

Conversational Maxims of Operation Targets in Police Investigative Interviews

Ade Fitriani Siregar^{1,*}, Sumarsih², Sri Minda Murni³

¹ English Applied Linguistics Study Program, Postgraduate School, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia

³ Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Indonesia

*Corresponding author : Email: adefitriansiregar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study deals with the conversational maxims of operation targets in police investigative interviews. This study attempted to investigate the types of conversational maxims (obedience and violations) by using the theory of conversational maxims. This study was conducted by using descriptive qualitative design. The source of data in this study were the operation targets which investigated by the police on *The Police Reality Show Trans 7*, and the data were taken from *The Police Reality Show Trans 7*. The data of this study were utterances consist of obedience and violation maxim in police investigative interview on *The Police Reality Show Trans 7*. The utterances in investigative interviews were downloaded and transcribed in order to be analysed. Then, the data were analysed by using interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana. The findings show that all types of maxims namely maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner, and maxim of relevance were occurred during investigative interviews. Obedience and violation of conversational maxims can be found in the police investigative interviews. From the analysis it is found that the conversational maxims are tend to be obeyed than violated by the operation targets in police investigative interviews. The obedience of the conversational maxim might be due to the power possessed by the police. In police-operation target communication, the police possess higher power so the operation targets tried to be cooperative and give the best contribution by obeying the conversational maxims, however the maxims violation still can be found in investigative interviews because the operation target tried to defend himself so that they will be avoided from the sanction.

Keywords: *conversational maxims, maxim violation, maxim fulfilment, police investigative interviews.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Communication can be conceived as the transfer of information and response situation between speakers [1]. Conversation may be taken to be that familiar predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking, which generally occurs outside specific institutional settings like religious services, law courts, police patrol, etc [2].

In communication, sometimes the speaker may utter something which is different with what they intended to be understood which make the listener cannot response appropriately. In daily conversation, people do not always say what is true and what they have evidence for. The speaker might also make their contribution not as informative as it is expected. The contribution which is uttered by them may also not

always relevant to the context and the way they conveyed their idea or answers is sometimes unclear. In that case, they break the rule in cooperative principle. The ability to provide an expected amount of information by a speaker in a conversation is a concept of cooperative principle in which the participants make their contributions as informative as is required [3].

Cooperative principle is a rule that should be obeyed to make communication among speakers. The cooperative principle describes how people interact with one another [3]. The principle is what forms the basis of interpretation of utterances. Cooperative principle presents the cooperative principle in the following terms: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" [4]. Hence, there are four

conversational implicature known as conversational maxims to explain the link between utterances and what was understood from them in order. The four maxims were maxim of quality, quantity relevance and manner [4].

Conversational maxims occur in the conversations in every situation of human life. The phenomenon of the conversational maxims also happens in police investigative interviews in *The Police* reality show Trans 7 which airs every Monday to Friday at 23.00 P.M - 24.00 A.M. The reality show is about the daily activities of the police patrol ranging from ticketing violators of the rules on the road to large cases such as ambush drug dealers where the operation targets are involved provide many occasions in which talk is needed.

Interviews/interrogations yield the most information in investigation. The interview is one of the primary methods used by police to obtain information from the witnesses, victims and suspects of crime and plays a significant role in the majority of police investigations [5].

Investigative interview is one of the communications in police interaction which involved operation target and police. In this investigative interview, the operation targets and police will have conversation. Police will interview the operation targets by asking them some questions so that the police obtain information about a criminal act done by the operation target. The operation target will share the information related to their cases and the police may give some sanction and also guidance or advice to the operation targets.

The topic discusses by the operation target and the police may be about the ticketing violators of the rules on the road to ambush drug dealers. In the conversation happen during this context, the operation targets may obey the maxims by giving informative answer to what interviewer asks and violate them by giving uncooperative and complicated answers during the conversations.

As the investigative interviews are important and really needed in many fields (i.e. courtroom, police station, etc), there are several previous studies which studied about the conversations in investigative interview. Previous study about forensic linguistics analysis on courtroom proceedings aimed to identify the different types of questions, types of responses and violations involving multiple cases on courtroom proceedings [6]. There were 30 Transcript Stenographer's Notes utilized where relative data and information were extracted. Courtroom proceedings used appropriate closed yes-no questions, appropriate

closed specific questions, probing questions, open questions, and yes-no questions which were identified as appropriate types of courtroom questions. Conversely, unproductive or poor questions included multiple questions, opinion/statement questions, leading questions, misleading questions which are discouraged and objected to ask. Maxims of Manner, Quantity and Relevance were the types of responses observed by the witnesses. However, these maxims were also violated. This study only utilized the Transcribed Stenographers Notes (TSN). Thus, it was not able to identify the Maxim of Quality. It articulated that the responses must be truthful and relative to the context of the question.

Investigative interviews, as one of the communication which took place in police patrol can also be studied. Many of the previous research which studies about conversational maxims in investigative interviews tend to analyse the conversation in the courtroom and police station. Research which study in detail the conversational maxim and the reason of their occurrence in investigative interviews in police patrol are still rarely to be found. The operation target while in the process of investigation tend to be panic and confuse because they don't have any preparation before to face the interview which is suddenly and directly happen. It was different with the investigative interviews in courtroom and police station where as the suspects had already known that they will be interviewed and already prepared themselves, even they can have a lawyer to help them in the process of interviewing. Through this phenomenon, the researcher is interested towards conversational maxim of operation targets that occurs during the interviewing session in police patrol in *The Police* reality show Trans 7.

Therefore, this study investigates the conversational maxims of operation target in police investigative interview. It is expected to find out the types of conversational maxims employed by the operation targets in police investigative interview on *The Police* reality show Trans 7. The conversational maxims which are found in operation targets' utterances would be observed in this study. The study is limited to the occurrences of conversational maxims in *The Police* reality show by using the theory of conversational maxims.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Conversation Analysis

In conversation, there are some things which are needed to be analysed. It may be the meaning of conversation, or what occurred in the conversation. Conversation Analysis (CA) is the study of recorded, naturally occurring talk-in-interaction. CA deals with the problem of social order and how language is created

by social context [7]. It is an analysis of some aspects of conversation when the speaker follows in a particular interaction.

CA refers to the analysis of natural conversation in order to discover what the linguistic characteristics of conversation are and how conversation is used in ordinary life [8]. It includes the study of how speakers decide when to speak during a conversation (i.e. rules of turn-taking); how the sentences of two or more speakers are related (for example the study of adjacency pair); the different functions that conversation is used for (for example to establish roles, and to communicate intimacy). The data of CA consist of tape-recordings and transcripts of naturally occurring conversations.

CA focuses on the production and interpretation of talk-in-interaction. It investigates the organization of the talk not from any extraneous viewpoint, but from the perspective of how the participants display for one another their understanding of "what is going on" [8]. In CA, particular attention is given to spoken interaction such as: interview, interaction in courtroom or in police station between police and suspect.

2.2. Conversational Maxim

The Cooperative principle is a theory of principle between speaker and hearer when they exchange the information in their talk [4]. The cooperative principle which is also known as conversational maxim as an unwritten rule about conversation which people know and which influences the form of conversational exchanges [4].

In conclusion, cooperative principle is the principle which is needed to be managed and by the member of the conversation in order to be able to achieve meaningful and efficient communication. It deals with the contribution of the speaker and hearer in conversation to build a good communication to make the ideas conveyed clearly understood both by the speaker and the hearer.

Conversational Maxims are divided into four maxims. They are maxim of Quality (related to the truth-value of the utterance), Quantity (related to quantity of providing the information), maxim of Manner (related to the way the utterances that produced) and maxim of Relation (related to correlation between one utterances and other utterance).

2.2.1. Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality point is about truth. It requires the speakers to say what is true. It is not recommended to say something that the speaker believes to be false if they lack adequate evidence. The rules of maxim of quality are:

- a) do not say what you believe to be false, and
- b) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Example:

A : "Why did you come late last night?"

B : "The car was broken down"

In the example, B gives the truth because his car was broken down so that he came late. If B can also show the evidence for his not coming, and also the reasons are acceptable, it can be said that B has obeyed maxim of quality.

Another example of maxim of quality can be seen below:

A : Erm, I'll be there in the evening as far as I know

The utterance above indicates that what the speaker says may not be totally true. The speaker violates the maxim of quality which can be seen from the use of the phrase 'as far as I know' at which it indicates uncertainty. Therefore, the speaker can be protected from the accusation of lying since he or she makes it clear that he or she is totally unsure regarding the meeting.

2.2.2. Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity means that speakers should be as informative as is required, that they should give neither too little information nor too much [3]. So, maxim of quantity deals with the amount of information that should be delivered by the speaker. If the speaker only provides little information, the listener may lead to misunderstanding because the listener may find it difficult to identify what is being talked about. Meanwhile, if the speaker gives too much information, it probably will bore the listener.

Example:

a) This is my sister, Anne.

b) This is my sister, Mia. She is 25 years old. She works as a receptionist in a very famous hotel. She is always being friendly.

The utterances above show that the speaker is trying to introduce her sister in an occasion. In utterance (a), the speaker already followed the maxim of quantity. She provides adequate information by mentioning her sister's name in the attempt of introducing her sister. Meanwhile, the utterance (b) disobeys the maxim of quantity. In this case, the speaker gives too much information by mentioning age, her workplace and her character. The speaker may want to give more complete introduction about her sister. However, it also can be interpreted that the speaker not only attempts to introduce her sister but also wants to show off her sister's profession and good character. Thus, it is not recommended to use the pattern in utterance (b).

2.2.3. Maxim of Manner

The rules of maxim of manner are avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly [2]. One is said to obey maxim of manner if he or she creates a clear, brief and orderly statement. It is also important to bear in mind that one should avoid obscurity of expression and ambiguity in order not to flout this maxim.

Example:

A : Where were you last week?

B : I went to my hometown and visited my best friend

In the example above, the speaker B gives a clear explanation where he was last week, A also responds to the question orderly. It means that the speaker B obey the maxim of manner.

2.2.4. Maxim of Relation

The rule of maxim of relation maxim is being relevant [2]. The meaning of “relevant” is the connection between what the speaker says and the addressee hears is related each other. The speakers requires to provide statements that are relevant with the topic, for example:

A : “Where is my box of chocolates?”

B : “It is in your room.”

From the answer given by B, it indicate that the maxim of relation is obeyed. It is because the respond is relevant to the question given by A.

2.3. Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicatures have become one of the phenomena which become principal subjects to be studied in pragmatics. The word “implicatures” is derived from the verb “to imply”, as is its cognate “implication” [3]. Implicatures can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context and can be conventional (in different senses) or unconventional. Implicatures is used to communicate something which must be more than just what the words mean. Implicature denotes either the act of meaning, implying, or suggesting one thing by saying something else, or the object of that act [4]. So, it can be concluded that implicatures is an additional meaning from the word being conveyed.

Conversational implicature is related with Gricean maxims. The violation of conversational maxim can be realized in the utterances which conversationally implicate some other utterances [2].

Example:

Charlene : I hope you bring the bread and the cheese.

Dexter : Ah, I brought the bread.

From the example above, after hearing Dexter’s response, Charlene has to assume that Dexter is cooperating and not totally unaware of the quantity maxim. But he didn’t mention the cheese. If he had brought the cheese, he would say so, because he would be adhering to the quantity maxim. He must intend that she infers that what is not mentioned was not brought. In this case, Dexter has conveyed more than he said via a conversational implicature.

2.4. Police Investigative Interview

Interviews/interviews yield the most information in investigation. The interview is one of the primary methods used by police to obtain information from the witnesses, victims and suspects of crime and plays a significant role in the majority of police

investigations [5]. He further explains that the witness interview may give police new information about a crime such as a description of an offender, an account of events or useful background information. The suspect interview may allow the police to ascertain an individual’s level of involvement in an offence, implicate others or may help exonerate the suspect. Persons wishing to become proficient investigators must be serious students of interviewing and interrogation (focused interviewing). Additionally, higher-level investigative tasks performed by corporate security, police detectives, state or provincial investigators, federal investigators or military investigators involve interrogation. Being proficient at interrogation is a necessary skill for advancement in many investigative /security organizations.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research was conducted by using descriptive qualitative design. The data of this study were clauses consist of conversational maxim obedience and violation in police investigative interview on *The Police Reality Show Trans 7*. The source of data in this study were the operation targets which investigated by the police on *The Police Reality Show Trans 7*. The researcher used purposive sampling to take data in police investigative interviews. There were five episodes of *The Police* reality show chosen by the researcher. Those episodes were selected based on the citizen views and the highest view in YouTube. The cases discuss on the episodes were about ambush drug users/dealers. In this episodes, there were also occur so many conversational maxims of obedience and violation by the operation targets. In technique of data collection, the researcher was used documentary technique to collect the data. The data in this study was analysed by using interactive technique Miles, Huberman and Saldana’s theory [9].

4. DATA ANALYSIS

After analysing the data, the researcher found out that all conversational maxims are found during police investigative interviews. Violation and obedience of conversational maxims can be found in police investigative interviews.

The types of conversational maxims obedience in police investigative interviews are Maxim of Quantity Obedience, Maxim of Quality Obedience, Maxim of Relevance Obedience and Maxim of Manner Obedience. The most dominant type is Maxim of Quantity Obedience, meanwhile the less dominant type is Maxim of Manner Obedience.

Table 1. Types of Conversational Maxims Obedience

No.	Types of Conversational Maxims	Total	Percentage (%)
1.	Maxim of Quantity Obedience	182	30.03
2.	Maxim of Quality Obedience	133	21.94
3.	Maxim of Relevance Obedience	49	8.08
4.	Maxim of Manner Obedience	7	1.15

a) Maxim of Quantity Obedience

Obedience of quantity maxim means that the speakers obey the principles of quantity maxim by provides adequate information and being informative. The obedience to maxim of quantity in investigative interview can be seen as follows:

Data C9-C10/P1/OT1/Oct 4.'19

P1 : *Dapat dari mana?*
(Where do you get it?)

OT1 : *Dari Temen (C9)*
(From my friend)

P1 : *Di mana?*
(Where?)

OT1 : *Di Kalimalang, Pak (C10)*
(In Kalimalang, Sir)

The data was taken from *Tim Raimas Backbone Ungkap Peredaran Tembakau Sinte* episode on Oct. 4, 2019. The occasion is when one packet of synthetic tobacco found from teenager's trouser pocket, then the police asked about the ownership of the item. In the clauses 9 and 10, the operation target answers the police's questions informatively with adequate information which is not too little and not too much. Both of clauses of the operation target above are matched with the concept of maxim of quantity and can be concluded as obedience in maxim of quantity.

b) Maxim of Quality Obedience

The obedience of quality maxim means that the speaker says something that is believed to be true and the speaker can provide adequate evidence. The obedience to maxim of quality in police investigative interviews can be seen as follows:

Data C179/P1/OT4/Sept 13.'19

P1 : *Kau tau setengah garis itu berapa? Berapa kilo? Segaris itukan seperempat. iya toh?*
(You know how much is a half line? How many kilos? One line is a quarter. Yes?)

OT4 : *Iya (C179)*
(Yes)

The data was taken from *Raimas Backbone Kembali Beraksi* episode on Sept. 13, 2019. The occasion is when the police asked the operation target about the size of one line of marijuana. From the data above, it can be seen the operation target answered the question in C179 with a statement which is very exact

without any doubt. This statement is matched with the concept of maxim of quality.

c) Maxim of Relevance Obedience

Maxim of relevance is obeyed when the participants of a conversation convey information by following the rule in maxim of relevance which are being relevant, and stay on topic. In investigative interview, the maxim of relevance obedience can be found as follows:

Data C89/P1/OT3/Oct 4.'19

P1 : *Nanti saya geledah semuanya.*
(I'll look into everything later.)

OT3 : *Iya geledah aja semua silahkan (C89)*
(Yes, just search it all please)

The data was taken from *Tim Raimas Backbone Ungkap Peredaran Tembakau Sinte* episode on Oct. 4, 2019. The occasion is when the police said they wanted to search the synthetic tobacco in the operation target's home. From the clause above, it can be seen that the operation target answered the police's question relevantly and stayed on the topic. This statement uttered by the operation target is matched with maxim of relevance rule which are being relevant, and to stay on topic. Therefore, it can be concluded as obedience of relevance maxim.

d) Maxim of Manner Obedience

The rules of manner maxim are avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly. Therefore, obedience to maxim of manner in investigative interview can be seen in the data below:

Data C40/P1/OT1/Oct 4.'19

P1 : *Untungnya apa?*
(What's the profit?)

OT1 : *Emang gak ada untungnya, Pak (C40)*
(Isn't there any profit, sir?)

The data was taken from *Tim Raimas Backbone Ungkap Peredaran Tembakau Sinte* episode on Oct. 4, 2019. The occasion is when the police asked the operation target how much he bought and sold the synthetic, then the operation target said that the buying and selling prices were the same. The operation target's answer in C40 can be concluded as the obedience of the manner. The operation target gives a

clear and orderly explanation to response the police question about the profit from selling synthetic tobacco.

The types of conversational maxims violation in police investigative interviews are Maxim of Quality

Violation, Maxim of Quantity Violation, Maxim of Manner Violation and Maxim of Relevance Violation. The most dominant type is Maxim of Quality Violation, meanwhile the less dominant type is Maxim of Relevance Violation.

Table 2. Types of Conversational Maxims Violation

No.	Types of Conversational Maxims	Total	Percentage (%)
1.	Maxim of Quality Violation	107	17.65
2.	Maxim of Quantity Violation	56	9.24
3.	Maxim of Manner Violation	41	6.76
4.	Maxim of Relevance Violation	31	5.11

a) Maxim of Quality Violation

In investigative interview, violation of quality maxim can also be found when the operation targets consciously or unconsciously didn't follow the rule in maxim of quality. They might give false information or say something that the speaker they lack adequate evidence. The violation to maxim of quality in investigative interview can be seen as follows:

Data C77/P1/OT3/Oct 4.'19

P1 : *Tadi sebelumnya dia beli jam setengah sembilan, beli apa?*

(Earlier, he bought it at half past nine, what did he buy?)

OT3: *Beli ini, pak (C77)*

(Buy this, sir)

The data was taken from *Tim Raimas Backbone Ungkap Peredaran Tembakau Sinte* episode on Oct. 4, 2019. The occasion is when one packet of synthetic tobacco found from teenager's trouser pocket, then the boy took the police to the house of the synthetic seller and asked the seller what the boy had bought with him. In the C77, the operation target gives false information. The operation target answered the police's question by telling a lie which is actually the boy didn't buy the ones (gayo tobacco), but another (synthetic tobacco). Therefore, the operation target's answer can be concluded as violate the maxim of quality because it indicates that he said something untruth.

b) Maxim of Quantity Violation

Violation of quantity maxim rules can also be found in investigative interview. The operation targets can be uninformative or giving too short or too much information in answering the police's question. Therefore, the violation of maxim of quantity can be seen as follows:

Data C75/P1/OT3/Oct 4.'19

P1 : *Coba sini, ayo. Dari siapa dapatnya ini?*

(Come here, come on. Who got this from?)

OT3 : *Ini saya beli dari yang jual bunga. Tukang bunga kuburan juga jual kan, pak. Cuma dia bilang dari tukang bunga, saya beli sama dia. 30 ribu dia jual (C75)*

(I bought this from a flower seller. Cemetery florists also sell them, sir. He just said from the florist, I bought it with him. Thirty thousand he sold)

The data was taken from *Tim Raimas Backbone Ungkap Peredaran Tembakau Sinte* episode on Oct. 4, 2019. The occasion is when the police asked the operation target from whom he got the synthetic tobacco. In the clause 75, the operation target answer the police's question by giving too much information. The police asked the operation target from whom he got the tobacco, but he answered the question by adding more information related to the selling price of the tobacco. Therefore, it can be conclude that the clauses above are violation of quantity maxim.

c) Maxim of Manner Violation

When the operation targets didn't obey the rules in maxim of manner by using ambiguous language, exaggerating things, or talk in unclear voice, their utterances can be concluded as maxim of manner violation. It can be seen as follow:

Data C79/P1/OT1/Oct 4.'19

P1 : *Ya aku kan gak tahu. Aku juga baru tahu tembakau gayo ini apa. Ini belum diteliti laboratorium. Kau pakai ini apa yang kau rasakan?*

(Yes, I don't know. I also just found out what gayo tobacco is. This has not been studied in the laboratory. What do you feel when you use this?)

OT1 : *Kentang, Pak (C79)*

(It doesn't taste good, Sir)

The data was taken from *Tim Raimas Backbone Ungkap Peredaran Tembakau Sinte* episode on Oct. 4, 2019. The occasion is when the police asked the operation target about what he felt after using gayo tobacco. From the clauses above, the answers given by the operation target are ambiguous. The police asked about what he felt after using gayo tobacco, but he answered “*kentang*” (it tastes like potato) which lead to multiple interpretations, but actually that’s not what it means. “*Kentang*” here means (the taste is not good). Therefore, the clauses above can be classified as violation of maxim of manner.

d) Maxim of Relevance Violation

In investigative interview, the violation of relevance maxim can also be found. They violated the rule of relevance maxim by changing the conversation topic or makes the conversation unmatched with the topic. The violation of maxim of relevance can be seen as follows:

Data C12/P1/OT1/Oct 4.’19

P1 : *Punya siapa?*
(Who has this?)

OT1 : *Saya disuruh maping-in aja (C12)*
(I was told to map-in)

The data was taken from *Tim Raimas Backbone Ungkap Peredaran Tembakau Sinte* episode on Oct. 4, 2019. The occasion is when one packet of synthetic tobacco found from teenager’s trouser pocket, then the police asked who has that. The answer given by the operation target was irrelevant with the police’s question. The police’s question should be answered by telling whose tobacco belongs to, but the instead of that, he told the police that he was ordered only to deliver the tobacco. Therefore, it can be categorized as maxim of relevance violation because he says something irrelevantly.

5. FINDINGS

All types of conversational maxim occurred in police investigative interviews. All the conversational maxims were obeyed and also violated during the investigative interviews. In investigative interviews, the conversational maxims are mostly obeyed rather than violated by the operation targets. The obedience of the conversational maxim might be due to the higher power possessed by the police, so the operation targets tried to be cooperative and give the best contribution to what police asks and they want to get the trust from the police. However, the maxims violation still can be found in investigative interviews because the operation target tried to defend himself so that they will be avoided from the sanction.

Moreover, the most dominant type of maxim obedience is Maxim of Quantity, meanwhile the most dominant type of maxim violation is Maxim of Quality.

6. DISCUSSION

All types of maxims namely maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner, and maxim of relevance were occurred in during investigative interviews. Conversational maxims as the part of cooperative principle have the purpose to run conversation smoothly and effectively [4]. Obedience and violation of conversational maxims can be found in the police investigative interviews. From the analysis it is found that the conversational maxims are mostly obeyed than violated by the operation targets in police investigative interviews. The obedience of the conversational maxim might be due to the power possessed by the police. In police-operation target communication, the police possess higher power so the operation targets tried to give the best contribution by obeying the conversational maxims, however the maxims violation still can be found in investigative interviews. The reason of conversational maxims violation in police investigative interviews were different for each violation.

However, the findings are not similar to the findings of the previous research related to the type of conversational maxims employed in the witness stand during the courtroom trial [6]. It is found that only three types of maxims occurred in courtroom proceedings. The differences between these finding with the current research potentially are due to the different context where the maxims occurred. It also means that different context lead to the different fulfillments of violations of the type of conversational maxims.

7. CONCLUSION

All types of conversational maxim occurred in police investigative interviews. In investigative interviews, the conversational maxims mostly obeyed rather than violated by the operation targets. The obedience of the conversational maxim might be due to the higher power possessed by the police, so the operation targets tried to be cooperative and give the best contribution to what police asks. However, the most dominant type of maxim obedience is Maxim of Quantity, meanwhile the most dominant type of maxim violation is Maxim of Quality.

AUTHORS’ CONTRIBUTIONS

The findings of this study are expected to give contribution to linguistic theories in the field of pragmatics especially in conversational maxims and the development of studies related to conversational maxims. In addition, the findings can be references for further studies related to interactional language.

It is also hoped to be useful to be a reference for the university students majoring in linguistics who are interested in studying and conducting any further studies about conversational maxims. For speakers and listeners in daily conversation, the knowledge of conversational maxim will help them to create a better and more effective communication.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The highest appreciation goes to her first thesis adviser, Prof. Dr. Sumarsih, M.Pd and her second thesis adviser, Prof. Dr. Sri Minda Murni, M.S for all their valuable guidance through the completion of this article.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. A. Cruse, *Meaning in Language*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [2] Brown, P and S. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [3] G. Yule, *Pragmatics*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [4] H.P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*, in P. Cole and J.L. Morgan eds, *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- [5] K. Roberts, *Police Interviewing Of Criminal Suspects: A Historical Perspective*. Centre for Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, 2012.
- [6] J. S. Catoto, *On Courtroom Questioning: A Forensic Linguistic Analysis in IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 22, Issue 11, Ver. 8 (November. 2017) PP 65-97*, 2017.
- [7] Hutchby, I, and R. Wooffitt, *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications (2nd Edition)*, Cambridge: Polity, 2008.
- [8] Richards, J.C and Platt & Platt, *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*, Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2000.
- [9] Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., and J. Saldana, *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.)*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2014.