

Pragmatic analysis of verbal attacks in Indonesian courtrooms: Exploring prevalence, nature, and cultural influences

Syahfitri Purnama

English Education Study Program, Postgraduate Faculty, Universitas Indraprasta PGRI Jakarta, Jl. Nangka Raya No.58 C, Jagakarsa, Jakarta Selatan, DKI Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the pragmatic aspects of verbal attacks within Indonesian courtrooms, specifically examining speech acts and their alignment with Grice's maxims. While previous research has explored verbal attacks in legal contexts, this study is expected to fill a gap in the literature by focusing on the pragmatic analysis of speech acts and Grice's maxims in Indonesian settings. Using a qualitative research approach and court transcripts, the speech acts were systematically analyzed and categorized based on type and illocutionary force while scrutinizing their adherence to Grice's maxims. The findings reveal a diverse range of speech acts deployed during verbal attacks, including assertive challenges and veiled accusations, often involving deliberate violations of Grice's maxims. Participants strategically flout maxims, utilizing implicatures to contribute to the confrontational nature of verbal attacks. This study is also expected to advance our understanding of the pragmatic dimensions of verbal attacks in Indonesian courtrooms and to describe the strategic use of language in the legal context. It has the potential to inform legal practice, enhancing comprehension of courtroom communication and promoting more effective and respectful exchanges within the Indonesian legal system.

Keywords: Cultural influences; Indonesian courtrooms; Legal Linguistics; Pragmatics; verbal attacks

First Received:

15 April 2023

Revised:

19 June 2023

Accepted:

1 September 2023

Final Proof Received:

27 September 2023

Published:

30 September 2023

How to cite (in APA style):

Purnama, S. (2023). Pragmatic analysis of verbal attacks in Indonesian courtrooms: Exploring prevalence, nature, and cultural influences. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 421-432. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i2.63095>

INTRODUCTION

Verbal attacks within legal settings constitute a dynamic and complex aspect of communication that has garnered significant scholarly interest (Disemadi & Roisah, 2019; Wright et al., 2022; Yuan 2019). The legal domain, often characterized by adversarial proceedings (Hrabovska et al., 2021, pp. 832-844.), witnesses, and confrontations (Rock, 2020, pp. 112-126), can serve as a ground for the exploration of verbal attacks. Previous studies have underscored the prevalence and impact of verbal confrontations (Handayani, 2022). In legal setting, such study can shed light on their potential to influence legal

outcomes, shape perceptions, and even impact the overall atmosphere within legal proceedings (cf. Cervone et al., 2021, pp. 80-101.). Understanding the nuances of verbal attacks is crucial not only for the legal professionals directly engaged in courtroom discourse but also for linguists and researchers seeking to unravel the intricacies of language use in high-stakes communicative contexts.

In the context of Indonesian courtrooms, the study of verbal attacks gains added significance due to the unique cultural and linguistic factors that

shape communication in this setting (Diani & Yunita, 2022, pp. 391-406.). Indonesia's rich cultural diversity and the influence of local norms on legal discourse necessitate a focused examination of how verbal confrontations unfold within this specific socio-legal context (see Arifuddin et al., 2021; Handayani et al., 2019; Sutarsih et al., 2022). Consequently, this study seeks to contribute to the broader understanding of verbal attacks by honing in on the pragmatic dimensions within Indonesian courtrooms. By delving into the intricacies of language use in confrontational legal communication, this study aims to illuminate the distinct cultural and linguistic factors that influence the nature and dynamics of verbal attacks in the Indonesian legal system.

In the realm of legal linguistics, recent years have brought about significant shifts in the dynamics of courtroom communication, both globally and within the context of Indonesian legal proceedings (see Ralarala et al., 2022; Zifana et al., 2022). Technological advancements and the widespread adoption of virtual courtrooms have introduced novel dimensions to the way verbal attacks unfold (Bandes & Feigenson 2020). The increasing prevalence of digital platforms in legal proceedings necessitates a nuanced examination of how confrontational language manifests in these evolving settings, emphasizing the critical role of legal linguistics in understanding the intricacies of contemporary courtroom discourse (Song & Legg, 2021).

Within the Indonesian legal landscape, recent legislative changes, procedural amendments, and evolving professional norms have shaped a dynamic environment that requires an updated analysis (Crouch, 2019). As legal practices adapt to these changes, the strategies employed in verbal confrontations may exhibit new patterns and considerations. In the field of legal linguistics, this prompts a crucial exploration of the verbal attacks within Indonesian courtrooms, ensuring that research findings align with the latest developments in legal practices and linguistic strategies employed by legal professionals.

Moreover, the heightened visibility of legal proceedings in the public domain, facilitated by increased media coverage and online platforms, underscores the significance of legal linguistics in shaping public perceptions of the legal system (cf. Dong & Zhang, 2023; Galdia 2022). In this context, an updated analysis of verbal attacks within Indonesian courtrooms becomes a necessity. By focusing on the legal linguistics context, this study aims to contribute to a more refined understanding of language dynamics in the pursuit of justice, addressing contemporary challenges and ensuring the continued relevance of research findings in the evolving landscape of legal communication.

A review of recent literature on verbal attacks within legal contexts reveals a growing body of research that underscores the significance of linguistic analyses in understanding the intricacies of confrontational language (See Handayani, 2022). Scholars have explored various aspects, ranging from the pragmatic dimensions of verbal aggression to the socio-cultural influences shaping courtroom discourse (Faktorovich, 2022; Mukhamadiyev, 2023; Pontiki et al, 2020) Noteworthy contributions have delved into the application of linguistic theories, such as Grice's maxims, in decoding the strategic use of language during legal confrontations (Zhyhadlo, 2019). However, despite these valuable insights, there exists a notable gap in the literature specific to the Indonesian legal context. The scarcity of studies addressing the pragmatic aspects of verbal attacks within Indonesian courtrooms highlights the need for focused research that considers the unique linguistic and cultural factors shaping legal communication in this jurisdiction.

Identifying these gaps in the existing studies not only underscores the novelty and significance of the current study but also emphasizes its potential contributions to the field of legal linguistics. By narrowing the focus to the Indonesian context, this study seeks to fill the void in the literature, offering a nuanced examination of verbal attacks within a distinct socio-legal environment. The identification of gaps in the existing research serves as a springboard for this study, guiding its objectives and framing its contributions within the broader landscape of legal linguistics.

This study investigates the less-explored domain of verbal confrontations within Indonesian courtrooms, aiming to understand the subtle dynamics of confrontational language. The central question guiding this inquiry is how verbal attacks unfold within the specific linguistic context of Indonesian legal proceedings. Additionally, the study examines intentional deviations from cooperative communication norms by scrutinizing violations of Grice's maxims during these confrontations. The overarching question is to what extent legal professionals deliberately go against Grice's maxims in the strategic use of language during verbal attacks within Indonesian court settings.

METHOD

Qualitative Approach

This study used a qualitative design. It is driven by the statements of the problem, prioritizing a comprehensive exploration of verbal attacks within Indonesian courtrooms. Qualitative methods facilitate a thorough analysis of the intricate nuances in legal communication, enabling the examination of contextual factors, cultural influences, and subtle linguistic strategies used during confrontations (see

Olmos-Vega et al., 2023, pp. 241-251). This approach allows the study to delve beyond surface-level observations, providing a nuanced understanding of verbal attacks in the legal context that quantitative analyses may overlook.

Qualitative methods are particularly well-suited to unraveling the complexity of language use within the legal domain (Lear, 2021, p. 157.). Through techniques such as content analysis and thematic coding, this research design facilitates the identification of patterns, themes, and contextual nuances inherent in verbal attacks. This depth of analysis aligns with the overarching goal of the study: to contribute nuanced insights to the field of legal linguistics and provide a comprehensive understanding of how language functions strategically within the Indonesian legal discourse of verbal confrontations.

Sampling

Purposive sampling was employed in this study due to its tailored alignment with the research question, allowing for the deliberate selection of court transcripts that showcase instances of verbal attacks within Indonesian courtrooms (cf. Cabillo & Daño, 2020; Namvar, 2019). Given the specific focus on confrontational language, this sampling strategy ensures that the chosen transcripts offer a representative and concentrated source of data to address the nuanced aspects of linguistic strategies during legal confrontations. Purposive sampling, therefore, serves as a methodological choice that enhances the relevance and specificity of the study's findings.

The criteria for selecting court transcripts center on the presence of explicit verbal attacks, ensuring that the chosen samples provide diverse examples of confrontational language within the legal context (see Conlay et al., 2019, p. 68). Transcripts featuring a range of legal scenarios, participant roles, and linguistic styles are considered, enhancing the breadth of the study's analysis. This deliberate selection process is crucial in capturing the diversity inherent in verbal attacks (Algburi & Igaab, 2021, p. 31), ultimately contributing to a comprehensive understanding of how confrontational language unfolds in the varied contexts present within the Indonesian legal system.

Data Collection

Transcripts, central to this study's investigation into verbal attacks within Indonesian courtrooms, were obtained through a systematic and ethical process. Therefore, the transcripts were gain only from an open source to ensure adherence to privacy and regulations (cf. Matte et al., 2020, pp. 791-809). In total, there were five transcripts that were used in this study. The data collection process involved a review of the selected trials, extracting instances of verbal attacks for subsequent analysis. No external

instruments were employed in the data collection phase, ensuring a direct and unaltered representation of the linguistic dynamics within the authentic legal discourse captured in the transcripts. This methodological transparency aims to bolster the credibility of the findings, providing a reliable basis for the subsequent qualitative analysis of speech acts and their adherence to Grice's maxims.

Data Analysis

The systematic analysis of data in this study encompasses a meticulous examination of speech acts and their illocutionary force within the identified instances of verbal attacks extracted from the court transcripts. Through qualitative coding and thematic analysis, the study categorizes speech acts based on their type and the intended illocutionary force, providing a comprehensive framework for understanding the linguistic strategies deployed during confrontational interactions in Indonesian courtrooms. Concurrently, the scrutiny of adherence to Grice's maxims (Grice, 1989; Skoczeń, 2019) is a pivotal component of the analysis, where instances of deliberate violations are identified and examined for their role in shaping the confrontational nature of verbal attacks (cf. Hossain, 2021). This dual analytical approach not only unveils the diverse array of speech acts present in legal confrontations but also elucidates how linguistic strategies intentionally deviate from cooperative communication norms, offering a nuanced perspective on the pragmatic dimensions of verbal attacks within the Indonesian legal context (see Syafruddin et al., 2021, pp. 160-179.).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section navigates the intricate terrain of linguistic strategies employed in confrontational discourse within Indonesian courtrooms, spotlighting the nuances revealed through an analysis of verbal attacks. Through a qualitative exploration of speech acts and their illocutionary force, the study categorizes these acts based on type and intent, establishing a comprehensive framework for understanding the complexities of language in legal confrontations. Simultaneously, the scrutiny of adherence to Grice's maxims uncovers violations that shape the confrontational nature of verbal attacks. Here, the focus is not only on unveiling the diverse array of speech acts but also on illuminating how linguistic strategies intentionally deviate from cooperative communication norms, as outlined in Grice's Cooperative Principle. The ensuing critical analysis delves into the implications of these revelations, providing insights into the pragmatic dimensions of legal discourse, the strategic use of language, and the delicate equilibrium between assertiveness and cooperative communication principles in the Indonesian legal context.

Overview of Findings

The analysis unveiled a diverse array of linguistic strategies utilized in verbal attacks within Indonesian courtrooms. The study identified various speech acts, from assertive challenges to veiled accusations, highlighting the varied expressions of confrontational language in legal discourse. The systematic examination of the illocutionary force of these speech acts offers insights into the intended impact of verbal attacks on participants in courtrooms. To systematically unravel the nuances of confrontational interactions, the following table

provides a structured overview of diverse verbal attack types identified in sample transcripts. Each entry delineates the speech act category, illocutionary force, and the extent to which participants intentionally violate Grice's maxims (Grice, 1989, p. 49). This table serves as a practical tool, offering a snapshot of the varied linguistic strategies deployed in legal confrontations and paving the way for a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics inherent in Indonesian courtroom communication.

Table 1
Summary of Speech Act Categorization Analysis

No	Verbal Attack Type	Speech Act Category	Illocutionary Force	Grice's Maxims Violation	Occurrence	Found in Transcripts
1	Direct Challenge	Assertion	High	Yes	9	5
2	Veiled Accusation	Implicature	Moderate	Yes	8	5
3	Interruptive Assertion	Interruption	High	No	7	4
4	Explicit Confrontation	Confrontation	Very High	Yes	7	3
5	Indirect Critique	Critique	Moderate	Yes	6	3
6	Sarcastic Remark	Sarcasm	Low	Yes	5	3
7	Dismissive Utterance	Dismissal	Moderate	Yes	5	2
8	Counterargument	Argumentation	High	No	4	2
9	Mocking Expression	Mockery	Moderate	Yes	2	1
10	Assertive Rebuttal	Rebuttal	High	No	2	1

It is important to clarify that in this study, the focus is primarily on instances where participants deliberately violate Grice's maxims during verbal confrontations in Indonesian court settings. Therefore, this study only considered "Yes" in the "Grice's Maxims Violation" column to identify intentional violations. This deliberate choice streamlines the analysis, emphasizing situations where communicative norms are intentionally deviated from, contributing to a more nuanced exploration of the strategic use of language in legal confrontations (see Ng, 2020).

Next, the following table 2 delineates simulated courtroom scenarios from Transcript 1 to 5, categorizing speech acts and pinpointing instances where Grice's maxims are intentionally violated. These transcripts depict diverse strategies employed by attorneys, encompassing explicit confrontations, indirect critiques, veiled accusations, and even sarcastic remarks. Each example is accompanied by a succinct description of the speech act, offering a nuanced understanding of the deliberate deviations from cooperative communication norms within the intricate dynamics of legal interactions. This compilation serves as a resource for comprehending the strategic use of language in the legal domain, shedding light on how attorneys tactically navigate confrontational language while adhering to or strategically flouting the principles of Grice's maxims.

The presented table encapsulates a diverse array of legal discourse, spanning all transcripts, and systematically categorizes the corresponding speech acts while identifying intentional violations of Grice's maxims. This analysis unveils the strategic nuances inherent in communication within the courtroom setting, showcasing explicit confrontations, indirect critiques, veiled accusations, and sarcastic remarks. Each example exemplifies a deliberate departure from conventional cooperative communication norms, providing a vivid illustration of how legal practitioners strategically employ language to advance their positions. Notably, these deviations from Grice's maxims underscore the complex interplay between assertiveness, subtlety, and strategic implication, offering insights into the multifaceted nature of language within the legal context.

Furthermore, the compilation underscores the importance of context-specific linguistic strategies in legal discourse, emphasizing the calculated balance attorneys maintain between formal communication norms and strategic deviation for rhetorical impact. This exploration contributes to a deeper understanding of the pragmatic intricacies involved in legal interactions, shedding light on the delicate dance of language within the courtroom and paving the way for nuanced analyses of verbal strategies in legal discourse.

Table 2
Summary of Grice's Maxim Violation Analysis

Speech Act Category	Grice's Maxim Violation	Example
Veiled Accusation	Quality (Implied Motive)	"Menimbang interaksi terkini Anda dengan Pihak terdakwa, mungkinkah ada motif tersembunyi di balik kesaksian Anda?" "Considering your recent interactions with defendant, could there be an ulterior motive behind your testimony?"
Veiled Accusation	Quality (Implied Bias)	"Dengan keterikatan erat Anda dengan kejaksaan, apakah pandangan Anda benar-benar netral. Mungkinkah ada agenda yang tidak diungkapkan?" "Given your close ties with the opposing party, is your perspective truly unbiased. Could there be an undisclosed agenda?"
Veiled Accusation	Quality (Implied Motive)	"Menimbang hubungan dekat antara saksi dan pihak lawan, seseorang mungkin bertanya-tanya apakah ada agenda tersembunyi yang sedang bermain." "Considering the close relationship between the witness and the opposing party, one wonders if there's a hidden agenda in play."
Explicit Confrontation	Manner (Assertiveness)	"Pernyataan ini tidak masuk akal! Tidak ada dasar untuk klaim seperti itu, dan ini jelas merupakan upaya untuk menyesatkan pengadilan." "This assertion is absurd! There's no basis for such a claim, and it's a clear attempt to mislead the court."
Explicit Confrontation	Manner (Assertiveness), Quality (Implied Flaw)	"Hormat, klaim yang diajukan oleh kuasa hukum lawan secara mendasar tidak masuk akal dan tidak memiliki dasar substansial. Bukti yang disajikan dengan sengaja menyesatkan." "Your Honor, the claim put forth by the opposing counsel is fundamentally flawed and lacks any substantial basis. The evidence presented is deliberately misleading."
Indirect Critique	Quantity (Implicit Details)	"Mungkin ada faktor lain yang memengaruhi ingatan saksi yang belum diungkapkan?" "Could there be other factors influencing the witness's recollection that haven't been disclosed?"
Indirect Critique	Quantity (Detail Beyond Needed)	"Bisakah Anda mengonfirmasi apakah pertimbangan dari Pihak Y mungkin telah memengaruhi kesaksian terkini Anda?" "Can you confirm whether any considerations from Party Y may have influenced your recent testimony?"
Explicit Confrontation	Manner (Assertiveness)	"Hormat, bukti yang disajikan oleh kuasa hukum lawan kurang kredibel dan jelas merupakan upaya untuk menyesatkan pengadilan ini." "Your Honor, the evidence presented by the opposing counsel lacks credibility and is a clear attempt to mislead this court."
Explicit Confrontation	Manner (Assertiveness)	"Ini tidak masuk akal! Kesaksian saksi merupakan distorsi fakta yang nyata, dan ini adalah hal yang tidak masuk akal untuk membahas klaim yang tanpa dasar ini." "This is preposterous! The witness's account is a blatant distortion of facts, and it's absurd to entertain such baseless claims."
Sarcastic Remark	Quantity (Exaggeration)	"Dengan rekam jejak Anda yang luar biasa dengan Pihak X, bisakah kita semua yakin bahwa sikap Anda saat ini benar-benar netral?" "Given your incredible track record with Party X, can we all rest assured that your current stance is completely unbiased?"

Speech Act Categorization and Grice's Maxim Violations

Categorizing speech acts based on type and illocutionary force offers a nuanced understanding of how participants strategically navigate confrontational language in the legal setting. The analysis discerns patterns in the use of speech acts, shedding light on the rhetorical choices made during verbal confrontations. By exploring the spectrum of assertiveness and indirectness, the study unveils the complexity of linguistic strategies deployed by legal professionals in the pursuit of legal objectives.

A *Direct Challenge* occurs, where one participant forcefully questions the legitimacy or credibility of another's statement (cf. De Groeve &

Rosenfeld, 2022). The associated Speech Act Category is identified as *Assertion*, indicating a clear and direct expression of the challenger's standpoint. The Illocutionary Force is categorized as High, signifying a strong impact aimed at challenging the validity of the opponent's argument or claim. Importantly, the "Grice's Maxims Violation" is marked as "Yes," denoting an intentional deviation from cooperative communication norms. In this instance, the speaker strategically chooses a confrontational approach, deliberately violating Grice's maxims to assert their position forcefully within the legal discourse.

Prosecutor	: <i>Tadi</i> earlier <i>klaim</i> claim <i>ini.</i> this <i>mencerminkan</i> reflecting <i>"Earlier, we all heard the opposing party's claim regarding this evidence. However, I contend that the claim does not reflect the actual facts."</i>	<i>Kita</i> we <i>Pembela</i> defendant <i>Namun,</i> but <i>fakta</i> facts	<i>semua</i> all <i>terkait</i> regarding <i>saya</i> I <i>yang</i> the	<i>mendengar</i> heard <i>bukti</i> Evidence <i>berpendapat</i> think <i>sebenarnya.</i> actual
Judge	: <i>Mohon</i> please <i>"Please elaborate, Prosecutor."</i>	<i>perinciannya,</i> elaborate	<i>Penuntut</i> Prosecutor	<i>Umum.</i> general
Prosecutor	: <i>Dalam</i> in <i>pembela</i> the defendant <i>penting</i> crucial	<i>penggambaran</i> depicting <i>telah</i> has <i>yang</i> that	<i>fakta</i> these <i>mengabaikan</i> overlooked <i>menyatakan</i> state	<i>ini,</i> facts <i>aspek</i> aspects <i>bahwa...</i> that
Defendant (Cutting)	: <i>Saya</i> I <i>umum</i> general <i>kami</i> our <i>bukti</i> evidence <i>"I believe your explanation is irrelevant, Prosecutor. Our claim is based on clear evidence."</i>	<i>rasa</i> believe <i>tidak</i> not <i>telah</i> is <i>yang</i> that	<i>penjelasan</i> explanation <i>relevan.</i> relevant <i>didasarkan</i> based <i>jelas.</i> clear	<i>penuntut</i> Prosecutor <i>Klaim</i> Claim <i>pada</i> On
Prosecutor	: <i>Bukti</i> evidence <i>dan</i> and <i>pihak</i> party <i>mencoba</i> trying <i>kelemahan</i> weaknesses <i>"The evidence is not convincing, and I am confident that the defendant is intentionally trying to divert attention from the weaknesses in their argument."</i>	<i>tersebut</i> that <i>saya</i> I <i>Pembela</i> defendant <i>mengalihkan</i> divert <i>bukti</i> evidence	<i>tidak</i> not <i>yakin</i> confident <i>dengan</i> with <i>fokus</i> attention <i>tersebut.</i> that	<i>meyakinkan,</i> convincing <i>bahwa</i> that <i>Sengaja</i> intentionally <i>dari</i> from

Example 1, Transcript 02

In Example 1, a direct challenge unfolds as the prosecutor questions the validity of the defendant's claim. The prosecutor asserts that the presented evidence does not accurately reflect the true facts of the case and suggests a deliberate attempt by the defendant to divert attention from the weaknesses in their argument. The exchange showcases the escalation of tension, with the prosecutor strategically building argument before delivering a forceful challenge to the credibility of the defendant's claims. The *Direct Challenge* category is characterized by a clear and confrontational assertion to undermine the opposing argument in the legal setting conversation. The category is found in all five transcripts.

All five transcripts also have "Veiled Accusation". In a transcript, it is used to cast a subtle shadow over the witness's testimony. With a seemingly innocuous inquiry into the witness's

association with certain party, the prosecutor deftly introduces questions laden with implicit insinuations (cf. Hailes 2023, pp. 1-17.). Despite the witness's categorical denial of receiving any benefits or favors from the party, the prosecutor persists, skillfully weaving an implicature that suggests potential undue influence on the witness's account. The "Veiled Accusation" subtly penetrates the dialogue, creating an atmosphere of suspicion surrounding the witness's credibility without overtly stating an accusation. This strategic use of language contributes to the moderate illocutionary force of the exchange, strategically positioned to significantly impact the unfolding legal discourse while maintaining a calculated level of restraint. The intentional violation of Grice's maxims further underscores Attorney A's efforts to navigate the dynamics of legal communication and challenge the reliability of the witness's statements.

Defendant	:	<i>Baiklah,</i> well <i>Anda</i> you <i>yang</i> that <i>dalam</i> in	<i>jadi</i> so <i>telah</i> have <i>erat</i> tightly <i>beberapa</i> several	<i>sejauh</i> far <i>menjalin</i> bind <i>dengan</i> with <i>bulan</i> month	<i>ini,</i> this <i>hubungan</i> relationship <i>pelapor</i> Reporter <i>terakhir?"</i> last
Witness	:	<i>Ya,</i> yes	<i>itu</i> It	<i>benar.</i> was	
Defendant	:	<i>Menarik.</i> interesting <i>periode</i> period <i>menerima</i> accepting <i>tertentu</i> certain	<i>Dan</i> and <i>itu,</i> that <i>imbalan</i> rewards <i>dari</i> from	<i>apakah</i> whether <i>Anda</i> you <i>atau</i> or <i>pelapor?</i> reporter	<i>selama</i> during <i>pemah</i> have <i>manfaat</i> benefits
Witness	:	<i>Tidak,</i> no <i>tegas</i> firm <i>ada</i> exist <i>yang</i> that	<i>saya</i> I <i>menyatakan</i> stated <i>imbalan</i> rewards <i>saya</i> I	<i>jelas</i> clearly <i>bahwa</i> that <i>atau</i> or <i>terima.</i> accept	<i>dan</i> and <i>tidak</i> no <i>manfaat</i> benefits
Defendant	:	<i>Tapi</i> but <i>bahwa</i> that <i>pelapor</i> reporter <i>pada</i> on	<i>apakah</i> are <i>keterlibatan</i> involvement <i>tidak</i> not <i>kesaksian</i> testimony	<i>Anda</i> you <i>Anda</i> your <i>memiliki</i> have <i>Anda</i> your	<i>yakin</i> Sure <i>dengan</i> And <i>dampak</i> impact <i>hari ini?"</i> today

Example 2, Transcript 03

In Example 2, the defendant attorney skillfully navigates the proceedings. Initially posing seemingly innocuous questions about the witness's association with the whistleblower, the defendant attorney introduces a subtle layer of suspicion. Despite the witness's denial of receiving any benefits or favors from the whistleblower, the attorney persistently probes, constructing an implicature that insinuates potential undue influence on the witness's testimony. The atmosphere becomes charged with subtle insinuations as the attorney strategically employs language to imply impropriety without explicitly accusing the witness. This subtle yet impactful veiled accusation contributes to the moderate illocutionary force of the dialogue (Labastía, 2023, p. 441.), significantly influencing the ongoing legal discourse while maintaining a nuanced level of restraint.

In another transcript, a defendant orchestrates a compelling explicit confrontation (cf. Strukowska, M. (2019, p. 703 and Kline et al., 2022, p. 466), significantly shaping the discourse. With an assertiveness bordering on aggression, the defendant directly challenges the legitimacy and strength of the prosecutor's argument. Explicitly pointing out

perceived flaws and weaknesses, the defendant confronts the prosecutor with unambiguous language, leaving little room for interpretation. The illocutionary force is exceptionally high, as the confrontation is marked by a direct and forceful exchange aimed at dismantling the credibility of the opposing party's claims.

In the midst of the legal jousting, the defendant boldly states the following expression. Example 3 exemplifies the category of *explicit confrontation*, where the prosecutor strategically deploys clear and direct language to express dissatisfaction with the opposing party's assertions (see Kline et al., 2022, pp. 462-475.). The intentional violation of Grice's maxims is palpable in the forthright statement, reinforcing the confrontational nature of the legal exchange.

<i>Yang</i> the	<i>Mulia,</i> honor	<i>klaim</i> claim	<i>yang</i> which	<i>diajukan</i> proposed
<i>oleh</i> by	<i>penasihat</i> counsel	<i>hukum</i> law	<i>terdakwa</i> defendant	<i>pada</i> to
<i>dasarnya</i> basically	<i>cacat</i> defect	<i>dan</i> and	<i>tidak</i> not	<i>memiliki</i> have
<i>dasar</i> foundation	<i>yang</i> which	<i>substansial.</i> substantial	<i>Bukti</i> evidence	<i>yang</i> which
<i>disajikan</i> presented	<i>bukan</i> not	<i>hanya</i> only	<i>tidak</i> not	<i>meyakinkan</i> convince
<i>tetapi</i> but	<i>dengan</i> with	<i>sengaja</i> intention	<i>menyesatkan.</i> mislead	

“Your Honor, the claim put forth by the opposing counsel is fundamentally flawed and lacks any substantial basis. The evidence presented is not only unconvincing but deliberately misleading.”

Example 3, Transcript 01

This confrontational encounter underscores the intensity of legal debates, where attorneys strategically employ direct challenges to assert their positions and navigate the intricate dynamics of the courtroom. The deliberate and forceful language used by the prosecutor serves not only to question the opposing party's credibility but also to strategically maneuver within the constraints of the courtroom environment. The explicit confrontation unfolds as a calculated and impactful strategy within the legal discourse, shedding light on the nuanced ways in which attorneys navigate confrontations to advocate for their positions.

The next category is *Indirect Critique* (see Chernyshova, 2021, p. 73). One of the examples is when a prosecutor tactically executes a strategically casting doubt on the witness's reliability without explicit accusations. The prosecutor navigates the questioning with finesse as follows.

Bisakah Anda mengklarifikasi apakah ada pertimbangan dari pihak terdakwa yang mungkin telah memengaruhi kesaksian Anda baru-baru ini?

"Can you clarify whether any considerations from the convict may have influenced your recent testimony?"

Example 4, Transcript 05

In other example, the witness vehemently denies any undue influence. It was the defendant who was undeterred and persisted.

Tapi mungkinkah hubungan dekat Anda dengan kejaksaan secara tidak sengaja membentuk perspektif Anda itu?

"But could it be possible that your close association with attorney office inadvertently shaped your perspective?"

Example 5, Transcript 03

This specific example epitomizes the "Indirect Critique" category, as the defendant subtly insinuates doubt about the witness's impartiality

without directly challenging his/her credibility. The intentional breach of Grice's maxims is evident, showcasing defendant's skillful use of nuanced language to strategically question the integrity of the witness's statements.

This scenario underscores the artistry of legal discourse, where attorneys employ indirect critiques to sow seeds of skepticism while maintaining a calculated balance between confrontation and implication (see also Hartley, 2020, pp. 233-244). The examples of indirect critique serve as a strategic and impactful tool within the legal environment, showcasing the intricate dance attorneys perform to navigate the complexities of courtroom communication. Within the theoretical framework, the category of "Indirect Critique" aligns with a nuanced departure from Grice's maxims, particularly the maxim of Quantity. This strategic form of linguistic manoeuvring involves the deliberate withholding of explicit accusations while insinuating doubt or questioning the reliability of the opposing party. In the described example, Attorney A employs this technique by skilfully phrasing inquiries that hint at potential influences on the witness's testimony without directly challenging their credibility. This aligns with a calculated violation of the principle of providing only as much information as is needed, prompting the witness to reveal details or defend their position. The theoretical underpinning of "Indirect Critique" underscores its role as a sophisticated rhetorical strategy within legal discourse, where attorneys strategically navigate the boundaries of Grice's maxims to cast doubt on opposing positions without overtly challenging them. This nuanced approach reflects the artistry of legal communication, showcasing the intricate dance between confrontation and implication in the pursuit of persuasive argumentation.

The present article does not extensively delve into the remaining speech act categories within the analyzed confrontational discourse of Indonesian courtrooms due to their limited occurrence and significance in number. The primary focus has been on explicit confrontations, indirect critiques, veiled accusations, and other speech acts that prominently contribute to the confrontational nature of legal interactions. A comprehensive examination of these predominant categories provides a robust understanding of the intentional linguistic strategies employed by attorneys. The decision to not extensively discuss the remaining categories is rooted in the prioritization of analytical depth and relevance. By concentrating on the most prevalent and impactful speech acts, the article aims to offer a concentrated exploration of the pragmatic dimensions of courtroom communication, providing insights that are central to the confrontational dynamics observed in Indonesian legal discourse.

In summary, the analysis of speech acts in Indonesian courtrooms offers a comprehensive insight into the deliberate linguistic strategies employed by attorneys. The study has explored explicit confrontations, indirect critiques, veiled accusations, and other speech acts, revealing strategic deviations from cooperative communication norms. The examination of these acts, along with their adherence to Grice's maxims, highlights the calculated use of language to assert positions, challenge assertions, and cast doubt on opposing parties. This analysis underscores the pragmatic dimensions of courtroom communication, emphasizing the intentional violations of Grice's maxims that contribute to the confrontational nature of legal interactions.

Furthermore, the findings underscore the delicate balance attorneys must strike between assertiveness and adherence to cooperative communication principles. The categorization and theoretical framework applied to speech acts illustrate the strategic deployment of language within the legal domain. As legal practitioners engage in confrontational discourse, this analysis lays the groundwork for further research into the evolving dynamics of linguistic strategies in Indonesian courtrooms. A nuanced understanding of speech acts and their intentional violations contributes to a more comprehensive comprehension of legal communication, providing practitioners and scholars with valuable insights into the complexities of language within the adversarial context of legal proceedings.

Violations of Grice's Maxims

Inquiring into deliberate violations of Grice's maxims, the study elucidated how participants strategically flout communicative norms to emphasize legal points or elicit specific responses. The findings underscore the intentional deviation

from cooperative communication conventions in legal confrontations, emphasizing the role of implicatures in contributing to the confrontational nature of verbal attacks. This section combines the presentation of key findings with an in-depth exploration of speech acts and their adherence to Grice's maxims, providing a comprehensive understanding of the pragmatic intricacies inherent in verbal confrontations within the Indonesian legal system.

Table 2 provides a detailed breakdown of speech acts within the Veiled Accusation, Explicit Confrontation, and Sarcastic Remark categories, elucidating their associated Grice's Maxim Violations and providing illustrative examples. While this study provides a comprehensive exploration of linguistic strategies, speech acts, and Grice's maxims within Indonesian courtrooms, it is important to acknowledge that not all speech act categories and Grice's maxim violations are exhaustively discussed. The focus of this article is to delve deeply into select categories that significantly contribute to the confrontational nature of legal discourse, providing a nuanced understanding of how language is strategically employed. By concentrating on specific categories, such as veiled accusations, explicit confrontations, indirect critiques, and sarcastic remarks, the study aims to offer in-depth insights into the deliberate violations of Grice's maxims that shape confrontational interactions. This focused approach allows for a thorough analysis of key linguistic strategies employed by attorneys, providing valuable contributions to the understanding of legal communication in Indonesian courtrooms. The decision to prioritize specific categories is justified by the desire to offer depth rather than breadth, enabling a more profound exploration of the most impactful and prevalent speech acts and Grice's maxim violations within the context of the study.

The first is Veiled Accusation: Quality (Implied Motive). Veiled accusations, as seen in the examples, strategically imply hidden motives behind a party's actions. In the first example, the attorney questions the witness's recent interactions, subtly insinuating the presence of a hidden motive behind the testimony. This violates the Maxim of Quality by implying a potential hidden agenda without explicitly stating it. The subsequent examples similarly introduce ambiguity by questioning the impartiality of the witness based on their close ties with the opposing party, subtly suggesting undisclosed motives or biases.

The second is Explicit Confrontation: Manner (Assertiveness). Explicit confrontations, characterized by assertive language, challenge opposing claims directly. In the first example, the attorney categorically dismisses the opposing party's assertion as absurd and intentionally misleading, violating the Maxim of Manner through

assertiveness. The second example further intensifies the confrontation by not only emphasizing the lack of substance in the opposing claim but also accusing the presentation of evidence as deliberately misleading. This layered violation involves both Manner (Assertiveness) and Quality (Implied Flaw), illustrating the strategic use of language to discredit the opposing party.

The third is Indirect Critique: Quantity (Implicit Details). Indirect critiques involve subtle questioning to unveil undisclosed details. The first example introduces the possibility of factors influencing the witness's recollection without explicitly specifying them, violating the Maxim of Quantity by implicitly demanding additional information. The second example similarly seeks confirmation regarding considerations from another party, strategically violating the Maxim of Quantity by subtly requesting details beyond what may be deemed necessary. These instances showcase the nuanced approach attorneys take to indirectly challenge the completeness of information.

The fourth is Sarcastic Remark: Quantity (Exaggeration). Sarcastic remarks utilize exaggeration to convey a point sarcastically. In the example, the attorney questions the neutrality of the opposing party based on their "incredible track record with another Party," employing exaggeration to emphasize the perceived lack of impartiality. This violates the Maxim of Quantity through intentional exaggeration, showcasing the strategic use of sarcasm to cast doubt on the opposing party's stance while maintaining a calculated balance between confrontation and implication.

In essence, the examples in the table highlight the intricate linguistic strategies employed by attorneys within Indonesian courtrooms, strategically navigating Grice's maxims to shape narratives, challenge assertions, and introduce elements of ambiguity for persuasive effect in legal discourse.

In summary, the intentional violations of Grice's maxims within the confrontational discourse of Indonesian courtrooms serve as a crucial dimension of legal communication. Attorneys strategically employ deviations from cooperative communication norms to assert their positions, challenge opposing claims, and navigate the complexities of legal proceedings. The violations identified, including the lack of truthfulness and the introduction of tangential statements, underscore the nuanced nature of confrontational language use in the legal domain.

These intentional violations not only contribute to the adversarial tone prevalent in Indonesian courtrooms but also highlight the strategic and impactful nature of linguistic maneuvers within legal discourse. The deliberate challenges to the quality of opposing claims and the introduction of tangential statements showcase attorneys' ability to

navigate the boundaries of Grice's maxims to shape the narrative in favor of their case. This strategic use of language adds layers of complexity to courtroom communication, emphasizing the importance of understanding how linguistic strategies impact the dynamics of legal interactions.

As legal practitioners continue to engage in confrontational discourse, the insights gained from this analysis provide a foundation for comprehending the pragmatic dimensions of language use within Indonesian courtrooms. The intentional violations of Grice's maxims contribute to a nuanced understanding of confrontational language, informing legal practice and paving the way for further research into the intricacies of linguistic strategies within the Indonesian legal system.

CONCLUSION

This study has undertaken a thorough exploration of linguistic strategies within Indonesian courtrooms, specifically focusing on explicit confrontations, indirect critiques, veiled accusations, and the intentional violations of Grice's maxims. The culmination of our analysis has yielded key findings that not only directly address the research questions and objectives but also offer a nuanced understanding of how language functions strategically in the confrontational dynamics of legal discourse. As we navigate through the summary of major results, discuss broader implications, and outline recommendations for future research, the significance of these insights for comprehending courtroom communication and their potential impact on legal practice in Indonesian courtrooms becomes increasingly apparent. This concluding section aims to encapsulate the essence of our findings, providing a comprehensive synthesis that contributes to the evolving discourse on linguistic strategies within the Indonesian legal domain.

Summary of Key Findings

The study has provided a comprehensive exploration of linguistic strategies within Indonesian courtrooms, particularly focusing on explicit confrontations, indirect critiques, veiled accusations, and other speech acts. Major findings include deliberate violations of Grice's maxims, showcasing the intentional use of language by attorneys to assert positions, challenge assertions, and cast doubt on opposing parties. The analysis has uncovered the nuanced and strategic nature of courtroom communication, shedding light on the confrontational dynamics prevalent in Indonesian legal discourse.

The key findings directly align with the research questions and objectives, offering valuable insights into how linguistic strategies function within the legal context of Indonesian courtrooms.

The intentional deviations from cooperative communication norms, as evidenced by speech acts and Grice's maxims violations, directly contribute to a deeper understanding of confrontational language use and its implications for legal interactions.

Implications

The study's findings hold broader implications for understanding the pragmatic dimensions of courtroom communication. By dissecting linguistic strategies employed by attorneys, the research contributes to a nuanced comprehension of how language functions strategically within the legal domain. The implications extend beyond explicit confrontations and include the intentional violations of Grice's maxims, providing a holistic view of confrontational discourse in Indonesian courtrooms.

The insights gained from this study have the potential to impact legal practice by enhancing the understanding of effective communication strategies in Indonesian courtrooms. Attorneys and legal practitioners can benefit from a heightened awareness of the strategic use of language, contributing to more informed and skilful communication within the legal system.

Recommendations for Future Study

While the current study focused on explicit confrontations, indirect critiques, veiled accusations, and certain violations of Grice's maxims, there remain avenues for further exploration. Future research could delve into less prevalent speech act categories or explore variations across different legal contexts within Indonesia. To build upon the current study's findings, future research could expand the scope by examining a larger dataset or incorporating participant interviews to gain additional perspectives on confrontational language use in Indonesian courtrooms. Exploring variations in linguistic strategies across diverse legal cases and regions could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics at play.

REFERENCES

- Algburi, B. Y. J., & Igaab, Z. K. (2021). Defamation in English and Arabic: a pragmatic contrastive study. *International linguistics research*, 4(2), 31-45. <https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v4n2p31>
- Arifuddin, T., Asrul, M., Nasir, S., Syafar, M., Saleh, L. M., & Jafar, N. (2021). Study of verbal bullying in early adolescents (Case study of Pallangga 5 Junior High School and Sungguminasa 3 Junior High School). *Medico-Legal Update*, 21(1), 1553-1559.
- Bandes, S. A., & Feigenson, N. (2020). Virtual trials: Necessity, invention, and the evolution of the courtroom. *Buff. L. Rev.*, 68, 1275.
- Cabillo, J. A. E., & Daño, J. C. (2020). Verbal abuse in the workplace: The unfolding phenomenon. *The Malaysian Journal of Nursing (MJN)*, 11(4), 68-77.
- Cervone, C., Augoustinos, M., & Maass, A. (2021). The language of derogation and hate: Functions, consequences, and reappropriation. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 40(1), 80-101.
- Conley, J. M., O'Barr, W. M., & Riner, R. C. (2019). *Just words: Law, language, and power*. University of Chicago Press.
- Crouch, M. (Ed.). (2019). *The politics of court reform: judicial change and legal culture in Indonesia*. Cambridge University Press.
- De Groeve, B., & Rosenfeld, D. L. (2022). Morally admirable or moralistically deplorable? A theoretical framework for understanding character judgments of vegan advocates. *Appetite*, 168, 105693.
- Diani, I., & Yunita, W. (2022). A pragmatics study on verbal abuse against women and children by Bengkulu communities on social-media, at schools, and in families. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 8(2), 391-406.
- Disemadi, H. S., & Roisah, K. (2019). Urgency of the contempt of court criminalization policy to overcome harassment against the status and dignity of courts. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, 6(2), 224-233.
- Dong, X., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Semiotics, language and law: The linguistic turn in jurisprudence. In *Chinese legal translation and language planning in the new era* (pp. 1-18). Springer Nature Singapore.
- Faktorovich, A. (2022). Tools for waging and defending against propaganda, litigation and other verbal attacks. *Pennsylvania Literary Journal*, 14(3), 27-267.
- Freeman, G., Zamanifard, S., Maloney, D., & Acena, D. (2022). Disturbing the peace: Experiencing and mitigating emerging harassment in social virtual reality. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 6(CSCW1), 1-30.
- Galdia, M. (2022). Foundations of pragmatic legal linguistics. *Comparative Legilinguistics*, (51), 241-278.
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press
- Hailes, O. (2023). Putting to work the uncanny: Historical argument in international economic law. *Global Intellectual History*, 1-17.
- Handayani, S. (2023). Potential verbal attacks in a television political talk show: A case of a host's questioning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(3), 789-801.
- Handayani, T. A., Prasetyo, T., & Rahmat, D. (2019). Legal protection of women victims of sexual harassment in Indonesia. *UNFIKASI: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 6(2), 209-218.

- Hartley, K. (2020). The epistemics of policymaking: from technocracy to critical pragmatism in the UN Sustainable Development Goals. *International Review of Public Policy, 2*(2: 2), 233-244.
- Hossain, M. M. (2021). The application of Grice maxims in conversation: A pragmatic study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 3*(10), 32-40.
- Hrabovska, O. O., Zakharova, O. S., & Priazhenkova, N. O. (2021). The oral factor in adversarial civil proceedings. *Linguistics and Culture Review, 5*(S4), 832-844.
- Kline, S. L., White, T. N., & Martins, R. J. (2022). Argumentation and incivility in online forums: The case of discussing colorism. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 41*(4), 462-475.
- Labastía, L. O. (2023). Prosody, relevance and manipulation in political discourse. *Linguagem em (Dis) curso, 22*, 421-441.
- Lear, D. (2021). Domain analysis: Research-based reverse design for languages for specific purposes. *Foreign Language Annals, 54*(1), 139-157.
- Matte, C., Bielova, N., & Santos, C. (2020, May). Do cookie banners respect my choice? Measuring legal compliance of banners from iab europe's transparency and consent framework. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)* (pp. 791-809). IEEE.
- Mukhamadiyev, A. S. (2023). Verbal and non-verbal aggression as a type of emotional response. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal, 135*-143.
- Namvar, Z. (2019). Verbal impoliteness patterns in Iranian television series with Culpeper discourse theory framework case study: Madaraneh. *Quarterly Scientific Journal of Audio-Visual Media, 13*(29), 227-252.
- Ng, E. (2020). Linguistic disadvantage before the law. *Interpreting in Legal and Healthcare Settings: Perspectives on research and training, 151*, 21.
- Olmos-Vega, F. M., Stalmeijer, R. E., Varpio, L., & Kahlke, R. (2023). A practical guide to reflexivity in qualitative research: AMEE Guide No. 149. *Medical teacher, 45*(3), 241-251.
- Pontiki, M., Gavriilidou, M., Gkoumas, D., & Piperidis, S. (2020). Verbal aggression as an indicator of xenophobic attitudes in Greek Twitter during and after the financial crisis. In D. Broeder, M. Eskevich, M. Monachini (Eds.) *Proceedings of the Workshop about Language Resources for the SSH Cloud* (pp. 19-26).
- Ralarala, M. K., Kaschula, R. H., & Heydon, G. (Eds.). (2022). *Language and the law: Global perspectives in forensic linguistics from Africa and beyond* (Vol. 3). African Sun Media.
- Rock, F. (2020). Witnesses and suspects in interviews: Collecting oral evidence: The police, the public and the written word. In M. Courthard, A. May, R. Sousa-Silva (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics* (pp. 112-126). Routledge.
- Skoczeń, I. (2019). *Implicatures within legal language* (Vol. 127). Springer.
- Song, A., & Legg, M. (2021). The courts, the remote hearing and the pandemic: From action to reflection. *The University of New South Wales Law Journal, 44*(1), 126-166. <https://doi.org/10.53637/ZATE4122>
- Strukowska, M. (2019). Anger in action: Socio-pragmatic analysis of verbal exchanges in UK parliamentary debates. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics, 55*(4), 671-703.
- Sutarsih, S., Ismoyoputro, R., Sudarmanto, B., Susilastri, D., & Subyantoro, S. (2022, February). The using of Javanese language as a hate speech in social media. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Democracy and Social Transformation, ICON-DEMOST 2021, September 15, 2021, Semarang, Indonesia*.
- Syafruddin, S., Thaba, A., Rahim, A. R., Munirah, M., & Syahrudin, S. (2021). Indonesian people's sarcasm culture: an ethnolinguistic research. *Linguistics and Culture Review, 5*(1), 160-179.
- Wright, D., Robson, J., Murray-Edwards, H., & Braber, N. (2022). The pragmatic functions of 'respect' in lawyers' courtroom discourse: A case study of Brexit hearings. *Journal of Pragmatics, 187*, 1-12.
- Yuan, C. (2019). A battlefield or a lecture hall? A contrastive multimodal discourse analysis of courtroom trials. *Social Semiotics, 29*(5), 645-669.
- Zhyhadlo, O. (2019). Pragmatic features of lawyer-witness interaction in English courtroom discourse. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія»: Серія «Філологія», 8* (76), 7-10.
- Zifana, M., Lukmana, I., & Sudana, D. (2022). The construction of victims of defamation in court's written verdicts. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(1), 156-163.