasi dengan pengguna hak pilih?*(OK, stop it. How many people who correlate with the elector?)*
Agus:	Saya tidak bisa menjawab karena tidak melakukan rekapitulasi. Karena nantik masing2 KK jumlahnya beda-beda. (*I cannot answer that question because I did not do recapitulation. Since, the total of each family card is different)*(bisa menjawab total tapi tidak tahu dengan alasan tidak melakukan rekapitulasi)
Judge3 :	Ok..ok ok.. jumlahnya beda-beda. Berrati anda tidak tahu ya.yang kedua apakah orang yang ada di KK invalid itu anda teliti juga ndak atau anda telaah juga bahwa yang invalid itu menggunakan hak pilih. (*Ok. The total is different. It means that you did not know. The second one is, did you do a research or study that someone in invalid family card used his/her right?)*
Agus:	ehh yang invalid ini kan … kemudian kan..terbukti dilapangan dia eehh…siluman. tidak ada. *(ehmm… invalid..then.. it can be proved in the field that he/she ehhmm…. invisible. No one)*
Judge 3:	Tidak ada kan..oke. pendek2 saja jawabnya. Santai makanya susasanya supaya lebih santai jawab apa yang ditanya hakim Saja.saya tanya itu dari sekian itu orangnya ujungnya menggunakan hak pilih atau tidak? (*No one, right?! Ok! Just make it short. Be relaxed in answer the questions. I just ask about did the people used their right or not?)*
Agus:	Tidak tahu*(I don't know)*
Judge 3:	Oke. Santai saja tidak usah diberi penjelasan yang

	panjang. Jadi walaupun ada DPT yang invalid, KK yang invalid, tapi anda tidak bisa memberikan keterangan kepada mahkamah bahwa jumlah itu sekaligus pengguna hak pilih. (*Ok. Be relaxed. you don't need answer that question with long answer. So, even though there was invalid DPT, invalid family card, but you cannot tell the explanation to the court that those people used their right*)
Agus:	Iya, tidak jelas. *(Yes, it's not clear)*

The conversation above happened between judge 3 and the witness. In this conversation, the judge reminded the witness not to flouted the maxim of manner. Most of judge utterance cut the witness' statement in order that the witness asnwer it by clear answer, so they can make effective conversation.They talked about invalid family card. When the judge asked about the certain number of the invalid family card, the witness did not give the true answer. His answer is confusing. He stated that he did not do the recapitulation, moreover, he didn't do a research or study the invalid one. In contrast, they gave the number as if he knows all about the elector. Then in the end of their conversation, the witness stated that he did not know that someone in invalid family card used their right in general election. It is flouted maxim of quality. Since, he did not knowwhat they said before. He cannot prove his statement. In the end of their conversation, the witness agreed with the judge's statement that he cannot make sure that someone who is invalid family card used their right in generalelection.

Context 3: This contexts happened between the witness and the KPU team. In this context, the KPU team asked about the verification of data.

KPU:	Saudara tadi mengatakan bahwa kami verifikasi ke lapangan, kami verifikasi ke lapangan. Maksudnya kami itu dilakukan oleh siapa, hanya BPN 02 saja atau bersama-sama dengan KPU dan Bawaslu? (*You just now stated that we verified to the field. What do you mean by we? It is conducted by whom, it's only BPN 02 or together with KPU and Bawaslu?*)

Agus: Kami melakukan bersama tim kami. (*We conducted it with our team*)

KPU: Berdasarkan kesepakatan-kesepakatan setelah verifikasi data dan dilakukan verifikasi untuk ke lapangan itu apakah saudara saksi ikut hadir verifikasi di lapangan yang dilakukan oleh KPU, bawaslu, dan tim BPN 02 (*Based on the agreements after data verification and conducted verification to the field, did you join that moment which is conducted by KPU, Baawaslu, dan BPN 02 team?*)

Agus: Mohon ijin, boleh kami jawab agak lengkap pertanyaan ini? (*I'm sorry, may we try to answer this question completely?*)

KPU: Saya hanya tanya anda ikut nggak verifikasi ke lapangan itu?(*I just asks you, did you follow verification to the field?*)

Agus: kami tidak ikut, karena kami..... (*we did not join, since we....*)

KPU: Cukup (*enough*)

In the third context, there was situation where the witness was interviewed by KPU (general election commision). The conversation above was effective even though there is maxim that is flouted by the witness. From the first question, the witness can answer it clearly. In this part, there is no maxim that is flouted by him. Going to the second part, the witness aterted to floute the maxim. He wanted to answer by long sentence without answer the question. It flouted maxim of manner. Then, KPU tried to affirm the questions again by using the word "just" which means that KPU did not need the long answer. Therefore, in the last part, the witness said that he did not join the verification to the field. When he tried to give the reason, KPU cut his utterance. Since, they did not need his reason. It can be seen from the conversation above, it was effective without getting misunderstanding.

Conclusion

In this study, it can be seen that the conversation which happen between the judges and the witness flouted the maxims that is proposed by Grice. They are four maxims, they are maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner. The findings show that

those maxims are flouted by the witness. It happened, since the witness did not obey the rule of cooperative principle. In the data, the witness often answer by long sentence, moreover, he explained something that is not relevance with the judge's questions. Yet, the conversation was still effective even though in some utterances they got misunderstanding because of the witness' answer. Hence, there are many utterances that are cut by the judge and other questioner in order that they got the point from the witness' answer.

References

Brown, P. and S. C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.*Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press.

Chaer. Abdul. 2010. Kesantunan Berbahasa. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

CummingS,Louise. 2007. *Pragmatik Sebuah Prespektif Multidisipliner*. Yogyakarta:Pustaka Pelajar.

Grice, H.P. 1975. *Logic and Conversation*. In Peter Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.) Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts, New York: Academic.

Rustono. 1999. *Pokok-Pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press.

Sumarlam, dkk. 2010. *Teori dan Praktik Analisis Wacana*. Solo : Putra Cakra Surakarta.

Syamsuddin dan Vismaia S. Darmaianti. 2009. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa. Bandung: PT.Remaja Rosdakarya.

Wijana, I Dewa Putu. 1996. *Dasar-Dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta:Andi Offset.

Yule,George. 2008. *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Youtube (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fhlwvlx2jXY) diakses pada tanggal 3 September 2019.