



Article

The Role of Maxims in The Process of Investigations: A Case Study in Situbondo Resort Police Office

Yopi Thahara, Ahmad Yusuf Firdaus, Firqo Amelia

Abdurachman Saleh Situbondo University, East Java, Indonesia

SUBMISSION TRACK

Received: April 01, 2018.
Final Revision: April 20, 2018
Available Online: april 28, 2018

KEYWORD

Maxim violation, Police Investigation, Crime Motives

CORRESPONDENCE

E-mail: yopi.thahara@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

This study aims to reveal the role of maxim in the conversation between the investigators and suspects in giving information during the making of investigation reports in Situbondo police office. This is an interdisciplinary linguistic research that utilizes linguistic and pragmatic disciplines. The theory used to analyze the data in this study is the theory of speech acts initiated by Searle. This is a qualitative descriptive research, and it produces deep descriptions of the words, writings, and behaviors that can be observed from a specific individual, group, society, or organization in a particular context that is holistically studied. The result of this research is the role of maxim in the process of investigation and the degree of the trustworthiness.

I. INTRODUCTION

An investigation is conducted by the police officers to get the detail information from the suspects about criminal cases. In the process of investigation, the police officers are required to have special capabilities. The capabilities should include the ability to communicate, the ability to create questions that can reveal the motives of crimes committed, and the ability to uncover the secrets held by the suspects.

The investigation process is always related to the question and answer process undertaken by an investigator and a suspect. In the process of investigation, the investigator is often faced with some problems that need patience and skills to overcome. The most problems in the investigation are the languages and attitudes. The languages means

the language of the suspects. The attitudes means the attitude of the suspects which tend to cover the secrets about the cases.

Regarding the disclosure of crime motives, an investigation process is required. The investigation process is not a simple matter because the suspects sometimes do not want to tell the truth. Therefore, the researchers are interested in investigating the investigation processes of some criminal cases that occur in Situbondo. The investigation processes are done at Situbondo Resort Police.

The investigation process is always related to the question and answer process undertaken by an investigator and a suspect. In this study, the process of investigation is examined with pragmatics, the science that discusses language in its use. Specifically, the

researchers investigate the Maxim in the process of investigation.

Related studies have previously been done by some researchers. Aminudin (2014) conducts a research on forensic linguistics which focuses on the quality of question formulas submitted by the investigators and their relation to the full and true disclosure of information provided, discourse constructions developed by investigators to disclose information especially in connection with the strategy of the topic of conversation at the time of investigation, as well as the level of obedience in preparing the BAP as a report containing the information. Another research which is related to this research has been done by Hadiyani (2014). In her research, Hadiyani examines the types of questions, responses and presuppositions that appear in the investigative intervention processes. The research findings show that in the case of fraud and embezzlement, most of the questions are open-ended and only a few are closed.

This research is different from the previous researches because this research focuses on the investigation process. This research focuses on the cooperative principles of conversations conducted by police investigators and defendants. Therefore, the research discusses what happens in the investigation processes done by the investigators and the suspects; the system of conversational maxims that occur in the conversations between the police investigators and suspects; and the pattern of cooperation done by the suspects.

This study aims to reveal the cooperative principles (maxims) that occur during the conversations between the investigators and suspects. The principles are classified based on the theory proposed by Grice. Grice in Thomas (1996: 63) suggests four cooperative principles: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. Furthermore, this study also aims to reveal the possibility of cooperation that

occurs from the investigation process between the investigators and suspects.

However, Leech (1993: 2) says that the inclusion of pragmatics is the last stage in the waves of linguistic expansion, from a narrow discipline that takes care of the physical data of language to a broad discipline that includes forms, meanings, and contexts. This development of language studies comes from the highly concentrated language philosophers of pragmatic studies, including Austin (1962), Searle (1969), and Grice (1975).

On the basis of comparisons with structural analysis, it can be argued that those treated in pragmatic analysis are two things, namely (1) a lingual unit (or, sentence) that can be used to express a number of functions in communication, and (2) a particular communicative function that can be expressed with a number of linguistic units. (Kaswanti Purwo, 1990: 14).

To achieve an understanding in a conversation, Grice (1975) formulates a principle of cooperation (Cooperative Principles) which consists of four maxims of conversation, namely maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxims of relation, and maxim of manner.

In the Maxim of quantity, the speakers must give information that is informative as possible. Speakers also do not give more details than necessary. In the maxim of quality, the speakers must not say anything wrong. Speakers do not say something that is not proven. Maxim relation means that the speakers must speak relevantly. In the maxim of manner, the speakers must avoid obscurity, avoid coercion, speak briefly, and speak regularly.

II. METHODS

This is a descriptive qualitative research. This describes the principle of cooperation used by the defendants at during the investigation processes in Situbondo Resort Police Office.

Bogdan and Taylor (1992: 21-22) explains that qualitative research is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of speech or writing and the behavior of those observed.

A qualitative approach is expected to produce in-depth descriptions of the words, writings, and / or behaviors that can be observed from a particular individual, group, society, or organization in a given context that is viewed from a holistic and comprehensive perspective.

This study belongs to the qualitative research because the data collected are tangible words in sentences or drawings that have more meaning than just numbers (Sutopo, 2002). In this study the data are the result of direct observations in Situbondo Resort Police Office. The numbers that appear on research are not the measure or parameter, but rather a tool supporting to obtain data. The data are words uttered by the defendants in Situbondo Resort Police Office. Meanwhile, the data sources of this research are two. The first data source used by researchers is the defendants at the Situbondo Resort Police Office. The second source of data is information from the investigator. This research involves suspects investigated in June 2017 until September 2017. In addition, investigators and other stakeholders are also involved to draw the conclusion.

The data collection technique used in this study is the technique of sampling (sampling), the analysis of documents, and questionnaire. With the technique of sampling, the selection of informants is done based on the criteria. This sampling technique is also used by the researchers in determining the necessary data sources. The document analysis is done by analyzing the maxims. Mechanical analysis of documents (content analysis) is a way to find a variety of ways that are relevant to the needs and goals of the research (Yin Sutopo, 2006: 81)

Furthermore, to analyze the data, this study uses content analysis with contrastive analysis and ethnographic approaches. The Analysis was performed by contrasting the information submitted by the defendants with the information given by the investigators. After that, the analysis is continued by looking at the relationship between the parts in the data or elements involved in it.

The applicability of contrastive analysis is very useful for use in the study of language, especially when researchers want to find a relationship, similarity, and differences. Mechanical analysis by Spradley (1980) includes a four-step analysis: domain analysis, taxonomic analysis, componential analysis, analysis of the cultural theme..

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Maximize of quantity

Maxim of quantity requires each participant to give contribution as much as needed by the interlocutor. Here is an example of maxim of quantity violation found in the investigation process at Situbondo Resort Police.

P: *ada no hp, Pak?*

T: *gak punya hp. Ngalah ke istri curiganya dari hp. Ya udah.*

In this case, we can see that T violates the maxim of quantity because he gives information that is not needed "**ngalah curiganya dari hp. Ya udah.**" The context of the conversation on the data is that the investigator asks a question about the phone number. The Answer required by investigator is actually "Yes" or "no." However, in the conversation, the speaker, who in this case acts as a criminal, delivers an answer that is not needed. The actual message to be conveyed is "no." The explanation, as we can see above, is basically unnecessary.

Maxim of quality

This maxim requires each participant to say the truth. Here is a violation of the maxim of quality encountered in the process of investigation in Situbondo Resort Police Office.

P: *permasalahannya dengan bapak apa, apakah ada masalah keuangan?*
 T: *bukan*
 P: *permasalahan dia tidak tinggal serumah lagi?*
 T: *bukan. Bener hanya itu permasalahannya, karena curiga itu. Kalo masalah keuangan terus terang saja, saya memang PNS, tapi Golongan rendah. Kalo sebelum nikah saya ngasih gaji tiap bulan*

On this issue P provides information that is not informative when asked about his quarrel with his wife. In the conversation, the investigator asks about the reason why P committed acts of violence to Q. The answer the investigator hopes for is actually a reason. In this case, T gives an answer that has nothing to do with the question asked by the investigator.

Maxim of relevance

Maxim of relevance requires that each participant contribute relevantly to the subject matter of the conversation. The following is the example of violation of maxim of relevance found in the investigation process at Situbondo Resort Police.

P: *sejak kapan bapak tidak memberi nafkah?*
 T: *gini itu pak. Terus terang kalo masalah nafkah saya ndak ngasih. Cuma saya mengunjungi ibu*

In this case, P answers the question with an irrelevant answer. P commits a maximal offense relationship. The description given by T has nothing to do with the question asked by the investigator. The investigator's question in this case relates to the time. However, in his answer, T does not give any time-related information.

Maxim of Manner

This maxim requires that each participant speak directly without exaggeration. People who speak without considering this point are said to violate the maxim of manner. The following is a form of maxim of manner

violation found in the investigation process at Situbondo Resort Police.

P: *setelah nikah siri, benar istri ikut ke rumah bapak?*
 T: *di sini (situbondo)*

In this case, T gives unclear information. It gives an answer 'here'. The answer raises the vagueness of the wife's existence.

The results of this study as a whole can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Recapitulation of Result

No	Maxim type	Total
1	Obeying :	
	Quantity	94
	Quality	19
	Relevance	7
	Manner	4
	Total	124
2	Violating :	
	Quantity	39
	Quality	14
	Relevance	21
	Manner	22
	Total	96

From the table above, it can be seen that in the process of investigation the suspects dominantly obeying the maxim with the total 124 responses. The maxim quantity are dominantly obeyed by the suspect. It means that the suspects do not give more unnecessary information to the investigators. Obeying the maxim of quality with 19 utterances means that the suspects give the answers that appropriate with the evidence. Obeying the maxim of relevance with 7 data means that the suspects give relevant answers to the questions.

However, the maxim of quantity is also dominantly violated in the process of investigation. There are 39 question that are violated by the suspects. The violation of the maxim of quantity means that the suspect give more information about the subjects asked. The suspects give more detail information which mean the probability of the lying is low. Violating maxim of manner is also done by the suspects with 22 data. Violating maxim of manner means that the suspects give the

answer by considering the question or the question is not directly answered. Violating maxim of relevances are 21 data. It means that the suspects do not give the relevant answer. The violations of the maxim quality are 14 data. It means that the suspect give different answer with the evidence.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the process of investigation, the knowledge of the cooperative principle is very necessary. Obeying the maxim of quantity means that answer the questions by giving the necessary information or do not give more information that is needed. Obeying the maxim of quantity in the investigation process can result low trustworthiness. Otherwise, violating maxim quantity means the suspect give more information. The probability to lie is low, so the violating the maxim of quantity can result high trustworthiness.

Obeying maxim of quality means that answer appropriate with the evidences. Obeying maxim of quality in the investigation process can result high trustworthiness. Otherwise, violating maxim of quality can result low trustworthiness.

Obeying maxim of relevance means that the suspects relevantly answer to the subject matter of the conversation. Obeying maxim of relevance can result high trustworthiness. In contrast, violating maxim of relevance can result low trustworthiness.

Obeying maxim of manner means that the suspect answer directly without exaggeration. Obeying maxim of manner in the investigation can result high trustworthiness. In contrast, violating maxim of manner can result low level of trustworthiness.

REFERENCES

- Bodgam, R dan Steven J. T. (1975). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods*. New York: John Willey and Sons.
- Coulthard, M. (2005). *Some Forensic Applications of Descriptive Linguistics*. VEREDAS
- Coulthard, M. & A. Johnson. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics* London: Routledge.
- Hadari, N. (1995). *Buku Metode penelitian bidang sosial*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Handayani.(2014). Tipe Pertanyaan, Respon dan Praanggapan yang Muncul pada Interviu Investigatif Kepolisian. *Jurnal Parole Vol.4 (1)*, 38-53.
- H.B. Sutopo(2006).*Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif : Dasar teori dan Terapannya dalam Penelitian* Surakarta: Universitas. Sebelas Maret.
- Houses of Parliament.(2015). *Forensic Language Analysis*. London: The Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology.
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. London
- Kaelan.(2004). "Filsafat Analitis menurut Ludwig Wittgenstein: Relevansinya bagi Pengembangan Pragmatik". dalam jurnal *Humaniora* volume 16, No. 2, Juni 2004: 133-146.
- Kartono, K. (1999). *Patologi Sosial*. Jakarta: Raja grafindo Persada.
- Kaswanti Purwo, B. (1990). *Pragmatik dan Pengajaran Bahasa Menyibak Kurikulum 1984*.Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. (terjemahan) M.D.D. Oka. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
- Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: United Kingdom.
- Santosa, R. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan*. Draf Buku. Surakarta: Fakultas Sastra dan Seni Rupa
- Spradley, J.P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Tarigan, H.G. (2009). *Pengajaran Sintaksis*. Bandung:Angkasa.

_____. 2009.*Prinsip-prinsip Dasar Sintaksis*. Bandung:Angkasa.

Turell, M.T. (2008). *The Role and Task of the Forensic Linguist in Giving Evidence*.Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Wijana, I Dewa Putu.(1996). *Dasar-Dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.

Internet:

<http://www.tribratanevssitubondo.com/berita-kapolres-situbondo-rilis-hasil-ungkap-33-kasus-kriminal-yang-resahkan-masyarakat.html##ixzz44GLuCCa3>