

LEXICAL PRESUPPOSITION OF IKA VALENSIA THEORY IN POLICE INVESTIGATION REPORT

Ika Arifianti

FKIP/ Universitas Pekalongan

ikaarivianti@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

Police interrogation reports are part of the investigator's authority. Investigators carry out interrogations in order to do their duties and functions as a state apparatus. Pragmatic studies can be used in assessing the language used in Police investigation report. This study focuses on lexical presuppositions in police investigation report. Lexical presupposition is The use of one form with its asserted meaning is conventionally interpreted with the presupposition that another (non-asserted) meaning is understood and involving the lexical items, stop, start, and again. The lexical presupposition of Ika Valensia's theory is a development of the main theory of Levinson (1985), which was later developed by Rustono (1998), Ika Arifianti (2019) completed with the presupposition of Ika Valensia which gave rise to functions such as the development of Austin theory (1962) which was developed and refined by his student, Searle (1969). Descriptive form of human behavior that violates the law can lead to criminal acts. This unpleasant behavior is included in the complaint offense case category. A complaint offense case is a case related to defamation, slander, or other behavior deemed unpleasant. Responsible linguists are needed to uncover the potential for serious injustices in the judicial process.

Keywords: *complaint offense, pragmatics, lexical presupposition.*

Introduction

This research discusses presuppositions in the pragmatic realm. Presuppositions are analyzed in detail as presuppositions that are fixed and conventional as part of the structure that has been assumed to be true. Through presupposition analysis, Investigators in the BAP (Investigation Report) are placed in the hegemonic discourse. Investigators have the authority to resolve cases. Based on the form of BAP, investigators can side with one person or group of people depending on the interests of the investigation process. The investigator's speech in the BAP (Investigation News) contains an element of hegemony. Hegemony is a particular element capable of constructing universal demands. The process of state domination over society takes place through state ideological apparatus which construct false awareness in society and fortify society from forming knowledge of exploitation and oppression.

Gramsci (in Ritzer 2004: 100) defines hegemony as a central concept of leadership that reflects cultural leadership run by the

ruling class. In government politics, hegemony is exercised by the legislative, executive and police powers. This phenomenon is worth researching with pragmatic studies for the scientific development of linguistics in Indonesia.

Levinson's (1985) view of pragmatics is the study of language usage. Levinson views pragmatics in five perspectives, namely (1) pragmatics as the study of language with a certain context, (2) pragmatics as a study of aspects of meaning that are not covered in the semantic aspect, (3) pragmatics as a study of language with a context that underlies the explanation of understanding language, (4) pragmatics as the study of the ability of language user to pair sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate, (5) pragmatics as the study of deixis (at least in part), implicature, presupposition, speech art, and aspect of discourse structure

Rahardi (2005: 42) defines presupposition as pre-presenting speech. A speech can be said to presuppose another speech if the untruth of the presumed utterance results in the truth of the presumed

speech cannot be said. The notion of presupposition according to Levinson (1985, in Cummings 2007: 52) is technically limited to certain pragmatic inferences or assumptions that seem at least built into linguistic expressions.

Amirudin (2004: 118-132) distinguishes the complaint offense into two: 1) Absolute or absolute complaint offense (absolute *klachtdelicten*), 2) Relative complaint offense (relative *klachtdelicten*)

Absolute or absolute complaint offense is a complaint offense for certain crimes for which the prosecutor generally requires a complaint. The nature of the complaint in an absolute complaint offense (absolute *klachtdelicten*) is not limited to a certain number of people, but to anyone who commits the crime in question. In this complaint it cannot be broken down (*onsplitsbaar*).

Relative complaint offenses are intended for certain types of crimes where prosecution generally does not require a complaint, but in this case it is only determined that the complaint is a condition, if there is a certain relationship between the maker and the complainant. The particular relationship between the maker and the complainant is the relationship of blood families in a straight line (father, grandmother, child, grandchild) or in the second degree of the line (siblings) and marital families in a straight line (parents-in-law, son-in-law) or in the second degree of the deviant line (brother-in-law).

The formulation of the problem in this research is what is the form and function of the lexical presupposition of the investigator's speech in the case of complaint offenses? The purpose of this study is to identify the form and function of investigators' presumptive speech in the case of complaint offenses. The benefits of this research are divided into two, namely theoretical and practical benefits. The benefits obtained from this research are: 1) it can contribute to the development of

studies on pragmatics and can make a positive contribution in the field of education and the field of police in the form of police speeches in interrogating cases of complaint offenses. In addition, this research is also expected to inspire other studies that are being carried out by educators, researchers, and students in tertiary institutions on an ongoing basis.

Methodology

The data collection techniques used in this study were reading techniques and note taking techniques. The data analysis technique in this study used a qualitative descriptive analysis. The data in this study are fragments of the discourse text of the Central Java Police's complaint offense. The data source of this research is the complete discourse text of the Criminal Investigation Report at the Central Java Regional Police in 2013.

Finding and discussion

In this presupposition study, a new theory was found, which the researcher named the theory of balance thinking in assuming a text and context. The theory of presupposition is called the Ika Valensia theory. This theory refers to Levinson's (1985) theory of presupposition, which Rustono (1998) developed into presuppositions. In the theory of Ika Valensia, the presupposition form is classified into six, but it is still categorized according to function.

a. Lexical Presupposition

Lexical presupposition is a presupposition that uses a form with a meaning stated conventionally, in this case the structure of certain sentences that have been analyzed as a regular and conventional presumption that the part of the structure has assumed the truth.

b. The Function of Lexical Presupposition

The lexical presupposition function based on the findings of this study are (1) interrogative clarification function, (2) truth interrogative function, (3) clarity interrogative function, and (4) time interrogative function.

1) Lexical Presupposition of the Interrogative Function of Clarification

The truth of the clarification made by investigators to victims, suspects, and witnesses has been assumed by the investigators. The real clarification is only to equalize the perception regarding the actual incident.

Context: investigators clarify detention and management of determination

Is it true that Polres (Departmental Police) X handled the case of strip mine typed C? And is it true that (Polres X) conducted an investigation in the process of suspect "H" and is it true that the investigation was carried out on behalf of Suspect H and is it true that detention and overcoming of detention were carried out against suspect H? Explain!

(BAP I, question No.10)

Interpretation of the narrative in BAP I, question No.10 which was submitted by the investigator is included in the lexical presupposition of the interrogative clarification function, where the investigator can assume the victim is handling cases of strip mine, as Police Report Number: Lp / A / XXX and on behalf of H can be suspended detention on ... until the date ... The excerpt of the sentence is included in the category of lexical presupposition because the investigator has conventionally stated and interpreted the prejudice against the victim who allegedly committed extortion as believed by the suspect. From the investigator's question it can be assumed that the truth is based on evidence from the printed media of the SM daily newspaper. As in the following section: *"Is it true that Polres X handled the case of strip mine typed C? And is it true (Polres x) carried out*

the investigation process on behalf of Suspect H ..."

2) Lexical Presupposition of the Interrogative Function of Truth

Truth interrogations are carried out by investigators to confirm information through statements of victims, suspects or witnesses. This aims to clarify the ongoing problem.

Context: investigators ask the truth of victim meeting with "K" and "H"

Is it true after you met K, and H in one of the rooms? and when is the meeting? Explain!

(BAP I victim Question no.5)

The speech fragment in (BAP I VICTIM, Question no.5) is included in the lexical presupposition perlocution category, the function of asking the truth is contained in the quotation as follows *Is it true after you met K, and H in one of the rooms? And when is the meeting? Explain ...*"During the process of examining victims, investigators questioned the truth of the meeting with victim with mr. K and mr. H, which is likely to discuss cases related to the case of strip mine typed C.

3) Lexical Presumptions Interrogative Function Clarity

The interrogation carried out by the investigator was characterized by repeated questions. This is intended to clarify information for investigative purposes.

Context: investigators look for truth information problems of strip mine

To what extent do you know about the case of strip mine typed C, namely as referred to in Police Report Number Lp / A / XXX dated X handled by Police X? Explain.

(BAP I, TSK, question No.8)

The narrative excerpt in (BAP I, TSK question No.8) is included in the lexical assumption of the interrogative clarity function, because the investigator presumes that the suspect knows the truth of *the case of strip mine typed C*, and estimates TSK

with Mr. H has a connection in *the case of strip mine typed C*. The investigator's interrogation of the suspect can be stated conventionally as contained in the following quote "*To what extent do you know about the case of strip mine typed C...*".

4) Lexical Presumption of Time Interrogative Functions

The interrogative carried out by the investigator is characterized by showing the time (days, or hours).

Conclusions

Lexical presuppositions have 4 functions, namely: a. clarification interrogative function, b. truth interrogative function, c. clarity interrogative function, and d. time interrogative function

The development of presuppositions produces a new theory, namely Ika Valensia theory which means thinking logically between text and context. This theory is the development of Levinson's (1985) theory of presuppositions, then the term was changed by Rustono (1998) to be presumption. In 2019 researchers have synthesized presumption theory (Rustono) to the level of function. This stage of synthesizing can produce a new theory; it is Ika Valensia theory.

Pragmatic analysis with Ika Valensia's theory of presupposition complete with its function categories with objects from the Investigation report is a rare thing so it deserves to be used as a good research reference in the fields of pragmatics and forensic linguistics.

The emergence of a new theory in the realm of presuppositions which the researcher named the Ika Valensia theory.

This theory will develop if it is used as a reference for further research in the pragmatic discipline.

References

Brow, Penelope dan S.C. Levinson. 1978. *Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena* dalam Ester N. Goody (ed) *Question and Politeness*. Cambridge University Press. Hal 56-342.

Cummings, Louise. 2007. *Pragmatik Sebuah Perspektif Multidisipliner*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Cummings, Loise. 2010. *Pragmatik Klinis*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Ghony M. Djunaidi, Fauzan Almansur. 2012. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jogjakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.

KUHAP dan KUHP. 2007. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1985. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mahsun. 2013. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan Strategi, Metode dan Tekniknya*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Mey, Jacob. L. 1994. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford & Cambridge, USA: Black Well.

Rahardi, Kunjana. 2005. *Pragmatik*; Jakarta: Erlangga.

Rahardi, Kunjana. 2009. *Sosio pragmatik*. Jakarta: Erlangga