



Linguistics

# An Analysis of Cooperative Principles on Asumsi.Co's Interviews on Russia-Ukraine War Issue

Hafiz Alfandi Rizqy<sup>1</sup>, Ike Revita<sup>2</sup>, Aslinda<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1, 2, 3</sup> Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia

## SUBMISSION TRACK

Received: April 23, 2023

Final Revision: August 15, 2023

Available Online: October 30, 2023

## KEYWORD

Asumsi.co, Cooperative Principles, Diplomat, Russia-Ukraine War

## CORRESPONDENCE

E-mail: [alfandi.hafiz@gmail.com](mailto:alfandi.hafiz@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

Cooperative Principle is one of the pragmatics disciplines that should be known by everyone to conduct effective communication, especially diplomats. This research studied the utterances which were uttered by two Russian diplomats who are actively working at the Russian Embassy in Indonesia, Denis Tetyushin and Lyudmila Vorobyova in their interviews with Asumsi.co. The objectives of this research were to identify the maxims of cooperative principle which are produced by the interviewees in the Asumsi.co interviews, to figure out the types of maxims disobedience which are produced by the interviewees, and to recognise the motives behind the interviewees obeying and disobeying the maxims. This study was conducted with a qualitative approach assisted by a statistical descriptive method to see the distribution of the obedience and disobedience utterances. The result of the research revealed 47 data obey and disobey the maxim of cooperative principles. The most obeyed maxim was the maxim of manner, followed by the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, and there was no utterance which followed the maxim of relevance rule.

## I. INTRODUCTION

It is widely acknowledged that language has a significant role in human communication. To achieve a successful one, all participants need to have good communication skills and understand the contexts in every conversation or interaction. The speaker produces utterances that then be interpreted by the hearer(s). A conversation sometimes could be unsuccessful because of a misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer. This can also lead to conflict between participants.

One of the important figures in denying or making clarification regarding the hoax or false information is diplomats. One of those means for them to complete their agenda is doing interviews with media, for instance, the interviews done by Denis Tetyushin, a press secretary for the Russian Embassy in Indonesia, and Lyudmila Vorobyova, the Russian Ambassador for Indonesia. In their line of duty, diplomats need to comprehend Grice's Cooperative Principle, a discipline that is also part of Pragmatics. The Cooperative Principle is a theory in pragmatics that highlights how the

participants of a conversation act cooperatively to have effective and efficient communication.

He classifies the Cooperative Principle into some maxims namely the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. Maxim of quantity is a maxim that requires the speaker to make a contribution that is as informative as is required. Maxim of quality is a maxim that requires factual and tangible information in an utterance. Then, the maxim of relevance is a maxim that requires correlation in an utterance. Furthermore, the maxim of manner is a maxim that requires a clear, brief, orderly, and unambiguous utterance. As a way to reach successful communication, these maxims should be obeyed in the conversation.

However, in some cases, speakers disobey the maxims by violating violation and flouting them. They have certain motivations in doing so, such as not wanting to cause offense and undermine others' self-esteem. They choose to violate the maxims and leave their utterances to others to take

the implicit meaning of what they said. In addition, they flout maxims to see what hearers will make of their utterance, and it leads hearers to assume more than one implicature.

In recent years, there has been some research conducted that dealt with the analysis of cooperative principles (Sari et al., 2019; Sari & Afriana, 2020; Rahmi et Al., 2018; Seftika, 2015; Gustari & Dikramdhanie, 2018; Aisya & Fitrawati, 2019). The theory of cooperative principle has been used in analysing obedience and disobedience of maxims in different kinds of research objects.

The differences between this research with the previous research are in the objectives of the research and the object of the analysis. The previous research focused on figuring out the cooperative principle maxim violation and obedience, while this research focused on identifying the maxims of cooperative principles which are produced by the interviewee, figuring out the types of maxims disobedience which are produced by the interviewee, and recognising motives behind the interviewee obeying and disobeying the maxims.

## II. METHOD

This study was conducted with a qualitative method assisted by a statistical descriptive method to see the distribution of obedience and disobedience utterances. The utterances that contain the obedience and disobedience of cooperative principles by the interviewee were the data of this research. The interviews were chosen to be the objects of the research because the Russia and Ukraine war was one of the hottest issues in the world for a year and Asumsi.co interviewed reliable resources, which are a Russian ambassador and the press secretary of the Russian Embassy in Indonesia.

The following steps were done in completing this research. The interview videos entitled 'Dubes Rusia Bicara, Dunia Bukan Hanya Amerika dan Uni Eropa' and 'Sekretaris Pers Kedubes Rusia Buka-bukaan Soal Operasi Militer di Konflik Rusia-Ukraina' were downloaded and were watched a few times. Then, the videos were transcribed into written data. After that, utterances that were related to the maxim obedience and disobedience were identified. Then, the obtained data were classified into three groups, such as maxim obedience, maxim violation, and flouting maxim. The data in this research were analysed by using the Identity Method. The determination of sorting technique

involves the use of a sorting tool, which is the mental state possessed by the researcher. To identify the motivation of the interviewees violating and flouting the maxim, the Identity Referential Method was used. Identity Referential Method is a method in which the determinant is reference, a reality that is being indicated by language. Defining Key Factors was also applied in identifying the motivation of the interviewees.

## III. RESULTS

### Result

Based on the analysis, there were 47 data, which consisted of 12 data of obedience and 35 data of disobedience utterances from both videos.

**Table 1. Cooperative Principle Obedience Analysis of Both Interviewees**

No	Types of Maxim Obedience	DT	LV	Freq	Percentage
1.	Maxim of Quality	2	0	2	17%
2.	Maxim of Quantity	3	0	3	25%
3.	Maxim of Relevance	0	0	0	0%
4.	Maxim of Manner	5	2	7	58%
<b>Total</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the most obeyed maxim by the first interviewee, DT, was the maxim of manner with a total of 5 utterances. This maxim was obeyed by DT to give validation to the interviewer who asked the thing that had been discussed by him before.

He also obeyed the maxim of quantity in 3 utterances to answer the question that could be categorised as small talk, and the maxim of quality in 2 utterances was obeyed to emphasise an answer to the interviewer. There was no maxim of relevance obedience found in DT's utterances because he used to give elaborations and narratives in each of his answers.

Similar to DT's, most of LV's utterances followed the maxim of manner rule with a total of 2 utterances because she gave the answers that were used to validate what the interviewer asked to her. There was no obedience of maxim quality, quantity, and manner found in LV's utterances.

**Table 2. Cooperative Principle Disobedience Analysis of Both Interviewees**

No.	Types of Maxims	Types of Disobedience	DT	LV	Total
1.	Maxim of Quality	Flouting	3	0	9%
		Violation	4	0	11%
2.	Maxim of Quantity	Flouting	1	0	3%
		Violation	10	8	51%
3.	Maxim of Relevance	Flouting	0	0	0%
		Violation	0	1	3%
4.	Maxim of Manner	Flouting	0	7	20%
		Violation	1	0	3%
<b>Total</b>			19	16	100%
			35		

It can be seen based on the table above that the most dominant disobedience that was done by DT is the violation of the maxim of quantity, with a total of 10 utterances because DT gave some elaborations on his answers to clarify something to the interviewer. It was followed by the violation of the maxim of quality 4 utterances because here DT gave answers that contained uncertainty to the interviewers, and flouting the maxim of quality 3 utterances because his answers contained ambiguous statements. It was also noted that there was no flouting maxim of relevance, the maxim of relevance violation, and the flouting maxim of manner found in DT's utterances to deliver some clarifications and explanations. In stating clarifications, he must be using clear and brief explanations, so the listeners or audiences can be able to understand easily.

LV violated the violation of maxim of quantity in 8 utterances. She also flouted the maxim of manner with a total of 7 utterances and there was 1 violation of maxim relevance. In addition, it was also found that there was no disobedience of maxim of quality, flouting of maxim quantity, flouting of maxi relevance, and maxim of manner violation done by LV. This is because she was answering the question by making ambiguous statements instead of giving more clarification in her statements.

The motivation of the interviewees to do the violation and flout the maxims was to clarify something by giving some elaborations on the answers that they delivered, to hide something by giving an answer that was not expected by the interviewers, and to provide details to the interviewers.

## Cooperative Principle Obedience

There are three types of maxims: the Maxim of Quality, the Maxim of Quantity, and the Maxim of Manner. The interviewees obeyed the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, and the maxim of relevance. The following part presents the analysis results in detail.

### *Maxim of Quality*

This maxim obedience occurred 2 times in the data. The following dialogues are representative data which shows the obedience of maxim of quality by DT:

(2) RI: Oh, ternyata bisa berbahasa Indonesia.

DT: Bisa, **dong**.

This datum showed the obedience of maxim quality by DT. He responded to the statement with a factual answer. He followed the requirement of maxim quality obedience, which was giving tangible and factual information. The motivation of DT answering the question by using the word **bisa, dong** was to emphasise his ability on speaking by using Indonesian language.

### *Maxim of Quantity*

From all the data obtained, it was found that there were 4 occurrences of maxim of quantity obedience. The data which show the maxim of quantity obedience which done by DT.

(4) RI: Oh, enam tahun setengah?

DT: **Iya**.

Here, DT's motivation in obeying the maxim of quantity rules was because the question that was asked by RI can be considered as small talk in order to open the interview.

### *Maxim of Manner*

There were 5 data which were categorised as maxim of manner obedience. The following was the datum which showed the obedience of maxim of manner done by DT.

(14) RI: So, everyone bisa membaca dokumen itu?

DT: **Bisa membaca ya**.

**Bisa membaca ya** is identified as maxim of manner obedience because DT gave the answer like that was required, without any additional statement or elaboration of the answer. The motivation of DT following the maxim of quantity rule was to inform the viewers the detail of information that he

explained before by accessing the Russian embassy website.

### *Cooperative Principle Disobedience*

The disobedience is divided into two categories: flouting and violation. Based on the data obtained, there were 37 utterances which showed the cooperative principle maxim disobedience. The following part presents the analysis results in more detail.

### *Flouting Maxim of Quality*

The flouting maxim of quality is found in 2 data. The following is the datum which shows the flouting maxim of quality done by DT.

- (29) RI: Denis, thankyou so much, sudah boleh ngobrol-ngobrol pada sore hari ini dan semoga kita ketemu lagi, dan mudah-mudahan ketemunya di Rusia ya, bukan ketemu di Indonesia.

DT: **Ayo, mari.**

The datum above shows that DT's answer was flouting maxim of quality. Here DT's utterance contained an ambiguous message by not telling where DT invited RI to. The motivation of DT's utterance was classified as competitive because he suggested RI something by saying **Ayo, mari**.

### *Flouting Maxim of Quantity*

The maxim of quality violations were found in 4 data. The following part presents the analysis results in more detail.

The following datum is also categorised as the maxim of quality violation done by DT.

- (25) RI: Tapi, kepastiannya seperti apa, Presiden Putin datang ke Indonesia, karena kan itu juga menjadi isu yang hangat dibahas di G-20 gitu kan, Putin akan datang ke sini, seberapa pasti beliau akan datang? Sejauh ini.

DT: Beliau sudah menyampaikan berniat datang, **tapi kita harus lihat** masih ada lima bulan ya perkembangannya. Sejauh ini beliau berniat datang ke Indonesia, sudah menyampaikan niat secara resmi.

The utterance above is classified as maxim of quality violation because DT's utterance showed uncertainty. This can be seen in this conversation he said **...kita harus lihat**. These words showed the uncertainty of Putin's ability to attend the G20 meeting in Bali. The motivation of DT violating the maxim by telling something uncertain because he did not want to give a false or hoax information to the media, due to their special military operation that was still happening and the situation was so dynamic.

### *Flouting Maxim of Quantity*

In the obtained data, there is 1 flouting maxim of quantity found. The following are the representative data which shows the flouting maxim of quantity done DT.

- (3) RI: Asik, ok Denis, jadi udah berapa lama ada di Indonesia?

DT: Ok, udah lumayan lama di sini, sudah enam tahun setengah di **Jakarta**.

DT's answer is categorised as flouting the maxim of quantity because he gave less information than what it's required by mentioning the specific city. The motivation of DT was giving this answer was Collaborative in order to mention something more particular.

### *Maxim of Quantity Violation*

From all data obtained, there were 19 data which show the maxim of quantity violation. The datum below shows the maxim of quantity violation done by DT.

- (9) RI: Kenapa harus ada laboratorium semacam ini?

DT: **Jadi berdasarkan informasi yang kita punya, totalnya ada 30 laboratorium AS yang didanai Pentagon di Ukraina, dan sebenarnya AS memiliki 336 laboratorium di seluruh dunia sekarang ini.** Jadi, kementerian pertahanan kami sejak mulainya operasi militer khusus Rusia di Ukraina, salah satu fokusnya mereka pada laboratorium tersebut karena hal ini sebenarnya menimbulkan keprihatinan besar Rusia. Karena, tujuan dari laboratorium tersebut tidak jelas sama sekali. Dan berdasarkan dokumen yang ditemukan selama operasi militer khusus kami di Ukraina, kami juga mendapatkan informasi bahwa salah satu tujuan dari laboratorium tersebut itu, melaksanakan penelitian terhadap beberapa pathogen infeksi penyakit yang berbahaya. Yang bisa jadi juga digunakannya untuk pembuatannya senjata biologis, yang bertujuan kelompok etnis tertentu, khususnya kelompok etnis Slavik, yang termasuk juga orang Rusia sebenarnya. Dan tentu ini menurut kami sangat berbahaya dan menimbulkan keprihatinan kami yang besar sekali.

The datum above is categorised as maxim of quantity violation because DT answered the question by providing the amount of US government's laboratories which were found by the Russian army during the military operation. Instead of mentioning the data, DT could straightly answer the question with **..., tujuan dari laboratorium tersebut tidak jelas sama sekali....** But, here DT chose to do maxim of quantity violation in order to inform the interview viewers that American government laboratories operation had been compromised.

### *Maxim of Relevance Violation*

There is 1 datum found which shows the maxim of relevance violation. The representative



datum which shows the maxim of relevance violation is presented below done by LV.

- (14) PS: Where do Russia see themselves in the map of global power these days? Because from the way I see it, it's about Russia want to be like the leader of the rest against the western hegemony. Is that true, madam ambassador?

LV: **No, I wouldn't put it that way.** It's not about leadership against western hegemony. It's just opposing western hegemony. We don't agree that just a small group of countries have the right to dictate their will to the whole world, and we don't agree that these countries are using economy information, military power as an instrument of attacking other countries. We are not the only country that have been targeted by the west. Everyone remembers Yugoslavia in 1999, everyone remembers Iraq, Libya, Syria or Afghanistan. Actually, we don't agree with the world order that allows things like that to happen that's why we don't agree with the concept of the rules based or world order promoted by the west. Because the problem with this concept is that the rules are written in Washington and Brussels and other countries don't have any part in that the rules are not written by China or Russia or by Indonesia. It's written by Washington and Brussel. Why do we have to follow these rules, and we already have a set of rules. It's international law, it's UN Charter, but we see how international law and your charter are being ignored by the west and it didn't happen in February. It happened a long time ago.

In this conversation, LV's answer was classified as the maxim of relevance violation because PS' question category required 'yes, it is' or 'no, it is not' answer. Instead of following the rule of maxim, LV violated the maxim by answering the question with **No, I wouldn't put it that way....** The motivation of LV by answering the question in this way was because she would like to clarify Russia's current position in the world.

### *Flouting Maxim of Manner*

There are 6 data which show the flouting maxim of manner. The following is representative datum which shows the flouting maxim of manner done by LV.

- (10) PS: You understand that position as well. Your Foreign Minister, Mr. Lavrov met with our foreign minister in China. Is there any advancement between our countries since that meeting? What's the outcome from that meeting can you tell us?

LV: I think many issues have been discussed during this meeting, bilateral issues G20 of course, and I think positions have been stated from both sides. The meeting was quite recent so I would say that **there are any new developments.**

The flouting maxim of manner can be seen in the data above. Here PS asked about the topics that discussed in the Russian Foreign Minister and with the Indonesian Foreign Minister. But, here LV delivered the answer incompletely. It can be seen here LV uttered **...there are any developments.**

The motivation of LV doing the understatement was conflictive because she chose not to describe the specific development as she said.

### *Maxim of Manner Violation*

In the data, there is 1 occurrence of maxim of manner violation. The following is representative datum which shows the maxim of manner violation:

- (6) PS: But by sending the troops some people said it especially the Russians who violated the Minsk Agreement?

LV: **We were not part of the Minsk agreements.**

The datum above categorised as the flouting maxim of manner because she gave an offensive answer towards the interviewer by uttering irrelevant statement to the interviewer with Collaborative as the motivation. The motivation of doing the flouting maxim of manner was to clarify thing that has not known before by the public.

### **Discussion**

The findings on analysis of cooperative principles on Asumsi's interviews on Russia-Ukraine war issue reveal the obedience of 3 cooperative principle maxims. The maxims which were obeyed by the interviewees are maxim of quality, quantity, and relevance. This subchapter presents the discussion about the results of the analysis.

Based on the findings of the research, maxim of manner was mostly obeyed by the interviewees with the motivation to answer the questions that related to the small talks or the questions that related to clarify the interviewees previous statements. It is followed by maxim of quantity, which requires speakers to make a contribution that is as informative as is required with the motivation to validate the interviewer's utterance. In this case, the questions asked by interviewers were delivered briefly. Both interviewees obeyed the maxim of quantity to answer the questions briefly and also without the need to add excessive explanations. Contrary with Sari & Afriana (2020), in their analysis of cooperative principle in About Time movie, they noted that maxim of quantity and maxim of relevance are the maxims with the highest percentage of obedience. From the 37 data obtained, there were 14 occurrences of maxim quantity obedience and 14 occurrences of maxim relevance obedience. This showed that the characters in the movie fulfil the requirement of maxim quantity obedience by giving information as is required without additional answers and also

be relevant when providing the answers.

Rahmi, Refnaldi, and Wahyuni (2018) noted a different finding on their research in cooperative principle violation entitled *The Violation of Conversational Maxims found in Political Conversation at Rosi Talkshow*. Contrary to the findings of this research, the interviewee in the talkshow violated maxim of quantity for 18 times. The researchers also mentioned that the most dominant type of maxim violation is quantity because the speakers give information as much as possible to make it clear and to create good image with good words to get sympathy from audiences.

Based on the previous research on maxim of cooperative principle obedience which conducted by Lyra, Gunardi, and Muhtadin (2020) entitled *An Analysis of Grice's Cooperative Principle in Sundanese's Comic "Si Mamih"*, they found that by obeying the maxim the cartoonist of "Si Mamih" can create jokes through a visual graphic supports. In this research, it can be seen that the interviewees obeyed the cooperative principle maxims in order to answer questions which did not need any elaborations or clarifications.

In this research analysis, it reveals the interviewees disobey the maxims 35 times. This subchapter presents the discussion about the results of the analysis. Based on the findings of the research, maxim of quantity is mostly violated by the interviewees. This happened because the interviewees added some elaboration in their answers. Through elaborating the answers, the interviewees tried to clarify or explain something to the interviewers. While, the maxim which was mostly flouted by the interviewees is maxim of manner. The motivation of the interviewees flouting the maxims in order to simplify the information which delivered to the interviewers.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis of cooperative principle on Asumsi's interviews with Denis Tetyushin dan Lyudmila Vorobyova on Russia-Ukraine war issue, it can be concluded that the interviewees obeyed and also disobeyed the cooperative principle maxims. The interviewees obeyed the maxim of quality, quantity, and relevance. The obedience is done to answer the interview questions briefly and truthfully with the motivation to give validations to the interviewers and answer the questions that can be concluded as a small talk before get into the main discussion topics.

In addition to that, both interviewees disobeyed the maxims as well. The disobedience is divided into two, which are flouting and violation.

The maxims which were flouted by the interviewees were maxim of quality, quantity, and manner. Moreover, the maxims which were violated by the interviewees were maxim of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. The disobedience happened due to the intention of the interviewees to simplify the information which was delivered to the interviewers and audience.

## REFERENCES

- Aisya, N. Fitrawati. (2019). *E-Journal of English Language & Literature*. An Analysis of Flouting of Maxim Performed by Politician Guests in Mata Najwa Talkshow in the Episode of Adu Lantang Jelang Penentuan and Babak Akhir Pilpres. Vol. 8 No. 4.
- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Ary, D. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education Eight Edition*. United State: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Agustina & Ariyanti. (2016). *Flouting Maxim to Create Humor in Move This Means War*. Language Horion, 4 (2), 38-45.
- Anggraini, N., Rosdiana, D. D. (2020). *The Analysis of Cooperative Principle in Corbuzier Podcast of Siti Fadilah, Sebuah Konspirasi – Saya Dikorbankan Episode*. Gema Wiralodra, 11(2), 292–310.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse, A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In *Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts*, ed. by Peter, C. and Jerry L. M., 41–58. Academic Press.
- Gustary, D. T., Dikramdhanie, M. (2018). *Biormatika*. The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Mata Najwa's Talkshow "Gengsi Merebut Kursi". Vol. 4 No. 1.
- Lyra, Hera Meganova, Gunardi, Gugun, Muhtadin, Teddi. (2020). *Analisis Kepatuhan Terhadap Prinsip Kerja Sama Grice dalam Komik Sunda Si Mamih*. Departemen Linguistik Fakultas Ilmu Budaya.
- Mahsun. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan Strategi, Metode, dan Tekniknya*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Marlisa, R. Hidayat, D. (2020). *Englisia*. The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) Talkshow. Vol. 7 No. 2.
- Seftika. (2015). *Jurnal SMART*. Flouts of the Maxims in Interview between Barrack Obama and Robin Roberts of ABC News' "Good Morning America". Vol. 1 No. 1.
- Sugiyono, (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Zaim, M (2014) *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Pendekatan Struktural*. In: *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Pendekatan Struktural*. FBS UNP Press.