

Violation of Cooperation Principle in the Discourse of Student WhatsApp Groups at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang

M. Fransiska Sri Rahayu^{1✉}, Rustono Rustono², Haryadi Haryadi²

¹ Vocational High School PIKA Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

History Articles

Received:

7 January 2022

Accepted:

25 February 2022

Published:

30 April 2022

Keywords:

discourse,
student,
whatsapp group,
violation of
cooperation principle

Abstract

This study describes the violation of the cooperative principle in the discourse of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang. The theory used in this study is Grice's (1975) theory, which states that speakers must pay attention to four maxims of cooperative principles in communicating: quantity maxim, quality maxim, relevance maxim, and manner maxim. The study used a descriptive qualitative approach. The data collection method used is listening and recording. The research object is speech events that occur in the discourse of students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang. The forms of violations found in this fragment the discourse of student WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang, there are sixteen data, including three data in the form of a quantity maxim violation, three data in the form of a quality maxim violation, four data in the form of a relevance maxim violation, and six data in the form of a maxim violation. The reason for the violation of the maxim is to generate interest in the form of cuteness, superior quality, and even satire and imagery in poetry anthology *Perahu Kertas* by Sapardi Djoko Damono.

✉ Correspondence address:

Imam Bonjol No.96, Pandansari, Semarang, Jawa Tengah (50139)

E-mail: hayusiska1971@gmail.com

p-ISSN 2301-6744

e-ISSN 2502-4493

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is the study of the meaning conveyed by speakers to speech partners. In pragmatics, some sciences are studied again, one of which is the principle of cooperation. According to Khotimah (2019), the principle of cooperation is a communication process carried out by the community. A speaker certainly has a goal that he wants to convey to his interlocutor; therefore, the principle of cooperation is indispensable in the conversation process. The goal is that conversation can be achieved. Rustono (1999) further stated that the principle of conversation is the principle that regulates the mechanism of dialogue between the speaker and the speech partner so that they can have a cooperative and polite conversation. Similarly, Ariyana and Retno (2018) say that the principle of cooperation between participants (speakers and speech partners) in a conversation will facilitate information in conveying the goals to be achieved. WhatsApp group discourse is a place to share experiences of industrial work practices, both joys, and sorrows. Communication in WhatsApp group discourse must also use communicative language and good cooperation between speakers and interlocutors to establish unidirectional communication.

The research took the object in a speech in the discourse of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang. Student communication in the WhatsApp group, it was suspected that there was a deviation in the principle of cooperation between students. A WhatsApp group consisting of approximately 52 students communicates every day to get information from schools and companies where industrial work practices are carried out. For the sake of smooth communication, they usually forget the principle of cooperation. They often bump into the principle of cooperation to make them look "closer," in fact they often feel confused when they have to string words that are short, clear, easy to understand, and don't offend the other person's feelings via WhatsApp so that there is a

violation of the principle of cooperation in communication.

This is interesting because Vocational High School PIKA students are prepared to become leaders or companies, especially supervisors. When communicating or speaking, it is appropriate that they must always pay attention to the principle of cooperation. Lestari (2020) has conducted research relevant to this research entitled "Compliance and Violation of Cooperation Principles in Preman Pensiun the Movie." The similarity between Lestari's study and this research is that they analyze the principle of cooperation. Wahyuni (2019) also carried out relevant research, "Violation of the Principles of Politeness and Conversational Implicatures in Dialogue for Children with Mental Requirements at Public Extraordinary School Ungaran." The similarity between Wahyuni's research and this research is that they both describe violations. Wahyuni focuses on violations of politeness, while this research focuses on violations of the principle of cooperation. In line with Wahyuni's research, research conducted by Riri Savitri et al. (2014) entitled "Violation of the Cooperation Principle in the Novel Rantau 1 Muara by Ahmad Fuadi" both analyzed the deviations from the cooperative principle and the differences between the object of study and the results of the data found. Research conducted by Niswatin (2018) entitled "The Violation of Bidal (Flouting Maxim) in the Speech of the Character of the Radio Galau Fm Film: A Pragmatic Study." This study examines the violation of the maxim of cooperation whose object of study is the discourse of students' WhatsApp groups. The similarity between this research and the research conducted by Niswati is that they both examine the violation of the principle of cooperation. This study aims to describe the violations of the cooperative principle by students in the WhatsApp group discourse. The benefits of the research provide information about violations of the cooperative principle in pragmatic studies and suggestions for providing language guidance to students who still violate the cooperative principle. Setyasih's research (2020) is also

relevant to this research. Collecting data both use the listening method and note-taking technique. Data analysis also uses the normative approach. The difference is that Setyasih describes the violation and compliance with the politeness principle in Iwan Fals' song lyrics. This study describes the violation of the principle of cooperation by students in the WhatsApp group. In line with Setyasih, Masroi's (2020) research entitled "The implicature of Ridwan Remin's conversation in the Stand Up Comedy Event" is also relevant to this research, especially the approach used in the study is both a qualitative descriptive approach. Sources of data in the form of discourse, data collection with listening techniques, and note-taking techniques.

The principle of cooperation is the principle that governs what speakers and interlocutors do so that a conversation sounds coherent and in harmony. Grice (1975) states that communication requires cooperation between the speaker and the speech partner to achieve the purpose of the discussion. In the principle of cooperation, according to Hidayati (2018), speakers or interlocutors must have a mutual desire or goal to convey and interpret the meaning of an utterance issued. In addition, the speaker and the interlocutor must work together so that communication runs efficiently. According to Grice, in the principles of cooperation, there are four maxims, among others: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, the maxim of the method

Sabardila, et al. (2014) stated that this quantity maxim expects every speaker and interlocutor to contribute as much as needed by the interlocutor when the conversation takes place between the two. Quantitative maxims require that every speaker and interlocutor contribute in the form of sufficient and clear information so that there is no violation. The quality maxim contains advice to make a genuine contribution with specific evidence. According to Arta (2016), the quality maxim requires every speaker and interlocutor to convey the actual form of language. The

contribution of conversation participants must be based on adequate evidence. In a conversation, the speaker and the interlocutor should contribute utterances honestly and truthfully accompanied by proof that what is said is accurate, not lying, do not issue words that are believed to be wrong. The maxim of relevance requires that each speaker make a relevant and helpful contribution to the conversation. According to Ariyani and Retno (2018), this relevant maxim needs the speaker or speech partner to speak according to the theme or problem being discussed. This relevance maxim requires the speaker and speech partner to talk according to the context of the discussion, not deviate discussed. This means that the speaker or speech partner does not go out of context.

Suppose one of the deviations mentioned above will result in a violation. Tiarina (2009) states that the maxim should be direct, unambiguous, not exaggerating, and sequentially. Speaking means that the speaker strives for clear speech that can be heard and understood clearly. Titi and Bambang research (2016) entitled "Violations of Conversational Principles and Pragmatic Parameters in Stand Up Comedy Dodit Discourse" describes the form of violations, patterns of violations, and the factors behind the violation of conversational principles and pragmatic parameters. Similarities with this study are both using the listening method and note-taking technique. Likewise, in a study entitled "Forms of State Officials' Language Politeness in Metro TV Talkshow Q and A: Pragmatic Analysis," Vita, et al. (2019) analyzed the forms and types of violations and compliance with the maxims of Leech politeness of state administrators in MetroTV Talk Show Q and A. The similarities with this research are both use a pragmatic qualitative approach and a qualitative descriptive-analytical approach.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a pragmatic approach and a qualitative descriptive-analytical approach. The research data is in the form of transcripts of

student speech in the discourse of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang. The research object is a fragment of the discourse of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang; this object aims to find and analyze violations of the cooperative principle. The results of data analysis regarding violations of the cooperative principle are presented in a qualitative descriptive form. According to Moleong (Hermawan, 2015), qualitative research data is data in fragments of discourse or writing in the form of words. Data collection techniques in this study are listening methods and note-taking techniques. According to Oktavia (2015), the listening technique is a data collection technique by listening to the use of language. Listening is done by transcribing fragments of WhatsApp group discourse. The note-taking technique is used to record the data obtained from the listening technique.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the research, it was found that some data violated the maxim of the cooperative principle, namely the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. It can be seen through the classification Table 1.

Table 1. Examples violations of the cooperative principle

Type of Maxim	Quantity
Quantity maxim	3
Quality maxim	3
Relevance maxim	4
Way maxim	6
Total	16

In the Table 1, sixteen violations of the principle of cooperation were found, including three violations of the maxim of quantity in the form of excessive sentences, three violations of the quality maxim in the form of uninformative sentences, and sentences that do not match reality, four violations of the maxim of relevance in the form of sentences that are not in

context/irrelevant, uncommunicative sentences, and six violations of the maxim of the way in the form of convoluted sentences and ambiguous or ambiguous sentences. The following are the findings the violation of the principle of cooperation in the WhatsApp group discourse of Vocational High School PIKA Semarang students.

Quantity maxim

Quantity maxim is a form of communication between speech partners by providing sufficient information not to be exaggerated according to the interlocutor's needs. Achsani (2019) says that the quantity maxim principle requires the speaker or interlocutor to provide information as needed, no less and no more. The following is a form of violation of the quantity maxim regarding the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang.

- (1) Context: One Night, A Class Student Opened Whatsapp, And It Turned Out That There Was A New Whatsapp Group

Daniel :Tonight...What Group Is This?
(Malam...Ini Grup Apa Ya?)

Reshy :This Is To Facilitate Communication Or Essential Announcements From The School. Here Are Representatives Of Each Company. Likewise, If We Have Problems, Please Chat Here To Respond Quickly. Everyone Knows, And It's A Lesson For Us All. Thanks.
(Ini Untuk Memudahkan Komunikasi Atau Pengumuman Penting Dr Sekolah.. Yg Ada Di Sini Perwakilan Masing-Masing Perusahaan.. Begitu Juga Kalau Kita Ada Masalah Di Perusahaan Silakan Chat Di Sini Supaya Kita Cpt Tanggap.. Semua Tahu Dan Jadi Pembelajaran Kita Semua..Thanks..)

Daniel :Yes, Res, I Understand
(Owalah, Iya Res Saya Paham.)

Reshy said, "This is to facilitate communication or essential announcements

from the school. Here are representatives of each company. Likewise, if we have problems, please chat here to respond quickly. Everyone knows, and it's a lesson for us all. Thanks." violates the maxim of quantity because the utterance is quantitatively lacking. The contribution contributed in the discourse fragment (1) does not match what is needed, too much. Meanwhile, the interlocutor only contributed a little to the speech. Violations of the quantity maxim can also be seen in the following passage.

(2) Context: The Class Leader Asked If They Had Reached Their Respective Destinations

Reshy :Evening Friends! Ckwi Night, Jati City, Cirebon
(*Malam Teman-Teman! Malam Ckwi, Kota Jati, Cirebon*)

Christin :Sharing, Friends At Gema Graha Sarana, It Was Decided To Stay In The Ppic Division For Six Months Because I Am Not Allowed To Operate Machines. Still, I Don't Deny That I Also Have To Know And Understand All The Processes Of A Product That Is Made From Planning To Product Sent. This Is My Sharing
(*Sharing Ya Teman-Teman... Di Gema Graha Sarana Saya Selama 6 Bulan Di Putuskan Untuk Tetap Berada Di Divisi Ppic, Dikarenakan Saya Tidak Diperbolehkan Untuk Mengoperasikan Mesin, Tetapi Tidak Memungkiri Bahwa Saya Juga Harus Tau Dan Paham Semua Proses Suatu Produk Yang Di Buat Dari Perencanaan Sampai Produk Dikirim. Ini Sharing Saya.*)

Antoni :Info Well-Received Cris
(*Info Diterima Dengan Baik Cris*)

Gilang :Ok Cris

Christin said, sharing, friends at Gema Graha Sarana, it was decided to stay in the PPIC division for six months because I am not allowed to operate machines. Still, I don't deny that I also have to know and understand all the

processes of a product that is made from planning to product sent. This is my sharing. The contribution made in the fragment of the discourse is not following what is needed, which is too much. It violates the maxim of quantity because the utterance is quantitatively lacking. Meanwhile, the interlocutor only contributed a little to the speech. Violation of the quantity maxim is also seen in the following conversation snippet.

(3) Context: A Student Who Practices Industrial Work At Pt. Satyamas Indoraya Cikarang Bekasi Was Stunned To Find That Its Manager Was An Alumni Of Pika

Karisma :Friends, My Manager Is Alumni
(*Teman-Teman, Manajer Saya Alumni...*)

Steffy :You Are Class? Ma
(*Angkatan Berapa Ma..*)

Karisma :Class 43. Oooo Yes, Stef, Earlier I Was Asked By My Manager, Who Is An Alumnus, I Was Asked "Pika, Huh? From Vocational High School Or Academy?" We Are Confused, Stef Answered, Nervous, Haha.

(*Angkatan 43. Oooo Iya Stef, Tadi Aku Ditanyain Sama Managerku Yang Alumni Itu, Aku Ditanyain "Pika Ya? Dari Smk Apa Akademinya ??" Kita Bingung Stef Jawabnya, Groggi Haha.*)

Karisma said Class 43. Oooo yes, Stef, earlier I was asked by my manager, who is an alumnus, I was asked "PIKA, huh? From Vocational High School or Academy?" We are confused, Stef answered, nervous, haha. This speech violates the quantitative maxim because the vocabulary is quantitatively lacking. The contribution contributed in the discourse fragment (3) is not following what is needed, which is too much. Meanwhile, the interlocutor only contributed a little to the speech. Based on the research data, it was found that there was a violation of the principle of quality, as shown in the following passage.

Quality maxim

Quality maxim contains advice that speakers should contribute properly and be supported by accountable evidence. In carrying out a conversation, the speaker must not say something wrong and has no evidence. So, the maxim of quality violation occurs when the speaker says something that is wrong and is not accompanied by evidence. The following is a violation of the quality maxim in the discourse of the WhatsApp group of the 43rd batch students from Vocational High School PIKA Semarang. The following are the findings of the quality maxim violation found in the student's WhatsApp group discourse.

- (4) Context: Grego, A Student Who Practices Industrial Work At Pt. Erka Interindo Asked About Examen

Grego :Resh The Examen Collected?
(*Resh Yang Examen Dikumpulkan?*)
Reshy :Yes, It Was Collected. If It's Like Examen, It Doesn't Have To Have Chapters. It Also Doesn't Have To Be A Background And A Problem Statement Either.
(*Ya Dikumpul Lah... Kalau Seperti Examen Nggak Harus Ada Bab-Babnya... Juga Nggak Harus Ada Latar Belakang Dan Rumusan Masalah Juga...*)

Reshy's statement Yes, it was collected. If it's like Examen, it doesn't have to have chapters. It also doesn't have to be a background and a problem statement either. Reshy's speech violates the quality rule. The untruth of speech (4) is known to all of 43rd batch students'. All students of 43rd batch know that there are certainly no chapters, background, and problem formulations in the exam. Everyone already knows that the exam reflects the most exciting and uninteresting experience and feels God's work in these activities. The following is a fragment of discourse that violates the maxim of quality.

- (5) Context: Debhy Asks The Head Of The Class For Help To Find A Friend Who Can Edit The Design

Debhy :Resh, Please Find A Friend Who Has A Laptop And Can Edit. I Don't Know If My Design, When Zoomed-In, Broke Or Not
(*Resh, Tolong Sarikan Teman Yang Punya Laptop Dan Bisa Edit. Itu Saya Nggak Tau Desain Saya Waktu Di Zoom Pecah Atau Tidak*)
Reshy :Just A Hoodie, Not A Zipper
(*Hoodie Aja Jangan Yg Resleting*)
Antoni :Find The Picture
(*Cariin Gambarnya*)

The discourse fragment (5) speech is not cooperative because there is a violation of the maxim of quality. The untruth of Reshy's statement, "Just hoodie, don't zip," is known to all group members. Everyone in the group who reads Debhy's message knows that Debhy needs a friend who has a laptop and has design editing skills. Debhy said, "Reshy, please find a friend who has a laptop and can edit. I don't know if my design when zoomed-in broke or not" it was clear that he needed a laptop and a friend, but Reshy didn't seem to know and instead asked to make a hoodie without a zipper. Thus the fragment of discourse (5) does not meet the maxim of quality.

- (6) Context: Feren Is A Student In The Same Group As Agung, Who Practices Industrial Work At Pt. Indah Design Indonesia In Jepara Asked Her Friends For Help To Visit Agung, Who Had Returned To Semarang For A Week.

Feren :Those In Semarang, Please Go To Agung's Boarding House. The Cellphone Is Still Off.
(*Yang Di Semarang, Tolong Ke Kost Agung. Hp Ne Off Terus.*)
Donda :It's Great That You're In Jepara. Who Knows, Right? You Ask Someone Else.

(Agung Kan Di Jepara Sama Kamu, Yang Tahu Kan Yo Kamu Malah Tanya Orang Lain.)

Feren :He Went Back To Semarang.
(Dia Pulang Semarang.)

The speech in the conversation fragment (6) is not cooperative because there is a violation of the quality maxim. The untruth of Donda's statement, "It's great that you're in Jepara. Who knows, right? You ask someone else," is also known to all group members. All group members who read Feren's message knew that Feren needed the help of a friend who has an Industrial Work Practice or lives in Semarang to find information about Agung at his home. Feren added that Agung had returned to Semarang and had not yet returned to Jepara. Even Feren and Reshy have called their cellphones, but they are not active. So Feren said, "Those in Semarang, please go to Agung's boarding house. The cellphone is still off." It was clear that he needed the help of friends who lived in Semarang to find information about Agung by visiting Agung's house. Based on the research data, it is found that there is a violation of the principle of relevance, as shown in the following passage.

Relevance maxim

Relevance maxim is a form of communication that emphasizes the cooperation between the speaker and the speech partner in conveying information related to the topic of conversation. According to Hermaliza (Achsani, 2019), the relevance maxim requires each participant of the conversation to make a relevant contribution or relate to the problem being discussed. The following is a form of violation of the relevance maxim in the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang.

The maxim of relevance requires that the speaker speaks about things relevant to the speech's topic. This maxim requires the speaker to maintain the relevance of his speech so that conversational coherence is created and the purpose of the conversation is achieved

effectively. However, in this discourse, some utterances violate the maxim of relevance. The following are the violations of the relevance maxim contained in the fragments of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang.

(7) Context: Debhy Is A Student Who Practices Industrial Work At Pt. Jati Luhur Agung Semarang Asked About The Overtime Activity Of Making Medals

Debhy :Friends, Will There Be A Medal Ceremony Tomorrow, Monday?
(Teman-Teman Apakah Besok Senin Ada Lembur Medali?)

Steffy :Tomorrow Is Monday Overtime For The Ceremony, Dheb.
(Besok Senin Lembur Upacara Dheb)

The utterance in the conversation fragment (7) includes a violation of the relevance maxim because the contribution received by the speaker does not match or has no relevance to the contribution expected by the speaker. Steffy's statement, "Tomorrow is Monday overtime for the ceremony, Dheb," does not contribute to the speaker's expectations. Whereas the speaker, in his speech "Friends of Semarang, will there be a medal melting tomorrow, Monday?" clearly expects information from his friends in Semarang regarding the overtime of making medals. But Debhy instead got an answer completely unrelated to what was expected. Violation of the maxim of relevance is also seen in the following snippet of conversation.

(8) Context: Binar, A Student From East Java But Industrial Practice At Pt. Erka Interindo Jakarta Asked When To Return To Semarang

Binar :Clemen, When Are You Coming Back To Semarang?
(Clemen Kapan Balik Semarang?)

Clemen :I'm Working On A Big Project At Profilindah
(Aku Nggarap Proyek Besar Di Profilindah)

Thomas :Take Lapindo Mud When You Go Home
(*Titip Lumpur Lapindo Kalo Pulang*)

The speech in the conversation fragment (8) violates the relevance maxim because the interlocutor does not make an appropriate contribution in the above speech. Through his speech "I am working on a big project in Profilindah," Clemen does not make a good contribution to the speaker, who asks when to return to Semarang through the speech "Clemen, when are you coming back to Semarang?". Likewise, Thomas, who was involved in the discourse of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang, also did not make the expected contribution. Through his speech, "Take Lapindo mud when you go home," Thomas seems to be joking or seriously asking Clemen to bring Lapindo mud when he returns to Semarang. The following passage of discourse (9) is also a violation of relevance.

(9) Context: Reshy, The Head Of The Class, Asked Where His Friends Were At The Industrial Work Practice

Resh :Bogowonto Already Got A Boarding House? What About Inkase? Have Got A Boarding House?
(*Bogowonto Udah Dapet Kos? Yg Inkase Gmn.?? Sdh Dpt Kos.??*)

Eko :Which Area Is Bogowonto Located? Suriname Or America?
(*Bogowonto Itu Di Daerah Mana Ya.?? Suriname Apa Amerika.??*)

Yulio :Inkase Is In A Country Of Your Own. So You Have Your Own Freedom. Hehehe
(*Inkase Itu Di Sebuah Negara Sndri.. Jd Punya Kebebasan Sndri.. Hehehe*)

The speech in the conversation fragment (9) violates the maxim of relevance. Because the contribution received by the speaker is not appropriate or has no relevance to the contribution expected by the speaker. Eko said,

"Which area is Bogowonto located? Suriname or America? Does not make the contribution expected by the speaker. Even though the speaker, through his speech "Bogowonto already got a boarding house? What about Inkase? Have got a boarding house?" clearly expected information from friends who at that time had industrial work practices at PT. Bogowonto Primalaras Semarang, and at PT. Inkase Indo Corpora Klaten. It seems that Eko and Yulio, who have industrial work practices in Bogowonto and Inkase, did not take it seriously, resulting in a violation of the maxim of relevance. The findings of the violation of relevance can also be seen in the following fragment of discourse.

(10) Context: Hervina, A Student Who Practices Industrial Work At Danwood Nusantara Semarang, Was Surprised To Learn That Thomas And Yohanes, Students Who Practiced Industrial Work At Pt. East Jakarta Harfit International Departs Very Early.

Thomas :Early Edition To The Office. Monday Sister.

(*Edisi Gasik Masuk Kantor...Senin Lurr*)

Hervina :What Are You Doing, Thom
(*Ngapain Kowe Thom*)

Thomas :Yohanes And I Are Waiting For The Sand Truck, So As Not To Be Late
(*Aku Ro Yohanes Nunggu Truk Pasir... Maksudnya Supaya Tidak Terlambat*)

The utterance in the conversation fragment (10) includes a violation of the relevance maxim because the contribution received by the speaker is not appropriate or has no relevance to the contribution expected by the speaker. Thomas said, "Yohanes and I are waiting for the sand truck, so as not to be late." does not make the contribution expected by the speaker. Even though the speaker, through his speech " What are you doing, Thom" clearly expects an explanation from his two friends who at that time practiced industrial work at PT. Harfit Internasional, East Jakarta, the reason for

coming to the office so early in the morning. It seems that Thomas and Yohanes deliberately took it in a non-serious manner to violate the heresy of relevance.

Maxim way

A maxim is a form of communication between the speaker and the speech partner who speaks or answers directly without being complicated. It must be clear, not vague, and ambiguous directly at the essential points of the conversation. Achsan(2019) states that the maxim of manner is a limitation in conversation that requires the speaker and the speech partner to provide straightforward, unambiguous, and long-winded information. The following is a form of violation of the maxim of the way in the discourse of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang. The maxim requires every speaker to avoid ambiguity and ambiguity in speaking briefly and directly, and coherently. The speaker must express his utterance in such a way as to be easily understood by the interlocutor. However, in reality, there are still frequent violations of the maxim of manner because speaking is ambiguous and unclear. In the violation of the maxim in this way, there are four sub-bids as follows. The following describes the violations of the maxim of ways contained in the discourse of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang. Avoid ambiguity of speech violation of the maxim of manner because the ambiguity of speech can be seen in the following fragment of discourse.

(11) Context: The Class Leader Greets His Friends In The Class Group

Reshy :Evening, Guys! How's Kharisma Klasik? (*Malam Teman-Teman! Pa Kabar Kharisma Klasik?*)
 Lintar :Good Healthy And Physically, But Mentally Doubtful, Resh (*Sehat Wal'afiat Badannya, Tp Mentalnya Diragukan Resh*)
 Antoni :Lintar Stress Resh (*Lintar Stress Resh*)

The speech in the conversation fragment (11) includes a violation of the maxim of cause in the first subchapter. Because it contains ambiguity in speech, which is seen in Lintar's speech, "good healthy and physically, but mentally he is doubtful, Resh." The meaning of the speech is if the speaker, in normal conditions, can catch the speech. However, if the speaker is in an abnormal condition, perhaps the utterance of "good healthy and physically, but mentally doubtful, Resh" can cause the speaker to think that the interlocutor is indeed mentally disturbed. Avoid ambiguity (ambiguity) in violation of the maxim of the way because ambiguity can be seen in the following fragment of discourse.

(12) Context: Tentra Nico Practices Industrial Work At Pt. Inkase Indo Corpora Klaten Asks For An Explanation From Reshy

Tentra Nico :Resh (*Resh...*)
 Reshy :Yes Nic (*Piye Nic*)
 Tentra Nico :I'm In Inkase, Can I Not Roll? Because I Got A Project For Six Months (*Saya Di Inkase Tidak Di Roling Boleh Ngga? Karena Saya Dapat Proyek Untuk 6 Bulan*)

The speech in the conversation fragment (12) violates the maxim of manner because it is in the second subsection. Because it is taxa and less clear. The ambiguity of speech can be seen in Tentra Nico's speech, "I am in Inkase, can I not roll? Because I got a project for six months". Speakers can consciously interpret the project as an order or an order for furniture. However, the interlocutor can give the meaning of the project as a side job in a negative connotation. Another quote that contains a violation of the maxim of the manner in the second sub-title in avoiding ambiguity, namely, can be seen in the following conversation snippet.

(13) Context: The Class Leader Greets The Class Group In The Morning Before Work

- Reshy :Good Morning Guys
(*Mat Pagi Teman-Teman*)
- Steffy :Jati City Is Complete With Eggs
(*Kota Jati Komplet Pakai Telor*)
- Daniel :Super Complete Noodles, Not Only Eggs But Also Meat And Meatballs
(*Mi Super Komplet Nggak Cuma Telor Tapi Juga Daging Dan Bakso*)
- Gabby :Charisma Is All Healthy, Not Crazy
(*Kharisma Sehat Semua Ora Gemblung*)

The speech in the conversation fragment (13) includes a violation of the maxim of manner, because it is in the second subchapter. Because it is taxa and less clear. The ambiguity of speech, which can be seen in Steffy's utterance "Jati City is complete with eggs" and Daniel's utterance "Super complete noodles, not only eggs but also meat and meatballs". The meaning of the two utterances in bold is ambiguous, meaning that the meaning intended by the speaker is not the same as that intended by the interlocutor. Speakers can consciously interpret complete is complete. However, these two utterances can be misinterpreted by the interlocutor with the statements "using eggs" and "not only eggs but also meat and meatballs". Even though the context of the sentence is a furniture company, not a food context. Speak concisely and briefly (avoid excessive lengthy descriptions). Violation of the maxim of way because of the long description can be seen in the following fragment of discourse.

- (14) Context: Thomas Shares In The Class Group The Atmosphere Of The Company's Mess Or Place Of Residence During Industrial Work Practices.

Thomas :I'm At Harfit In The Engineering Flooring Section With More Orders, Guys And Accompanied By A Mystical Atmosphere
(*Saya Di Harfit Dibagian Engineering Flooring Dengan Order Semakin Banyak Gaes.. Dan Ditemani Suasana Mistis*)

- Risaldi :Thank God, Thom. Hopefully You Can Get Used To It So That If You Pass The Overtime Work That You Accompany Like That Is Normal
(*Alhamdulillah, Thom. Semoga Bisa Terbiasa Biar Kalo Lulus Kerja Lembur Yang Temenin Kayak Gitu Udah Biasa*)

The utterance in the conversation fragment (14) above can contain a violation of the way maxim in the third sub-bidal, which is not being able to speak briefly and unclearly, so that it seems redundant. The ambiguity of speech, which can be seen in Thomas's speech "I'm at Harfit in the Engineering Flooring section with more orders, guys and accompanied by a mystical atmosphere". From the speech, it implies that Thomas during his industrial work practice was placed in the Engineering Flooring section. Incidentally, during industrial work practices, in that section many orders were carried out. However, because the sentence delivered by the speaker, namely Thomas, is quite long, the meaning cannot be clearly accepted by the interlocutor.

The ambiguity of speech is also seen in Risaldi's speech "Thank God, Thom. Hopefully you can get used to it so that if you pass the overtime work that you accompany like that is normal" This utterance means as if forcing Thomas to be grateful that speakers can experience working overtime at a company in unusual (or mystical) situations. The utterance can mean joking or not taking the speaker seriously. However, because the sentence conveyed by the speaker, namely Risaldi is quite long, the meaning cannot be clearly accepted by the interlocutor. Violation of the maxim way can also be seen in the following conversation snippet.

- (15) Context: Thomas, A Student Who Practices Industrial Work At Pt. Harfit Internasional, East Jakarta, Just Realized That The Mess He Lived In Was Between The Company's Workshops.

Thomas :My Mess Is Also Between The Workshops, So It's A Bit Scary, Hehe
(*Ternyata Mess Ku Juga Di Antara Bengkel-Bengkel Jadi Agak Horor, Hehe*)

Karisma :It's Just That We've Become Like That, Thom, I'm Also A Little Scary Like That
(*Ini Aja Kita Udah Jadi Kayak Gitu, Thom, Aku Juga Jadi Agak Serem Gitu.*)

Hervina :Scare (*Laiss Kee Laiss*)

The utterance in the conversation fragment (15) above can contain a violation of the way maxim in the third sub-bidal, which is not being able to speak briefly and not clearly, so it seems redundant. The ambiguity of speech, which is seen in Thomas's utterance "My mess is also between the workshops, so it's a bit scary, hehe" From this speech, it means that Thomas just realized that his mess or residence is between the company's workshops, at night it must be quiet because none of the employees. However, because the sentence delivered by the speaker, namely Thomas, is quite long, the meaning is not easily accepted by the interlocutor. It is possible that Yohanes, a friend from a company during his industrial work practice, could not feel at home because of fear, etc.

The ambiguity of speech is also seen in Karisma's utterance, "It's just that we've become like that, Thom, I'm also a little scary like that" which means that Karisma became "like that" horror, Karisma also became even more afraid. Meanwhile, Hervina's story "Scare" adds to the atmosphere of horror. This ambiguity, because the sentence delivered by the speaker, namely Thomas and Karisma, is quite long, so the meaning cannot be clearly accepted by the interlocutor.

Speak in an orderly and orderly manner. In the view stated in Grice's theory (1975) the maxim of manner means that when a person can convey the speech as asked and systematically or sequentially, it means that it does not exceed the speech in question, but is violated. This can be seen in the following excerpt of the conversation.

(16) Context: Risaldi Left A Comment When He Saw The Photo That Steffy Sent From Jepara.

Risaldi :Wow, Engineering Candidate
(*Wah Calon Engineering*)

Marcel :What Are You Measuring Steff?
Km Ngukur Apa Steff.??)

Reshy :That's What The Father Measures, Not Nopik, Nopik Just Laughs
(*Kui Sing Ngukur Bapak, Ora Nopik, Nopik Mung Ngekek Kok*)

Steffy :Not Me Cel, I'm Just Following
(*Bukan Saya Cel, Saya Cuma Ngikut-Ngikut Aja*)

Steffy :It's Novi Who Drew It
(*Sing Gambar Ki Novi Yo*)

Reshy :Good (*Joos*)

The utterance in the conversation fragment (16) contains a violation of the maxim of manner in the fourth sub-bid, which is not being able to speak in an orderly and orderly manner, so that it seems excessive. This can be seen from Risaldi's statement "Wow, engineering candidate" because he saw Steffy's photo. Then through his speech "What are you measuring Steff?" Marcel was curious about what Steffy was doing, and in the end Steffy explained with the words "Not me Cel, I'm just following, it's Novi who drew it". The conversation is too redundant because there is no clear specific topic. The speaker and the interlocutor both cannot clearly understand the intent and direction of the conversation, thus a violation of the fourth subbidal method occurs because the speaker does not speak in an orderly and manner.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that the violation of the principle of cooperation in the discourse of the 43rd batch students' WhatsApp group at Vocational High School PIKA Semarang occurred in the four maxims, namely the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and

the maxim of the way. Following the study results, the violation of the principle of cooperation in WhatsApp group discourse, readers, especially WhatsApp users, are times when every utterance that comes from WhatsApp does not have to be applied to informal situations. Each interlocutor should filter the intent more wisely so that it can be established, communicative communication between speakers and speech partners. In addition, with this research, it is necessary to investigate further the impact of violating the cooperative principle on the speech partner forms of speech construction that violate the cooperative regulation in morphological studies and syntactic studies.

REFERENCES

- Achsani, F. (2019). "Pematuhan dan Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Komunikasi Siswa-Siswi MAN 1 Surakarta", *Jurnal Taling*, 2(2), 147-168.
- Ariyana, & Retno, N. (2018). "Bentuk Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesantunan dan Prinsip Kerja Sama pada Film Manusia Setengah Salmon". *Lingua Rima*, 7(1), 1-11.
- Arta, I. M. R. (2016). "Prinsip Kerjasama dan Kesantunan pada Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia dengan Pendekatan Saintifik". *Palapa, Jurnal Studi Keislaman dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 4(2), 139-151.
- Grice, H. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hermawan, A. (2015). "Penerapan Prinsip Kerjasama dalam Dialog ILC (Indoensia Lawyers Club), Tinjauan Pragmatik". *Nosi*, 3(4), 478-487.
- Hidayati, N. N. (2018). "Pelanggaran Bidal (Floting Maxim) dalam Tuturan Tokoh Film Radio Galau FM: Sebuah Kajian Pragmatik". *Humaniora*, 2(2), 248-263.
- Khotimah, K. (2018). "Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerjasama dalam Debat Kandidat Calon Wakil Gubernur Jawa Timur Tahun 2018". *Stilistika: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 11(2).
- Lestari, M., & Tomi Yuniawan. 2020. "Pematuhan dan Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Film Preman Pensiun the Movie". *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, 9(3), 16-22.
<http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jsi>
- Masroi, N. (2020) "Implikatur Percakapan Ridwan Remin dalam Acara Stand Events". *Magistra Andalusia, Jurnal Ilmu Sastra*. ISSN 2656-6230
<https://doi.org/10.25077/majis.2020.v2i2.27>
- Oktarini, E. D. A., & Oktavia, W. (2019). "Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dan Implikasinya pada Mahasiswa Thailand di IAIN Surakarta", *Diglosia, Jurnal Pendidikan, Kebahasaan, dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2, 12-19.
- Oktavia, W. (2015). "Variasi Jargon Chatting WhatsApp Grup Mahasiswa Tadris Bahasa Indonesia". *Kata*, 2(2), 317-325.
- Rustono. (1999). *Pokok-Pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: CV IKIP Semarang Press.
- Setyasih M, & Haryadi. (2020) "Prinsip Kesantunan dalam Lirik Lagu Iwan Fals" *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, 9(1), 71-77.
<http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jsi>
- Sabardila, A., Azizah, M. Y., & Abdul, N. (2014). "Penyimpangan Prinsip Kerja Sama dan Prinsip Kesopanan Wacana Kartun pada Buku Politik Santun dalam Kartun Karya Muhammad Mice Misrad". *Humaniora*, 2(1) : 141-154.
- Tiarina, Y. (2009). "Prinsip Kerjasama dalam Film Kartun Avatar". *Jurnal Bahasa dan Seni*, Vol. 11(1), 62-70.
- Titi Puji L & Bambang I. (2016). "Pelanggaran Prinsip Percakapan dan Parameter Pragmatik dalam Wacana Stand Up Comedy Dodit" *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 5(2), 148-162. e-ISSN 2502-4493
<http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka>
- Vita Kartikawati, Haryadi & Fathur Rokhman (2019) "Bentuk Kesantunan Bahasa

- Pejabat Negara dalam Q dan A Talkshow Metro TV: Analisis Pragmatis” *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia* 8(3), 50-56.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/35380>
- Wahyuni T, & Muh Badrus Siroj. (2019). “Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesantunan dan Implikatur Percakapan pada Dialog Anak Penyandang Tunagrahita di SLB Negeri Ungaran”. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*. 8(3) : 164-171 UNNES Semarang.
<http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jsi>
- Wijana, I. D. P. & M. Rohmadi. (2010). *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik*. Surakarta: Yuma Pustaka.