

COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES IN *HOTMAN PARIS SHOW*

IN INEWS

Riska Utami Putri Damanik¹, I Wy Dirgeyasa²

State University of Medan

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to find out the principle of cooperation that occurs at the *Hotman Paris Show* and the reason for the participants to violate the maxims. The method used by researchers in this study is qualitative research with data sourced from the *Hotman Paris Show* youtube account that uses #trending in the publishing process so that 17 videos are obtained. Data collection techniques using documentary techniques as data collection instruments. The analysis technique used is: 1) Identify the types of maxims and factors that violate the principle of cooperation that occurs at the *Hotman Paris Show* 2) Reducing irrelevant data sources with maxims and factors that violate the principle of cooperation 3) Classifying the data to its types 4) Interpreting the expressions of the principles of cooperation and factors that violate the principle of cooperation that occur in the conversations of the participants and 5) Drawing the conclusions based on the research problem of this study. The results of this research principle of cooperation on the maxim of quantity with the number of 65 utterances (64%), the maxim of quality with the number of 19 utterances (19%), the maxims of the relationship with the number of 8 utterances (8%) and manner with the number of 9 utterances (9 %). In the analysis of reasons, there were 83 errors made by participants which were divided into understatements of 20 data (24%), irony 17 data (20%), overstatements 13 data (15%), extreme 10 data (12%), sarcasm 8 data (10%), ambiguous statements 7 data (8%), irrelevant statement 6 data (8%), and metaphors 3 data (4%).

Keywords: *Cooperative Principles, The reason for violating the maxim, Grice Theory, Hotman Paris Show*

INTRODUCTION

The conversation is a simple sentence form using everyday vocabulary. Conversation as a means of communication between individuals or groups done as a form of social interaction. Gordon Pask (1975) states that conversation can be conducted at many levels: natural language (general discussion), object language (to discuss the subject matter), and metalanguage (to talk about learning/language). Conversation can be said to be the prevalent dominant speech in which two or more participants freely take turns speaking, which generally takes place outside of special institutional settings such as religious services, legal courts, classrooms, and the like (Levinson 1983).

The success of the conversation depends on the approach to interact. How people try to make the conversation work effectively is sometimes called a cooperative principle. To be cooperative, someone must obey the four maxims, known as conversational maxims. The cooperative principle also draws on how effective communication in conversation is achieved in common social situations. Speakers and listeners must speak cooperatively and mutually accept each other to be understood in a particular way.

Based on implicature theory, Grice states two theories, firstly he divides two sorts of meaning in the communication namely, natural meaning and non-natural meaning. Secondly, he leads one to be effective and efficient to utter the sorts of communication contents (Grice in Sumarsono,

2010). The researcher chooses communication media such as television for research objects. Television is a well-known telecommunication medium that functions as a receiver for broadcasting moving images and sound, both monochrome and color. As for the form of television programs such as talk shows, documentaries, films, quizzes, music, instructional, etc.

Previous studies related to the cooperative principle were conducted by Dwi (2015) who analyzed Flouting Maxim in EFL Classroom Interaction. In that paper, the data are taken from teacher and students interact in the EFL classroom with a qualitative approach method. The proportion of non-observance maxim is only 2%. Sorts of the maxim that are flouted by the speaker are maxim of quantity, quality, and manner. The flout of the maxim is done by students because of their lack of linguistic and actional competence.

Sammie and Arianmanesh (2018) analyzed Comprehension of Conversational Implicature in an Iranian EFL context: A validation study. The researcher uses Instrument(s) :1) theoretical development of the measure, and 2) Construction of the measure in the research method. The participants were 385 undergraduate and postgraduate university students (164 males and 221 females). This study was a preliminary attempt to investigate whether students of English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) a measure of this ability was developed and its validity was systematically established. The findings of this study may not be conclusive enough to give an extensive account of the comprehension of EFL learners in other provinces, because the sample was from universities in a single province of Iran, namely, Ilam.

Based on the data above, the researcher consider the accuracy of the topic to be discussed. The previous studies discussed many implicatures using the same theory in the classroom, comedy programs, talk shows, films but none of them took data from religious programs so that the researcher took the topic to be discussed the implications based on the cooperative principle that occur in a television program that is *Hotman Paris Show*. The researcher chose the program, *Hotman Paris Show* because the program has been around since 2015 and still exists today. The researcher chose this event because the presenter of the event had an unusual background. If most of the talk show host on television has a background with entertainment, *Hotman Paris Show* event hosted by a reliable lawyer who was well known abroad. Thus, the talk shows that is delivered not only raises the topic or issue currently happening in the community but also provides a view of the law, as different from other talk shows. Therefore the researcher wants to analyze the principles of cooperation that occur at the event.

The principle of cooperation is one of the principles of conversation in pragmatics. This principle emphasizes the existence of collaborative efforts that exist between speakers and speech partners in a conversation. This principle explains how speakers and speakers act cooperatively and accept each other to understand in certain ways.

This study will focus on conversational implicatures based on cooperative principles and the reason violated generated through participant conversations at the *Hotman Paris Show*. This implicature was analyzed using Grice's theory of the principle of cooperation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Pragmatic

Parker (1986) states that pragmatic is the study of how language is used to communicate. Pragmatic is different from grammar, that is, the study of the internal structure of language. Pragmatics is the study of meanings conveyed by speakers or researchers and interpreted by listeners or readers with the result that this study relates more to an analysis of what is meant by someone's speech or utterance with a meaning separate from the words or phrases used in the speech or utterance itself.

2. Implicature

Grice coined technical terms in linguistics called implicature. Refers to words that have meaning implied by these words. The implication is divided into three namely conventional implications, conversational or non-conventional implications, and assumptions (Grice, 1975). Yule (1996) states that something must be more than just what the words mean. It is an additional conveyed meaning, called implicature. Gazdar (1979) states that implicature is a proposition implied by utterance in context even though the proposition is not part of or does not require what is actually said. An implicature does not require the correct conditions of a spoken sentence or in other words, it can only be a thought.

3. Conversational Implicature

a) Maxims of Quantity

Maxim of quantity is about the quantity of the information which is provided by the speaker. It means that the information should be informative and enough, not less or more than is required. The maxim quantity related to the quantity of information to be provided, and under it fall the following maxim:

- (1) Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
- (2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

b) Maxims of Quality

Maxim of quality is about the quality of the information which is provided by the speaker. The information should be true. Grice divided maxim of quality in to two sub maxims:

- (1) Do not say what you believe is false.
- (2) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

c) Maxims of Relation

The maxim of relation (or relevance), for this maxim, Grice writes, though the maxim itself is terse, its formulation conceals several problems that exercise me a good deal: questions about what different kinds and focuses of relevance there may be, how these shift in the course of a talk exchange, how to allow for the fact that subjects of conversations are legitimately changed, and so on. I find the treatment of such questions exceedingly difficult, and I hope to revert to them in later work.

d) Maxims of Manner

This type of maxim is the rule of conversation which the speakers and listeners have to be obvious in providing contribution in a communication exchange. It focuses on how it is said to be rather than what it is said. It means that the information that is provided will be clear. Grice (1975) states that the rule of maxim of quality more specific as follow:

- (1) Avoid obscurity of expression,
- (2) Avoid ambiguity,
- (3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity) and
- (4) Be orderly.

4. The Non-Observance Maxim

However, that there are very many occasions when people fail to observe the maxims. People may fail to observe a maxim, for example in some situations they are incapable of speaking clearly, or because they deliberately choose to lie. There are five ways of failing to observe a maxim:

a. Flouting a Maxims

The speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim in which he has no intention of deceiving or misleading.

b. Violating a Maxim

Grice (1975) state that the speaker violates a maxim when s/he will be liable to mislead the hearer to have such implicature. The speaker deliberately tries to make his utterance overt or to be noticed.

c. Infringing The Maxims

When the speaker has an imperfect knowledge or performance of language, the speaker here infringes the maxims like a young child or a learner of a foreign language who has imperfect command of the language.

d. Opting Out The Maxims

When the speaker opts out from the maxim, s/he seems unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires (Grice, 1975).

e. Suspending The Maxims

The suspending of the maxim of quality can be found in funeral orations and obituaries when the description of the deceased needs to be praiseworthy and exclude any potentially unfavorable aspects of their life or persona

5. The Reasons for Violation of Maxim

There are some ways of maxim flouting used by the speaker in a conversation based on Cutting (2002) explained in detail below.

1) Overstatement

This way of maxim flouting is often used by the speaker to flout the maxim of quantity as they give too much information than what is required. Grundy (2000) called this phenomenon an overstatement. Other than overstatement, Cutting (2002) calls it hyperbole. It is used to exaggerate expression. In other words, it is used to make the speaker's utterance seems more important than it actually is by adding unimportant information.

2) Understatement

It is a kind of maxim flouting strategy in which the speaker gives too little information than the hearer needs to know. Grundy (2000) calls it an understatement in which the importance of the information given by the speaker is less than they need to give to the hearer.

3) Metaphor

Metaphor is one of the ways of maxim flouting in which the speaker describes an object or an action with something in a way that is not literally true, but it has the same characteristics as the one they are referring to so it helps to explain the idea.

4) Irony

The irony is an expression that is apparently polite and friendly but actually offensive. It means that irony is the way of someone to commit flouting maxim by saying something nice but not truthful.

5) Banter

In contrast with irony, banter is an expression that is used by saying something offensive but actually being friendly. It is used to show the intimacy of the speaker and the hearer. Close friends usually banter back and forth easily, like it is their own special language of friendship. But people can also engage in banter with siblings, parents, and even good-natured strangers.

6) Sarcasm

According to Cutting, a kind of irony that is not very friendly is called sarcasm, it is intended to hurt and make someone feel foolish. Sarcastic statements are not meant to be taken literally and commonly, people use sarcasm by saying something that is the opposite of what is true.

7) Irrelevant statement

The irrelevant statement is a strategy of committing flouting maxim of relation, it is exploited by making a response that is obviously irrelevant to the topic. It is usually used when the speaker avoids talking about something or just wants to end the conversation. In giving an irrelevant statement, the hearer is expected to imagine what is the speaker does not say.

8) Ambiguous statement

In an ambiguous statement, the speaker does not mention things straightforward. The speaker is trying to make their utterance to be unclear to the third party that may be near around the corner. This strategy is usually used in maxim flouting of manner as the speaker does not want to include the third party in the conversation.

6. *Hotman Paris Show*

Hotman Paris Show is a talk show broadcast on iNews by inviting several guests to discuss the most controversial issues and events currently being discussed by the people of the country, hosted by Hotman Paris as host, Lolita Agustine, Melaney Ricardo, Wulan Yee, Tenny Amelia Putri, and Vannesa Angel as co-hosts. Hotman Paris, a figure who is known to be tough in courtrooms and persistent in fighting for his clients, is now present to discuss various hot issues and is considered taboo.

Previous researches are important to be known because it can help the researcher to do research that has the same topic or object. In the following explanations, some previous researches can support this research and also conduct reliable and valid research.

Bing (2019) analyzed the Violation of Cooperative Principle in Advertisements, this paper discusses advertisements, whether in the written form or visual/audio. Advertisement creators purposefully violate the cooperative principle to attract audiences and extend their time in interpreting the content. It is revealed that the purposeful violation of CP in advertisements is an art of language and helps to attain the goal of the advertisers.

Li and Liang (2019) analyzed Humor in Yue Yunpeng's Cross-Talks: Based on Cooperative Principles, in the paper conclude that the violation of the maxim of the quality and relevance mainly produces humor. In the process, when violating the maxims, rhetorical devices are often used. People can find the humorous language of the cross-talks directly by data analysis; the audience can better appreciate cross-talks language humor.

There are similarities and differences from the research above. The equation is a researcher using the principle of collaboration with Maxim Grice and researchers analyzing the proverb violation of the talk show, intervention, advertisements, and film events. But in this study different from the previous researcher because this study analyzed the principle of cooperation and violations that occurred in the talk show that gave legal advice in each episode, namely the Hotman Paris Show event.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was be conducted by using qualitative method. Bogdan and Taylor (1975) qualitative research as a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written words or writings from people and observable behavior. The method used in this research is the descriptive method.

To collect the data, the researcher will use documentary technique, Documentary research is defined as research carried out through the use of official documents or personal documents as a source of information. With the video documentary, the researcher recorded conversations between participants in the video and marks the information about the data, and make transcripts to compile data.

In this study, the data analyzed using descriptive qualitative methods. There are several steps that will be taken in analyzing the data, namely: 1) identify the types of maxims and factors that violate the principle of cooperation that occurs at the *Hotman Paris Show*. 2) reducing irrelevant data sources with maxims and factors violate the principle of cooperation. , 3) classifying the data to its types, 4) analyzing the expressions of the principles of cooperation and factors that violate the principle of cooperation that occur in the conversations of the participants and 5) drawing the conclusions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study took data from 17 videos at the Hotman Paris Show which discussed different themes. Researchers have analyzed these videos and obtained results in several categories. In the data analysis principle of cooperation, there are 100 data consisting of a maxim quantity of 64 data (64%), quality of maxim 19 data (19%), a maxim relationship of 8 data (8%), and a maxim of a manner of 9 data (9%). In the analysis of reasons, there were 85 errors made by participants which were divided into understatements of 20 data (24%), irony 17 data (20%), overstatements 13 data (15%), extreme 10 data (12%), sarcasm 8 data (10%), ambiguous statements 7 data (8%), irrelevant statement 6 data (8%), and metaphors 3 data (4%).

Table I. Total of Percentage of Cooperative Principle in *Hotman Paris Show*

No.	Data	F	%
1.	Quantity	64	64%
2.	Quality	19	19%
3.	Relation	8	8%
4.	Manner	9	9%
	Total	100	100%

a. Maxims of Quantity

Maxim of quantity requires the speaker to make what he said in accordance with what is needed. This maxim can be used, for example, in a speech to strengthen something, in a speech for affirmation, in a speech on oaths.

Melaney: Nikita Mirzani, kan lu sekarang single, jujur kalau Hotman Paris ngelamar elu sekarang, lu mau gak jadi binik keduanya Hotman Paris?

Nikita: Kalau ditanya nikah sekarang, aku gak mau, karena sekarang buat niki laki-laki itu cuma ghost

Melaney: Nikita Mirzani, right now you're single, to be honest, if Hotman Paris is applying for you now, do you want to be the second partner of Hotman Paris?

Nikita: When asked about marriage now, I don't want to, because now for a male Niki, it's just a ghost

The context of the dialogue above occurred when Melaney, one of the hosts, asked Nikita Mirzani as a female guest star who had just finished a divorce trial. The above dialogue occurs in one of the episodes with the theme of the mystery of life.

The dialogue above takes place by carrying out the maximal quantity. The implementation of this maxim requires speakers to provide the speech needed by the speech partners, namely so that the speech partners get a reinforcement of opinion and the affirmation they need, because the question */lu mau gak jadi binik keduanya Hotman Paris/* directly answered with */kalau ditanya nikah sekarang, aku gak mau, karena sekarang buat niki laki-laki itu cuma ghost/*.

b. Maxims of Quality

Maxim of quality requires the speaker not to say what the speaker thinks is wrong or does not have strong and sufficient evidence. This maxim can be used, in presumptive speech, forecast/prediction speech, demand speech, suggestion speech. The following illustration is example of the maxim of quantity cooperation principle.

Elza: Diskriminasi, tidak bisa mempertemukan bapak dengan anaknya tapi itu ada kaitannya dengan 768 itu kan dan pelantaran anak tapi kan tidak semuanya pasal dalam itu masuk

Elza: Discrimination, can't meet between father and son, but it has relation with 768 and neglect of children, but not all of the articles in it are included.

The context above discusses the law that is in process reported by Sajad Ukra to the accused Nikita Mirzani and explains the articles that will be the punishment for Nikita Mirzani. Data contained in number 4.

The speech is spoken by a speaker (a lawyer) in a dialogical form. His speech partner is Hotman Paris. The context of the speech is when asked about the law that was violated by Nikita Mirzani in her case. It happened because the speech necessary for hearer obtain correct information or having sufficient evidence, in the form of a prediction because the legal process is still in the process that has not been approved by the Chief Justice.

c. Maxims of Relation (Relevance)

Maxim of relevance requires the speaker to create a strong message that is simple and relevant. This maxim can be used, for example, in announcement speeches, speech prohibitions, speech commands, speech giving promises, speeches of sympathy, speeches of congratulations, speeches of gratitude, speeches giving forgiveness, speeches of apology, speech in vows, speech on the postponement, the speech of giving veto, sentence.

Melaney: Ini minum aja bang, minimal 2 liter sehari dan yang lebih asik lagi Le Minerale ini diambil langsung dari sumber pegunungan terpilih jadi udah pasti

Hotman: Seger banget

Melaney: Nah itu dia, Le Minerale ini bisa menyegarkan hari-hari yang super padat karena ada manis-manisnya

Melaney: Just drink, bro, at least 2 liters a day, and what's even better is Le Minerale is taken directly from selected mountain sources so that's for sure.

Hotman: Really fresh

Melaney: Well there it is, Le Minerale can refresh a super-dense day because there are sweet things

The context of the conversation above was when Hotman Paris and Melaney were doing a sponsorship promotion in one of the episodes that discussed the theme of life is change.

The above speech applies the principle of cooperation by using the maxim of the relationship because there is a sentence */minum aja bang, minimal 2 liter sehari dan yang lebih asik lagi Le Minerale ini diambil langsung dari sumber pegunungan terpilih jadi udah pasti/* the information is included in the announcement speech with answers partner speech with the greeting */Seger banget/*.

d. Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner (Grice calls way) require speakers to avoid ambiguous and obscure expressions. This maxim can be used, for example, in offering speeches, self-offer speeches, urgent messages, affirmative speeches, veto-giving speeches, speech imposing sentences.

Hotman: Dan korbannya beberapa wilayah, ayo panggil dong

Hotman: And the victims are in several areas, let's call them

The context of the speech above occurs when the guest stars who come will discuss the fraud committed by the suspect Pablo, who has many victims. This speech is found in the episode which discusses the theme behind salted fish and the speech is on data number 82.

The above speech occurred when Lolita as the speaker said that after Pablo's arrest, the other lies were raised and known by the public, one of which was a fraud, so his partner Hotman Paris gave a message to urge in the speech */ ayo panggil dong /* which is the principle

Table II Total Percentage of Reasons Participants Violated Maxims in *Hotman Paris Show*

No.	Reasons of Violated Maxims	Occurrence	
		F	%
1.	Overstatements	13	15%
2.	Understatements	20	24%
3.	Metaphor	3	4%
4.	Irony	19	22%
5.	Banter	10	12%
6.	Sarcasm	7	8%
7.	Irrelevant Statement	6	7%
8.	Ambiguous Statements	7	8%
Total		85	100%

a) Overstatements

Denise: Gak, gak tau, gak jelas gitu, kalau saya arahnya kan ada gitu, ya saya mau naikkan toko bunga, lah kalau ini maksudnya apa gitu loh, ini tidak jelas

Denise: No, I don't know, it's not that clear, if I told you the directions were there, so I wanted to raise a flower shop, what does this mean, you know, it's not clear

From the participant's expression above, it happened when the host asked about the participant's behavior in doing social media so that he became famous. The participant's utterances have information overload or even repeat sentences that are not needed /*gak, gak tau, gak jelas gitu*/.

b) Understatements

Melaney: Jadi sebelum sebelumnya belum tipe lu?

Hotman: Enggak kelihatan

Melaney: So before, weren't she your type?

Hotman: I can't see

The conversation above occurred when discussing the criteria for a partner, but the host committed a violation by providing little information / *Enggak kelihatan* / so that it was not in accordance with the maxim of quality.

c) Metaphor

Irma: Eh jam lu asli gak? Bang, abangkan yang ngerti asli-aslian ya

Kumala: Oh ini sabun colek ini mereknya

Irma: Hey, is your watch real or not? Bro, brother, who knows the real thing

Kumala: Oh, this dab soap is the brand

Kumala: Bukan simulasi? Semur jengkol kali

Kumala: Not a simulation? Jengkol stew

Kumala: Emang gue ikan shapu-shapu apa mancing-mancing elu, aneh, bang gimana?

Kumala: Am I a shapu-shapu fish or are you fishing, weird, bro?

In the conversation above, it can be seen that the participants said assumptions that were not in accordance with the topic of discussion such as in the sentence /*Semur jengkol kali*/, /*Emang gue ikan shapu-shapu* / so that the participants violated the maxim.

d) Irony

Kumala: Gue biar halu juga kemaren udah dinobatin jadi ratu halu, emangnya elu

Irma: Jadi ratu halu aja lu bangga kalau gue mah amit-amit, ngapain ratu halu, bangga banget ratu halu kalau gue mah ratu reality, ratu

Kumala: I'll let Halu also be crowned the queen of Halu yesterday, are you really?

Irma: So the queen of halu, you're proud that I'm God forbid, what's the queen of halu really proud of if I'm the queen of reality, queen

Kumala: (Nyanyi)

Irma : Bang, dia suaranya bagus bang tapi lebih bagus kalau diam

Kumala: (Singing)

Irma : Bro, he has a good voice, but it's better if he is silent

The conversation data above, it can be seen that if the participant commits a violation by saying a sentence that aims to offend the interlocutor, it is found in the sentence */Jadi ratu halu aja lu bangga kalau gue mah amit-amit /, /Bang, dia suaranya bagus bang tapi lebih bagus kalau diam/.*

e) Banter

Nikita: Abang, masa dia gak punya calon suami, dia kan perempuan

Lucinta: Aku perempuan, mantan aku aja udah banyak

Billy: Perempuan seutuhnya bang

Hotman: Huh? Are you sure?

Nikita: Brother, when he doesn't have a husband, he's a girl

Lucinta: I'm a girl, I've had a lot of exes

Billy: Whole girl bro

The example of the conversation above is carried out when the speaker and the interlocutor are close friends so that they violate the maxim with the aim of jokes, as in the sentence */Abang, masa dia gak punya calon suami, dia kan perempuan/.*

f) Sarcasm

Nikita: Masa sih, gajinya aja yang dimasukkan dipengadilan itu Rp. 15.000.000,- loh soalnya saya gak pernah miss satu kali persidangan pun saat saya mau bercerai dengan Sajad Ukra, iya gak sih? Gaji palsu loh, saya masih simpan dan ibu bukan yang pertama kan jadi lawyernya si Sajad, ibu itu yang kedua, lawyer yang pertama itu dimaki-maki sampek keluar tau gak, ini kebetulan banget saya ketemu ibu, saya senang banget, terima kasih ini ya buat Hotman Paris Show, karena saya udah capek bu diginiin terus

Nikita: Really, the salary that was included in the court was Rp. 15,000,000, - you know, because I never missed a trial even once when I wanted to divorce Sajad Ukra, didn't I? It's a fake salary, I still keep it and mom isn't the first to be Sajad's lawyer, mother is the second, the first lawyer was abused until he came out, you know, it's a coincidence that I met mom, I'm really happy, thank you for this for the Hotman Paris Show, because I'm already tired, ma'am, keep on watching

In the conversation above, participants give harsh sentences to hurt others and can be in the form of ridicule or ridicule such as *as / ibu bukan yang pertama kan jadi lawyernya si Sajad, ibu itu yang kedua, lawyer yang pertama itu dimaki-maki sampek keluar tau gak/*.

g) Irrelevant Statement

Wulan: Terus itu hubungannya gimana sama mama Iis?

Lutfi: Eh tapi ngomong-ngomong bang Hotman lebih tau kan tetanggan dulu

Wulan: So what's the relationship with Mama Iis?

Lutfi: Eh, but by the way, Hotman knows better his neighbors first

h) Ambiguous Statements

Hotman: Apa yang menarik dari dia? Kulitnya atau apanya?

Melaney: Apa yang menarik dari dia? Kulitnya, dagingnya atau bijinya? (tertawa) jeruk kali ah

Hotman: What's so interesting about him? The skin or what?

Melaney: What's so attractive about him? The skin, the flesh or the seeds? (laughs) Kali oranges ah.

The conversation above is seen if the participant gives an unclear statement so that it can make the listener or interlocutor have different thoughts or even do not understand the sentence spoken by the speaker, such as in the sentence */Kulitnya, dagingnya atau bijinya? (tertawa) jeruk kali ah/*.

The first problem, in the conversation of the participants at the Hotman Paris Show that had been selected in 17 videos uploaded by YouTube, it was found that the types of maxims based on Grice's theory (1975) were: 64 expressions of the maxim of quantity, 19 expressions of the maxim of quality, 9 expressions of the maxim of manner, and 8 expressions of the maxim of the relationship. All types of cooperation principles are found in the participant dialogue at the Hotman Paris Show, so based on the findings above, it can be concluded that participants at the Hotman Paris Show have adhered to the principle of cooperation and mostly adhere to the principle of cooperation on the maxim of quantity. So the maxim that is most commonly found on the *Hotman Paris Show* is the maxim of quantity because there are many utterances that discuss the law not only to victims but also to the whole community who watched the event.

In the second problem, the researcher uses Cutting theory (2002) to answer the reasons why the participants made mistakes when communicating as many as 83 data with the highest factors, namely

understatement with 20 data, irony 17 data, overstatement 13 data, extreme 10 data, sarcasm 8 data, ambiguous statements 7 data, irrelevant statement 6 data, and metaphors 3 data.

CONCLUSION

This study discusses the principle of cooperation in the Hotman Paris Show. After analyzing the data based on the results of this study. The researchers concluded that:

1. There are 4 principles of cooperation adopted by the participants, namely the maxims of quantity, quality, relationship, and method. Specifically, there are 64 maxims of quantity, 29 maxims of quality, 9 maxims of manner, and 8 maxims of relationship.
2. The 8 factors that became the reasons for the participants to violate the cooperative principle were understatement with 20 data, irony 17 data, overstatement 13 data, extreme 10 data, sarcasm 8 data, ambiguous statements 7 data, irrelevant statement 6 data, and metaphors 3 data

SUGGESTIONS

Taking into account the research results and conclusions there are several suggestions put forward as follows:

1. In implicature it does not only discuss conversational implicatures but also has two other types, namely conventional implicatures and politeness implicatures so that they can be taken into consideration for further research to analyze these implicatures.
2. With the factors that result in a violation of the cooperative principle, further researchers can use other theories.

REFERENCES

Bing, Xu. (2019, Vol 329). The Violation of Cooperative Principle in Advertisements. *International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Humanities*.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: a Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.

Dwi, Asri. (2015, Vol. 4, No. 2.). An Analysis Of Flouting Maxim In Efl Classroom Interaction. *Journal Vision*, 243 – 259.

Gazdar, G. (1979). *Pragmatic Implicative, Presupposition and Logical Form*. New York: Academia Press

Grice, H. (1975). *Logic and Converstation, in P.Cole and J.L. Morganeds, Syntax and Semantics*. New York: Academia Press.

Grundy, Pr. (2000). *Doing Pracmatic*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambrige University Press.

Parker, F. (1986). *Linguistics For Non-Linguists*. London. UK: Taylor and Francis Ltd.

Samaie, Mahmoud and Arianmanesh, Maha (2018, ISSN: 1305-578). Comprehension of conversational implicature in an Iranian EFL context: A validation study. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 44-62.

Suharsono. (2010, Vol : 3, No : 2). *Interpersonal Function of The Implicatures Utterances in Indonesian in Verbal Discourse* .

Xin Lu, X. L. (2019, Vol 15, No 2, ISSN 1712-8358). Analysis of The Humors in Yue Yunpeng's Cross Talks : Based on Cooperative Principles. *Cross-Cultural Communication* , 29-34

Yule. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York : Oxford University Press.