



## **A COMPARISON OF VIOLATION PHENOMENA OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN TRADITIONAL MARKETS PASAR RAYA AND LUBUK ALUNG**

**Marisa Kurniawan<sup>1</sup>, Havid Ardi<sup>2</sup>**

English Department

Faculty of Languages and Arts

Universitas Negeri Padang

email: [marisakurniawan5@gmail.com](mailto:marisakurniawan5@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

The study deals with violating maxims by the sellers and the buyers in traditional markets of Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung. The objectives of the study are to find out how sellers and buyers do violation maxims in their transactions in traditional market Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung and to identify the differences and similarities of violation of maxims between traditional market Pasar Raya Padang and Lubuk Alung. This research was conducted by using descriptive qualitative method. The data were the utterances between sellers and buyers from 21 conversations each traditional market. The data were collected by recording the conversations. There were 108 utterances that violated the maxims used by sellers and buyers traditional market Pasar Raya while in traditional market Lubuk Alung there were 106 utterances that violated maxims used by sellers and buyers. The implications of violating maxims that used by sellers and buyers were to show closeness and become the part of their purpose how they do transaction each other, how they attract the customers, and how they get a deal in bargaining transaction.

**Key words:** Cooperative Principle, violating Maxims, Sellers and Buyers in Traditional market Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung

### **A. INTRODUCTION**

The study of violation of maxim happen in real life communication, such as in traditional markets. Mostly, there will be bargaining process between sellers and buyers in traditional markets. Every one in a traditional market is communicating with different politeness concept or solidarity between them. It is effected by social factor involving the activity and social roles of the speaker. Then, the research related to the analysis of cooperative principle in the traditional market has been conducted by Irnandia (2017) at Lubuk Alung traditional market. She analyzed the comparisons between male and female in flouting of the maxim in

<sup>1</sup> English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on September 2019

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang



buyers' and sellers' interaction in the traditional market. Then, the violation phenomena of Cooperative Principle often occurs in social interaction especially in the market which is one of the centers of interaction in social life. Language is one of important aspects of human life. People use language to communicate with the others. In conversation, people usually give appropriate response to other's question or comment, that is called as Cooperative Principle. Cooperative Principle is the way how to make an acceptable and understandable conversation.

In order to have a good conversation, people need to fulfill the Cooperative Principle of conversation. Cooperative Principle is defined as the way to make a conversational contribution as is required, at the stage of which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which the person is engaged (Grice, 1975). In the Cooperative Principle, speakers should speak honestly, remain in the same context or topic and not be ambiguous. To reach the Cooperative Principle in communication, people must follow four types of maxims. They are 1) maxim of quality: to say something which is true. 2) maxim of quantity: to say something as much as is necessary. 3) maxim of relation: what is said must be relevant. 4) maxim of manner: what is said must be clear, brief, orderly and free of ambiguity, (Grice, 1975).

However, Cutting (2006) stated that sometimes speakers ignore the rules of maxims in order to achieve their purpose in conversation. If the principles are not followed, there will be flouting of maxims and violation of maxims. Flouting means the speakers are intentionally ironic while violating means the speakers are intentionally misleading their utterances (Thomas, 1995). A violation of Grice's maxims can mislead what they want to express in order to misinterpret the meaning and sometimes to make understanding that provide ambiguous, obscure, insufficient or irrelevant information (Dinh, 2010). It is normal when people do the violation of maxims in their conversation. It is because the speakers are not aware of the maxim when they speak. Violating and flouting may happen in daily life. Speakers can choose to ignore the maxims to create a particular effect. The researcher will focus on violation of maxims in the traditional markets because the researcher found that it is interesting thing where people especially in market activity intentionally mislead the utterance in order to achieve their purpose. Moreover, people are not aware that they have violated the maxims.

In the transaction activity in markets, not only can be discussed from economics studies, it also show the violation maxim therefore it can be discussed through linguistics studies. The way people get meaning based on the context from an interaction which is communication can be acceptable and understandable each other. Seller and buyer in traditional markets come from different background such as from education, social statues, culture, gender, age which effects the language that is used. Therefore, the existence of differences background need Cooperative Principle that is used between buyers and sellers in negotiation. the researcher focuses on the concept of Cooperative Principle limited to the violation of maxims that is found through selling and buying transactions in traditional market Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung. The analysis of these Cooperative Principle was restricted only to the types of the violation of maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, maxim of manner.

**B. RESEARCH METHOD**

This research used the descriptive qualitative method in order to get understanding and describing cultural phenomena. The researcher did the observation then classifies the data into categories, then provided the categories into table form (Spradley in Santosa 2017). The researcher described the violation maxims which was assumed in traditional market Pasar Raya and traditional market Lubuk Alung. Then, the source of data is sellers and buyers in the traditional market Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung. Moreover, the data was collected from utterances of sellers and buyers.

**C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**1. Finding**

from data analysis there are three findings found :

1. The violation of maxims occurred in transaction between seller and buyer in traditional market Pasar Raya.

Table 4.2. The violation of maxims occurred in transaction between seller and buyer in traditional market Pasar Raya

Domain		Quality	Quantity	Manner	Relevance
Pasar Raya	Clothing store	3	46	0	11
	Shoes store	7	26	0	27
Sum		10	72	0	38

from both stores in traditional market Pasar Raya, the researcher found that the maxim of quantity is the more occurred than other maxims.

2. The violation of maxims occurred in transaction between seller and buyer in traditional market Lubuk Alung.

Table 4.3 The violation of maxims occurred in transaction between seller and buyer in traditional market Lubuk Alung.

Domain		Quality	Quantity	Manner	Relevance
Lubuk Alung	Clothing store	0	32	0	18
	Shoes store	5	48	0	21
Sum		5	80	0	39

From the table above, the researcher found that the violation maxim of quantity is the most occurred in traditional market Lubuk Alung.

3. The differences and similarities of the violation of maxims between traditional market Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung.

Table 4.4 The differences and similarities of the violation of maxims between traditional market Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung.

Domain	Quality	Quantity	Relevance	Manner
Pasar Raya	10	72	38	0
Lubuk Alung	4	80	39	0

From the table above, the researcher found that there is similarities and differences of violation maxims between Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung.

## 2. Analysis of Data

### Type of Violation in the traditional market Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung

#### a. Violation of Quantity Maxim

##### PSRY/Cc1/10

Buyer : lai ndak gadang polanyo ko da ?  
(*isn't this pattern big enough sir?*)

Seller : gadang pola nyo tu dek, warna nyo banyak ko  
(*that is the big pattern, sist. The colours are vary too*)

From the respons given by the seller above, it could be seen that the seller violated the maxim quantity. The information given was more than what the buyer needed. The question from the buyer was about the size of the cloth. The seller answered the question with “**gadang pola nyo tu dek, banyak warna nyo ko**” from the first respond of the seller, he gave the answer that the buyer needed. However, the seller added an information about the color of the cloth that was unnecessary. He directly answered the main point of the question but he violated the maxim of quantity by giving more information that what was not needed.

##### PSLA/Cc3/31

Buyer : ndak do langan panjang nyo do ni ?  
(*don't you have the one with a long sleeve, madam?*)

Seller : lengan panjang ndak do do, ndak masuk lengan panjang tu, kalo ndak lah uni ambiak mah.  
(*the long sleeves are out, they haven't been distributed, if they have, I'd take them for sure*)

Based on the dialogue above, the seller's answer contained violation maxim of quantity. After giving the main point of her answer, the seller gave more information. Meanwhile, by saying "ndak ado do" the seller has given the main point what the buyer need to know. However, the seller added more information that was unnecessary.

### **b. Violation of Quality Maxim**

#### **PSRY/Cs2/246**

Seller : lai, ukuran bara abang kak makai ?

(*yes, what size your brother have?*)

Buyer : 41, 42, 43

(*41,42,43*)

Based on the data above, the researcher identified that the buyer's respond was violating the maxim of quality. Because she did not actually sure about the size of shoes that she need. By answering 41, 42, 43 the buyer showed the possibility not a fact. She just guessed between the size.

#### **PSLA/Cs4/169**

Buyer : cubo caliak ni?  
(*may I look it, madam?*)

Seller : ko ancak mah ni  
(*this one is nice*)

Based on the data above, the seller has violated quality maxim. When the buyer asked to see the item, the seller's respond "ko ancak mah ni" it meant that actually she gives respond what her believe or her opinion while the buyer did not ask about the quality of the item. The maxim quality as Grice said "do not say something what you believe not true or lack of evidence".

### **c. Violation of Relevance Maxim**

#### **PSRY/Cs1/175**

Buyer : tapak kareh model iko ado bang ?

*(do you have a hard shoe sole like this one, sir?)*

Seller : channel baa ?

*(what about Channel ?)*

From the dialogue above the researcher argues that the seller had violated maxim of relevance. The buyer asked that there was another quality of the shoes or not to the seller. However, the seller gave respond by offering the other brand. The seller's answers actually was irrelevant with the question of the buyer. He did not answer the main point what the buyer asking for. In order to gave relevant answer, the seller should answer by saying “ lai ado kak”. It means there is also the another one.

**PSLA/Cs4/173**

Buyer : lai ndak lapang ko ni ?

*(does not this big enough, madam?)*

Seller : nyo karet mah ni  
*(it is rubber based material)*

From the data above, the researchcer argue that the seller violated the maxim of relevance. When the buyer asked about size of the item but the seller gave the respond about her opinion the quality of the item. In order to make relevant answer, the seller should answer “iyo ko gadang mah ni”. Meanwhile, the information was not relevant with the main point that buyer want to know.

**2. The Differences and Similarities Violation of Maxims between Traditional Markets Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung.**

Table 4.5 The differences and similarities violation of maxims between traditional markets Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung.

domain			Ql	Qt	Rl	Mn	Sum
Pasar Raya	Clothing store	F	3	46	11	0	60
		%	5%	76,6%	18,3%	0%	99,9%
	Shoes store	F	7	26	27	0	60
		%	11,7%	43,3%	45%	0%	100%
Lubuk Alung	Clothing store	F	0	32	18	0	50
		%	0%	64%	36%	0%	100%
	Shoes store	F	5	48	21	0	74
		%	6,7%	64,8%	28,3%	0%	99,8%

From the data that had been obtained, the interaction of buying and selling in Lubuk Alung market took longer than Pasar Raya. from the table can be seen that Pasar Raya and Lubuk Alung have the same rank of violation of maxims. The most violation of maxim that occurred both markets is maxim of Quantity. Then, the second rank of violation that occurred both markets is maxim of relevance.

### **3. Discussion**

The first problem which was proposed in this research is how the participants violating the maxim in transaction activity.

Firstly, maxim of quantity is violated if the speakers' respond is not enough of information or exceed than needed (Leech, 2014). From sellers and buyers' interaction, sellers were more often violated this maxim than buyers because they often provided excessive and unnecessary informations. Sellers violated this maxim when they are convincing the customer by exaggerating the information that there provides, such as explaining about the prize or about the quality of the items (Keckskes, 2014). By mean of violation maxim of quantity, it can be seen that the sellers further demand of information from the buyers.

Maxim of quality was violated when speaker's contribution is not true and their information cannot be proven yet (Grice, 1975). In this research, it is found that among four maxims, maxim quality is the maxim that mostly not violated either by the seller or the buyer. Thus, it can be concluded that in order to convince the buyers, the seller tend to tell the truth or honest rather than telling false information as Grice mentioned (Grice, 1975).

Then, maxim of relevance is violated when the speaker's contribution is not relevance with the topic (Grice, 1975)), sellers often violated this maxim when the buyer tried to bargain the price, they responded it by talking about the other topic.

Lastly, maxim of manner is violated when speaker's contribution is not perspicuous and it may be obscure, and ambiguous (Grice, 1975). However, both of traditional markets there was no violating the maxim of manner that occurred.

From the data that have been obtained, it can be seen that both markets, the most occurred of violations was maxim quantity and relevance. In Pasar Raya there were 72 violation of maxim quantity and 38 maxim relevance, while in Lubuk Alung Market there were 80 violation of maxim quantity and 39 maxim relevance.

First, Pasar Raya market and Lubuk Alung market are both classified as traditional market. These two traditional markets are located in different location and have different background. Pasar raya market which is located in the center of Padang city is visited by people almost every kind of social class. On the other hand, Lubuk Alung market which is located in suburban area of Lubuk Alung that mostly visited by one particular social class which is mostly house wife.

From the research that has been conducted, the researcher found that there is no major differences how these two traditional markets violated maxims of cooperative principle. This is due to these two traditional markets have same cultural background where the people interacted in those markets are

Minangkabau. The only difference as been stated earlier is in the perspective of people's relationship. The interaction in Lubuk Alung market took longer time because almost every people interacted in that market is having close relationship because they are people who live in the same ways. Therefore, they would like to have a little chit chat in transaction because they know each other.

However in Pasar Raya market as stated before is located in Padang comes from many different places. Therefore, they barely know each other and produced a low level of closeness with each other that is why the transaction in Pasar Raya market is more strike forward than Lubuk Alung market.

Next, selling and buying transactions each traditional markets in Indonesia used variety of languages, different cultures and different style of language. Basically, the language that people used in traditional markets is generally the local language which is selling and buying transactions, people tends to ignore maxims of cooperative principle (Huang, 2007) . It can be seen from some research that found violation maxim of cooperative principle in traditional markets from various areas.

Firstly from traditional market Banyuasri that have been researched by Yukti, et al(2017). They found that seller buyer violated all type of maxims that the most occur was maxim quantity. Secondly, from Sari, et al (2016) found 45 violation maxim of quantity, there was no violation maxim of quality, 6 violation maxim of relevance and 44 violation maxim of manner in traditional market Surakarta. Lastly, violation maxims in traditional market Pematang Siantar Toba Batak had found by Manik (2017) there were 58 violation maxim of quantity, 12 maxim of quality, 20 violation of relevance and 27 violation maxim of manner.

From the research that the researcher has conducted, it is shown that the maxim quality is the type of maxim that violated in traditional markets. This fact is supported by the previous researchs that shows the same result. So, it can be concluded that the seller in traditional markets are tend to speak and give more information eventhough it is not asked by the buyer in order to convince the buyer to buy their products. However the only different between this research and previous research is that the researcher did not find the violation maxim of manner in both Pasar Raya market and Lubuk Alung market. Thus, people in Pasar Raya market and Lubuk Alung market tend to speak clearly than say something ambiguously during the transactions. This case can be related with state that have been stated before in previous chapter, as a contradiction from Grice's theory in (Cutting, 2015) is different cultures, countries, and communities have their own ways to show and express their ideas through the concept of maxims in some situations. Then, the rules of the interaction and conversation carry culture to culture have some value honesty more than others that have been mentioned by (Cutting, 2015). Furthermore, from the case maxims are not the rule as what Grice was referring to but it is referred to social custom or the ways of behaving in conformation with the cooperative principle (Green, 1996).

Thus, selling and buying transactions in traditional markets will never be separated from violation of maxims. It is how sellers and buyers misleading their utterances in order to achieve their purpose in their interactions. As have been mentioned before in the chapter II, people usually ignore the effectiveness of their



interaction or conversation when they want to achieve certain purposes (Keckskes, 2014 ). Therefore, it is the part of their purpose on how they do transaction each other, how they attract the customers, and how they get a deal transaction.

## **D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

### **a. Conclusion**

The resercher found 108 utterances that consist of violation the maxims in conversation between buyers and sellers in traditional market Pasar Raya. Then, 123 utterances that violated the maxim in conversation between buyers and sellers in traditional market Lubuk Alung.

The writer concluded that the speakers violated maxim of quantity when the speaker convincing the customer by exaggerating the information there provides, such as explaining the quality of the items. Then the speakers violated the maxim of quality when the seller provided the information which not proven yet or (just according to him) for the buyer who interested in the items. Lastly, the speakers violated maxim of relevance when the they mean to trigger someone to introspect about certain phenomena.

### **b. Suggestion**

It is essential to study cooperative principles because people can avoid misunderstanding between speakers and hearers. The advantages of violation maxim of cooperative principles analysis is identifying some of the conversational utterance forms people use to perform specific actions. Then, people will be more understandable in communication process in their daily life because they have understood about people's mean in what they say.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Cutting, J. 2015. *Pragmatics (third edition)*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Fancis Group.
- Green, G. M. 1996. *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Mahwah, New Jersey
- Grundy, P. 2000. *Doing pragmatics*. London: Arnold. Grice, Paul (1975). "Logic and conversation". In Cole, P.; Morgan, J. *Syntax and semantics*. 3: Speech acts. New York: Academic Press. pp. 41–58.
- Huang, Y. 2007. *Pragmatics*. New York : Oxford University Press.

- Irnandia, I. N. 2017. *Conversational Implicature As Found In Buyers' And Sellers' Interaction In The Traditional Market Of Lubuk Alung*. E-Journal of English language & literature. Vol 6. No.2.
- Kecskes, I. 2014. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G. 2014. *The pragmatics of politeness*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Manik, D.A. 2017. *Violating maxims by toba batak sellers and buyers in parluasan traditional market pematangsiantar*. Thesis tidak diterbitkan. Medan : Universitas Negeri Medan.
- Renkema, J. 2004. *Introduction to Discourse Study*. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Santosa, R. 2017. *Metode penelitian kualitatif kebahasaan*. Jawa Tengah: UNS Press.
- Sari, R.L.T. 2016. Tindak tutur dalam proses jual beli di pasar tradisional Surakarta. *Megister Linguistik Deskriptif Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret* :Surakarta. Vol 1. No. 1
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan aneka teknik analysis bahasa*. Duta wacana University Press
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York : Oxford New York Press.
- Yukti,et al. 2017. *Prinsip kerja sama dalam interaksi jual beli di pasar tradisional banyuasri dan implikasinya terhadap pembelajaran teks negoisasi*. e-Journal Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Undiksha Volume : Vol: 7 No: 2.