



## **AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING OF MAXIM PERFORMED BY POLITICIAN GUESTS IN MATA NAJWA TALK SHOW IN THE EPISODE OF *ADU LANTANG JELANG PENENTUAN* AND *BABAK AKHIR PILPRES***

**Norin Aisya<sup>1</sup>, Fitrawati<sup>2</sup>**

English Department  
Faculty of Languages and Arts  
Universitas Negeri Padang  
email: [norinasy@gmail.com](mailto:norinasy@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

In the process of communication, speakers are expected to obey the maxim of cooperative principles to convey messages effectively. However, many speakers disobey it for some reasons. Flouting of maxim is one of cases when speakers fail to observe the maxim to generate an implicature. This research aimed to find the types of flouting of maxim and the reasons of indirectness in flouting the maxim done by Politician guests in two episode of Mata Najwa Talk Show entitled *Adu Lantang Jelang Penentuan* and *Babak Akhir Pilpres*. The method of this research is descriptive research. The data of this research were the utterances of guests that flout the maxim of cooperative principles. It is found that there were total of 55 utterances that flout the maxim of cooperative principles that were analyzed. The results show that the Politician guests flout maxim of *quantity* and *manner* the most with frequency of 53.96% and 36.50%. Flouting of maxim of *quality* and *relation* rarely appeared with the same frequency, 4.76%. It is also found that the reasons of indirectness in flouting the maxim were vary such as *interestingness*, *increasing the force's of messages*, *competing goals*, and *politeness*. However, *increasing the force of the messages* and *politeness* are two reasons that occurred more frequent in comparison to *interestingness* and *competing goals*. This research implicated that politician guests convey messages by flouting maxim for many reasons in order to gain support from masses.

**Key words:** *Flouting of Maxim, Indirectness, Politician guests, Mata Najwa Talk Show.*

### **A. INTRODUCTION**

In this modern era where communication is not solely about telling information to others, but to the extent of protecting self-image, hiding some information, and

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

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



other, language has developed based on the need of communication. Speakers tend to explore the way to convey messages since the need of communication changed. Thus, speakers tend to convey messages implicitly in certain situation. This kind of communication creates additional or implicit meaning.

The study of implicit meaning is implicature. Implicature is the study of indirect communication. According to Yule (1996:35), speakers actually communicate more than the words they utter, in this case, they communicate the additional meaning to the hearers. It means that in process of communication, people do not always say what they really mean. What speakers utter can be different, opposite, or more than what it says.

Communication is about delivering and receiving the ideas. In order for communication to be successful, there must be a cooperation between speakers and hearers. Grice (1975) came up with the idea of cooperative principle that describe the way a communication to be effective. He stated make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Grice 1989 in Thomas, 1995:61). That idea means that the speaker should make their contribution as informative as possible, relevant to the context, and also brief and clear. Jufriзал and Refnaldi (2008:180) also suggests cooperative principle as a norm in a conversation called conversational maxim. It means that it is a guidance in order to have a successful communication. Grice (1989:27) then proposed four maxims that people must obey to create an effective communication. According to Griffith (2006:135), a maxim is piece of widely applicable advice. It means that communication proceeds as if speakers are generally guided by these maxims. If speakers are not guided by the maxim, that's when the case of non-observance of maxim appear. Four maxim that is Proposed by Grice (1989:27) are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. If speakers follow these rules, the communication is successful. However, in some cases, people do not obey these maxims. People choose to violate, flout, opt out, or suspend the maxims in some situations. One of non-observance maxim found is flouting since flouting is the way to generate meaning implicitly to the hearers.

When speakers flout the maxim, it means that they are also being indirect in communication. Zhang and You (2009:99) argue that indirectness is communication in which speakers are being indirect in communicating in order to achieve certain goal. The goal may vary such as to protect one's image, being polite, etc. Zhang and You (2009:100) also states that the motives of indirectness are for politeness, self protection, for humor, for rejection or denial. On the other hand, Thomas (1995:142) gives broader motives of indirectness to be investigated. They are the desire to make one's language more or less interesting, to increase the force of one's message, competing goals, and politeness.

The researcher chose to study the flouting of maxim found in talk show of Mata Najwa in episode of *Adu Lantang Jelang Penentuan* and *Babak Akhir Pilpres*. In this episode, the guests were politician that come from government and opposition. Ayasreh and Razali (2018:43) states that Political leaders flout the maxim to produce several meanings which may not always be conceivable to all

parties in order to gain the support from masses. Thus, politicians tend to play with their word because they do not want to be very explicit in delivering ideas to gain support. It is supported by Indriani and Fitrawati (2018) that suggests that political language is important for it conveys not only ideas, but also arguments to gain power. Being that said, politician is one of the actor that fail to observe the maxim because they cannot deliver information explicitly to gain support from masses.

The purpose of this research is to find out the types of maxim flouted and the reasons of indirectness in flouting the maxim.

## B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a descriptive research. According to Kothari (1985:2), the function of descriptive research is to describe and report all events and phenomena related to what is being observed and happened. In this research, researcher observes the phenomena of flouting maxim and indirectness done in political discourse in a Talk Show.

The data of this research is utterances from 11 politician guests that flout the maxim of cooperative principle obtained from two episode of Mata Najwa Talk Show named Adu Lantang Jelang Penentuan and Babak Akhir Pilpres. The show aired on Trans TV with one hour duration for each episodes.

In collecting the data, the researcher downloaded the video of two episode obtained from official youtube account of Najwa Shihab, then transcribing the data from spoken to written data, then arranged the data in a table form. In analyzing the data, contexts are taken into account to find out the types of flouting of maxim and the reasons. Then the researcher describing the findings and make a conclusion.

## C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Result

#### 1) Types of Maxim Flouted

In this research, the researcher found that there 55 utterances that flout the maxim of cooperative principles. Based on this research, it is found that the guests flout all the maxim of principles namely quality, quantity, relation, and manner. Moreover, flouting the maxim of quantity and manner frequently found compared to quality and relation.

**Table 1 Types of Maxim Flouted**

Episode	Types of Maxim Flouted							
	Quality		Quantity		Relation		Manner	
	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%
Adu Lantang Jelang Penentuan	2	3.17%	19	30.15%	3	4.76%	13	20.63%
Babak Akhir Pilpres	1	1.58%	15	23.80%	0	0%	10	15.87%
<b>SUM</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.76%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>53.96%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.76%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>36.50%</b>

From the table above, it is visible that there are four types of flouting of maxim found in the research. It is seen that the flouting of maxim of quantity (53.96%) and manner (36.50%) are the types of flouting that frequently appeared. Furthermore, the flouting of maxim of quality and relation are appear with the same frequency. Below is the example of flout of maxim found in the research.

### A. Flouting of Maxim of Quality

#### ALJP/Datum 16

##### Context:

The conversation were about Makar where the supporter of 02 (Prabowo-Sandi) are said that they wanted to topple down the government system.

Najwa: Bagaimana kang Aria Bimo? (*Any idea, kang Aria Bimo?*)

Aria : Gini, intinya kan suatu imajinasi, nalar-nalar yang sebenarnya sensasional.*(the thing is that is an imagination, that is the sensational mindset.)*

Novel: Ini bukan nalar pak. Ini buktinya. Udah telanjang, kemungkaran udah telanjang.*(That is not, sir. We have the evidences. The nonsense is now bare. It is bare)*

Based on the data above, there are two utterances found that flout the maxim of quality. First is the statement “*Gini, intinya kan suatu imajinasi, nalar-nalar yang sensasional*”, second is the statement “*Ini bukan nalar pak. Ini buktinya. Udah telanjang, kemungkaran udah telanjang.*” Those statements are said to flout the maxim of quality since what they said did not represent the truth. In the first statement, the speaker had lack of evidence to prove that it is an imagination and sensational while in the second statement the speaker had lack of evidence saying about bare nonsense. Thus, what they said does not represent the truth. It is kind of flouting the maxim since they want to generate implicatures by saying so. In the first statement, the speaker hoped audiences to search implied meaning. By saying so, the speaker wanted to say that a sensational thing should not be trusted because it is only based on a claim without evidence. In the second statement, the speaker wanted to tell and create an impact to audiences that it is clear to see which side is right and wrong.

### B. Flouting of Maxim of Quantity

#### ALJP/Datum 9

##### Context:

The host started asking opposition’s view on PILEG (legislative election).

Najwa: Jadi kita menolak hasil pemilu berarti pak Prabowo juga akan menolak hasil Pileg?*(so rejecting presidential election result means rejecting PILEG result, doesn't it?)*

Riza: Ya harus dibedakan. Pemilu itu ada pemilu presiden dan wakil presiden, legislatif tentu harus dibedakan. Pak Prabowo berbicara sebagai capres tentu yang dimaksud adalah pemilu pilpres. Di dalam rekap itu ada saksi 01 02 mewakili paslon, ada saksi partai kami itu ada. Jadi harus dibedakan gugatan, laporan tadi berjenjang, itu dilaporkan. Urusan pilpres urusan pilpres, urusan pileg urusan pileg. Semua itu berjalan sesuai aturan dan mekanisme. *(it should be distinguished. Pemilu is president and vice president election. Mr. Prabowo talking as president candidate means it refers to presidential election. We have witnesses from 01 and 02 and from our parties. So the appeal should be distinguished. Pilpres is Pilres, Pileg is Pileg. They have their own rules and mechanism.)*

The excerpt above shows the flouting of maxim of quantity. When asked about whether Prabowo-Sandi's team will reject the PILEG's result or not, the speaker did not answer it straightforwardly but giving other information which is unnecessary. By saying "ya harus dibedakan. Pemilu itu ada pemilu presiden dan wakil presiden. Legislatif tentu harus dibedakan..." he wants to generate implicature that Prabowo-Sandi team does not reject and has no disappointment toward legislative election.

### C. Flouting of Maxim of Relation

#### ALJP/Datum 2

#### Context:

Ekspos publik is the event held by Prabowo-Sandi to speak up about fraud and fight against the fraud. The host asked the guest who came from government side about his opinion.

Najwa: Mas Aria, kemaren sempat menyimak acara ekspos publik yang kita lihat cuplikannya tadi? *(Mr. Aria, are you following the event (public expose)?)*

Aria: Saya menyimak ini, adu lantang ini, bahasa puitisnya mbak Najwa ini memang luar biasa bahwa adu lantang sampai suara itu serak saya kira sah-sah saja yang penting tanggal 22 itu adalah kesepakatan kita secara konstitusi, yang tidak bisa ditolak, yang tidak bisa dihindari, bahwa KPU harus memutuskan siapa yang menang, siapa yang kalah. Itu dulu. *(I notice that adu lantang, your poetic language is amazing that speaking up till you lost your voice is fine. What's important is that on Mei 22<sup>nd</sup>, our agreement based on constitutional cannot be rejected. KPU must decide who win the election. That is the thing.)*

The excerpt above shows the flouting of maxim of relation. The speaker tried to be *irrelevant* in answering the question. the proper answer should be 'yes' or 'no' with enough explanation. Instead of saying so, the speaker tried to steer the focus of the question to discuss about Najwa's poetic language and also discuss about the agreement day on Mei 22<sup>nd</sup> that has no relevancy with the question. it can be considered to flout the maxim of relation since the speaker did not want to give his opinion about the event. Thus, he steer the conversation away.

#### D. Flouting of Maxim of Manner

##### BAP/Datum 35

##### Context:

Najwa, the host, asked the guest that comes from government side about his opinion regarding the evidences of presidential election fraud provided by opposition.

Najwa: Rasa penasaran anda terjawab tidak selama sidang yang tempo hari? Anda mengatakan penasaran bukti-bukti seperti apa. Apakah terjawab rasa penasaran itu?*(how about your curiosity during the trial? You once said you are curious about the evidences they would provide. How is your curiosity now?)*

Yusril: Mohon maaf malah saya tercengang dengan bukti-bukti yang dihadirkan.*(I am sorry to say but I am surprised with the evidences given).*

The speaker is considered to flout the maxim of manner since his statement is *ambiguous*. By stating “*Mohon maaf malah saya tercengang dengan bukti yang dihadirkan.*”, it creates an *ambiguity* since surprised can be defined in a good and bad way. He said that to generate an implicature that he does not think the evidence is strong enough to back up the appeal.

##### A. Reasons of Indirectness in Flouting the Maxim

In this research, it is found that all reasons of indirectness in flouting the maxim appeared. The reasons found are interestingness, increasing the force of one’s messages, competing goals, and politeness. Below are the table of frequency of appearance of each reasons.

**Table 2 Reasons of Indirectness in Flouting the Maxim**

Episode	Reasons of Indirectness in Flouting the Maxim							
	Interestingness		Increasing the force of one’s messages		Competing Goals		Politeness	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Adu Lantang Jelang Pilpres	2	3.57%	21	37.5%	4	7.14%	5	8.92%
Babak Akhir Pilpres	1	1.78%	13	23.21%	1	1.78%	9	16.07%
<b>SUM</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5.37%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>60.71%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8.92%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>25%</b>

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that the reasons of interestingness (5.37%) and competing goals (8.92%) are the reasons that less likely to appear while increasing the force of one’s messages (60.71%) and

politeness (25%) are the most reasons that frequently appear. Below is the example of reasons of indirectness in flouting the maxim.

### A. Interestingness

#### ALJP/Datum 17

##### Context:

The conversation were about Makar where the supporter of 02 (Prabowo-Sandi) are said that they wanted to topple down the government system.

Najwa: Bagaimana kang Aria Bimo? (*Any idea, kang Aria Bimo?*)

Aria: Gini, intinya kan suatu imajinasi, nalar-nalar yang sebenarnya sensasional. (*the thing is that is an imagination, that is the sensational mindset.*)

Novel: Ini bukan nalar pak. Ini buktinya. Udah telanjang, kemungkaran udah telanjang. (*That is not, sir. We have the evidences. The nonsense is now bare. It is bare*)

Based on the data above, there are two utterances that being indirect in flouting the maxim because of interestingness. The statement “*Ini bukan nalar pak. Ini buktinya. Udah telanjang, kemungkaran udah telanjang.*” By saying so, the speaker said to employed metaphor in order to make language become more interesting by saying the word “*kemungkaran udah telanjang*” which makes it more interesting to be heard and creating more impact.

### B. Increasing the force of one’s messages

#### BAP/Datum 36

##### Context:

Najwa reminds the audiences that Nur Latifa, the witness of Presidential Election Fraud, tells the court that there are massive fraud occurred in Boyolali. Then, Najwa asked opinion of Pramono Ubay, the commissioner of KPU (General Election Commission).

Najwa: Bagaimana mas Pram? Kesaksian Latifah tadi apakah indikasi kecurangan yang lebih besar yang bisa diungkap di Boyolali? (*what do you think, Mas Pram?. Regarding the testification of Latifa, is that the indication of massive fraud occurred in Boyolali?*)

Pramono: Daerah yg dibuktikan itu daerah saya. Itu kira-kira 20 kilo dari rumah saya. Jadi ketika muncul masalah itu, saya langsung kontak temen-temen disana. Jadi benar ada tapi tidak seperti yang dinarasikan seolah-olah. Berdasarkan dari bawaslu bahwa kpps ini membantu nenek-nenek dalam bilik suara minta bantu. Kalo gitu coblosin sekalian. Lalu di sebelah itu mertuanya, sekalian dibantu. Nah akhirnya berentet menajdi sepuluh orang. Jadi berdasarkan kajian bawaslu

bukan pidana pemilu, hanya pelanggaran administrasi karena untuk membantu itu ada formulir C3 namanya oleh keluarga atau KPPS. Itu diperbolehkan. Tetapi tidak ditandatangani. *(the said region is my hometown. It is about 20 miles from my house. I contacted my friends as soon as I heard the case. So, what happened is not like what we have heard. According to Bawashu, KPPS helped a grandmother to vote since she did not know how to vote. And then, the other people asked for help too. There are total of 10 people who ask for help to vote. So, it is not a fraud, it is just a violation of administration. To help people that do not know how to vote, there should be C3 form, but they do not provide it.)*

Based on conversation above, Pramono is considered to increase the force of his messages. *By saying that Boyolali is his hometown and he contacted his friends who lives in Boyolali*, shows that he flout the maxim to give more impact to the hearers that what he said is true and should be trusted since he has strong connection with the said region.

## **B. Competing Goals**

### **ALJP/Datum 5**

#### **Context:**

The host of the talkshow asked Prabowo-Sandi team whether or not they will bring the cases to the MK (Constitutional Court).

Najwa: Saya ingin dapat konfirmasi apakah iya akan ke MK atau tidak akan mengambil jalur MK? *(I need a confirmation. Is it true that you will take this cases to institutional court?)*

Riza: Banyak kekecewaan kami yang luar biasa. Dulu 2004 buk Mega dan Pak Prabowo ke MK, 2014 kami ke MK, hari ini apakah ke MK? Kita akan lihat perkembangan nanti. Sejauh ini kami banyak kekecewaan dengan putusan MK. Apalagi kemaren MK memutuskan MK hakim, tidak semua kami kecewa dengan hakim-hakim MK, tidak semua. Tapi kan dengan memutuskan presiden threshold di MK adalah open legal policy disitu kita bisa melihat oh MK ini mengikuti naluri keinginan petahana penguasa pemerintah, bukan demokrasi. *(we are disappointed. In 2004, Mrs. Mega and Mr. Prabowo brought this case to MK, 2014 we did it again. Today, will we? Let's see. We are very disappointed to MK so far. We are not disappointed to all judges but looking back to their decision about president threshold, open legal policy, we concluded that MK is on incumbent's side, not our democracy.)*

Based on the data above, it shows that the speaker are being indirect because of competing goals. He chose to employ indirectness and flout the maxim because his *propositional goal* is that he needs to tell his stance to audiences about whether or not the case will be brought to the court. On the other hand, his *interpersonal goal* is that he should not say it directly since he is a part of Prabowo-Sandi team that need to be careful when delivering information.



### C. Politeness

#### BAP/Datum 35

##### Context:

Najwa, the host, asked the guest that came from government side about his opinion regarding the evidences of presidential election fraud provided by opposition.

Najwa: Rasa penasaran anda terjawab tidak selama sidang yang tempo hari? Anda mengatakan penasaran bukti-bukti seperti apa. Apakah terjawab rasa penasaran itu?. (*how about your curiosity during the trial? You once said you are curious about the evidences they would provide. How is your curiosity now?*)

Yusril: Mohon maaf malah saya tercengang dengan bukti-bukti yang dihadirkan. (*I am sorry but I am surprised with evidences given*).

The reasons of indirectness in flouting of the maxim is for politeness. Yusril tried to employ negative politeness by saying “*mohon maaf (I am sorry to say..)*” to reduce the face threatening effect to opposition side. Furthermore, by saying “*.... Saya malah tercengang dengan bukti yang dihadirkan. (...but I am surprised with the evidence given. )*”, it shows that speaker tried to employ politeness to reduce the embarrassment effect to the opposition side.

#### 2) Discussion

Flouting of maxim of quantity and manner are two types of flouting that occurred with the highest frequency compare to two other types of flouting of maxim. There 34 occurrences where speakers flouted the maxim of quantity by providing an overstatement which is not actually needed. Herawati (2013) states that Indonesian Speakers tend to overstate an information in order to be polite. In Indonesian culture, being polite can be indicated by overglorifying messages to show respect to listeners. It can be one of reasons why Indonesian Speakers, in this case the Politician, tend to flout the maxim of quantity. Massanga and Msuya (2017) says that the non-observance of maxim of quantity were caused by their effort to gain attention and support. This shows that politician guests tend to overglorify the messages when asked about vital issues in front of public to sound believable by masses. Moreover, this research show that maxim of manner also frequently flouted. Politician guests also tend to create an obscurity of expression, being longwinded, and create an ambiguity when addressing about certain issues which support the argument that maxim of manner is to avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief, and be orderly (Grice, 1989:27). One of reasons why speaker tend to flout the maxim of manner is what Hall and Hall (1989) considered as High Context Culture. According to Gudykunst at al. (1996), the indicator of High Context Culture is being indirect and ambiguous to maintain a harmony. Hall and Hall (1989) states that when applying High Context Culture, the speaker talks longwindedly but is not to the point. The speaker provides

messages and leave a hole to be filled by the listeners. From what stated by Hall and Hall, it shows that speaker tend to be ambiguous.

Politician guests also flouted the maxim of quality and relation even though the frequency is not as high as flouting of maxim of quantity and manner. It is found that there only 3 data when speakers flouted the maxim of quality by employing metaphor. In this research, it is found that the flout of maxim of quality is because of politeness reasons to be implicit in sending the messages. The last type of flouting that found is flouting of maxim of relation with 3 occurrences found. When flouted this maxim, the speakers wanted to avoid answering the issues by driving their answer to be irrelevant, hoping hearers to understand that the speakers did not want to answer the questions.

This research, discussing about politics with politician guests, found that the politician guests tend to flout the maxim to deliver an implied meaning that they cannot said directly. Often times, they do it to seem believable by masses. it is linked with what stated by Ayasreh and Razali (2018:43) states that Political Leaders flout the maxim to produce several meanings which may not always be conceivable to all parties in order to gain the support from masses. This research has the same result with the previous research in terms of types of flouting of the maxim. Irnanda and Hamzah (2017) who studied about types of flouting maxim performed by Buyers' and Sellers' in traditional market of Lubuk Alung found that maxim of quantity and manner are the common maxim flouted with the highest occurrences while flouting of maxim of quality rarely occurred. Similarly, Buddharat et al., (2017) also conducted a research on uncooperativeness in Political Discourse: Violating Gricean Maxims in Presidential Debate 2016. He found that maxim quantity is the most dominant type that occurred. However, there are some differences with the previous research. In previous research conducted by Buddharat et al., (2017), flouting of maxim quality is also one of types that often appear. However, this research found that maxim of quality is the one of maxim that rarely flouted by the guests.

Regarding the reasons of indirectness in flouting the maxim, this research shows that the politician guests being indirect in flouting the maxim because of various reasons. They did it because of interestingness of a language, increasing the force of one's messages, competing goals, and politeness.

Interestingness is the first reason why politicians guest employed indirectness in flouting the maxim. Sometimes, speakers enjoy having fun with language that makes them exploring their language used by making it more or less interesting. In this research there are 3 utterances that flout the maxim because of interestingness. They did it to convey specific messages and gain audiences' attention. It support the argument that metaphor enable speakers to convey ideologies and gain support (Rajandran 2013 in David, 2014:166).

The second one is increasing the force of one's messages. In this research, it is found that there 34 occurrences where speakers employed indirectness in flouting the maxim in order to increase the force of one's messages. Thomas

(1995:144) states that speakers can increase the impact and the effectiveness of their messages by employing indirectness. Being that said, it can be concluded that the guests flout the maxim because they want to create bigger impact of their messages to the hearers when talking about politics and power.

The third reason is competing goals. Thomas (1995:146) suggests that people employ indirectness because they have two goals to compete. In order to neutralize it, they choose to be indirect and flout the maxim. In this research, it is found that there are 5 occurrences of this reasons. There are tendency for the politician guests to flout the maxim because of competing goals since there are some rules, information, or goals that should be hidden by politician to avoid chaos.

The last one is politeness. Yule (2010) stated that politeness is a strategic way of being accepted in social interaction by being modest. It is related to the idea of politician who try to be modest in order to avoid chaos, or to hurt certain actor's feeling. In this research, there are 14 occurrences of flouting of maxim because of politeness reasons. It is found that the guests employed politeness by softening their language to save the hearer's face.

This research discovered a phenomena of politicians that stay polite even when the time they are attacked by opponents' questions. It is shown by 25% frequency of politician guests flout the maxim because of politeness. Herawati (2013) states that Indonesian Speakers tend to overstate an information in order to be polite. In Indonesian culture, being polite can be indicated by overglorifying messages to show respect to listeners. The phenomena shows that regardless of what roles a person has in society, their cultural background follows. Indonesian Speakers, in this case politician, bring their cultural background as Indonesian that they have to be polite. It affects the way they conduct a communication regardless of what context of situation that they face. Another reason that triggers politician to stay polite when talked about vital issues and sometimes attacked by their opponents is what stated by Massanga and Msuya (2017) that suggests politicians tend to soften their language to save his image and to deny the accusation when faced by political scandals. It shows that even though politician argue with opponents, they are still considering the aspect of politeness as the major reasons of flouting the maxim. This research has quite the same result with previous research conducted by Ekawati (2012) who studied about Reasons of Indirectness Found in Movie Easy A. the result revealed that politeness as the major reasons of indirectness. It follows by increasing the force of one's messages and competing goals with the same frequency, 25%. It is quite the same with result of this research. However, competing goals is not the major reasons of indirectness in this research.

## D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

### Conclusion

The result of this research showed that politician guest flout the maxim because of various reasons which is related to their job as a politician that hold power and responsibility. In this research, there are 55 utterances that flout the maxim of cooperative principle performed by politician guests. The researcher analyzed the utterances from two videos discussing about Indonesian Presidential Election Fraud. The episodes were *Adu Lantang Jelang Penentuan* and *Babak Akhir Pilpres*. It is found that maxim of quality occurred the most. It is followed by flouting of maxim of manner while quality and relation are the least types that occurred. Regarding with the reasons of their indirectness in flouting the maxim, it is found that the highest occurrences is the reason of increasing the force of the messages and the reason of politeness. Meanwhile, the reason of interestingness and competing goals rarely occurred. The result is in line with the idea that politician need trust from masses, therefore they tend to be indirect by flouting the maxim to send messages.

### Suggestion

The study of conversational implicature is interested to be investigated to see the various way people send messages implicitly. Thus, the further research can be conducted by future researchers so they could enlarge the discussion of non-observance maxim. Future researcher can explore the discussion not only to find out the flout of the maxim, but also finding out the case of infringing, suspending, and opting out of maxim. Furthermore, the future researchers can choose different contexts such as institutional contexts, family contexts, etc. To enlarge the discussion, future researcher can conduct a comparative analysis to see how each actors disobey the maxim differently

**Note:** this article is written based on Norin Aisya's thesis, under the supervision of, Fitrawati, S.S., M.Pd

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andresen, N. (2013). *An Analysis of Flouting in the Comedy Series Community*. (Unpublished Postgraduate Dissertation). Karlstad Universted, Sweden.
- Ayasreh, A., & Razali, R. (2018). The Flouting of Grice's Conversational Maxim: Examples from Bashar Al-Assad's Interview during the Arab Spring. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 23, 43-47. Doi: 10.9790/0837-2305014347
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistics (Edinburgh Textbook in Applied Linguistics)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Gumperz, J. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Buddharat, C., Ambele, E. A., & Boonsuk, Y. (2017). Uncooperativeness in Political Discourse: Violating Gricean Maxim in Presidential Debate 2016. *Humanities and Social Science*. 23. 179-216
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students (Routledge English Language Introduction)*. Routledge
- Cruse, A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- David, M.K. (2014). Language, Power, and Manipulation: The Use of Rhetoric in Maintaining Political Influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 5(1), 164-170
- Diniati, E., & Fitrawati. (2017). Comparison of Figurative Language between Pop-Punks Songs Lyric by "Paramore and Blink 182". *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*. 6(2). 163-171. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id>
- Dornerus, E. (2005). *A Comparative Study of How Scriptwriter break the maxims in Desperate Housewives and that 70's Show*. (Unpublished Postgraduate Dissertation). Karlstad Universted, Sweden.
- Ekawati, N.D. (2012). *An Analysis of Indirectness Employed by The Main Character Found In the Movie Easy A*. (Unpublished Thesis). Sebelas Maret University. Surakarta.
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Ways of Words*. London: Harvard University Press
- Griffith, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. Routledge: Hodder Arnold Publication.
- Gudykunst, W.B., et. Al. (1996). The Influence of Cultural Individualism-Collectivism, Self-Consruals, and In Individuals Values on Communication Styles Across Cultures. *Human Communication Research*, 22(4), 510-543.
- Hall, E.T., & Hall, M.R. (1989). *Understanding Cultural Differences*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Herawati, A. (2013). The Cooperative Principles: Is Grice's Theory Suitable to Indonesian Language Culture?. *Lingua Cultura*. 7(1). 43-48
- Huda, M. (2013). *Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue of Euro Trip Movie*. Faculty of Cultural Studies. Universitas Brawijaya. Malang

- Indriani, P. & Fitriwati. (2018). An Analysis Features in the Jakarta's Governor Election Debate 2017. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*. 7(1). 122-131. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id>
- Irnanda, I. N., & Hamzah (2017). Conversational Implicature as Found in Buyers' and Sellers' Interaction in the Tradiitonal Market of Lubuk Alung. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*. 6(2). 4-15. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id>
- Jufrizal, & Refnaldi. (2008). *Semantics and pragmatics*. Padang : English Language and Literature Department, State University of Padang
- Kothari, C.R. (1985). *Research Methodology*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- Leech, G. (1989). *The Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited
- Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Massanga, M. & Erasmus, A. M. (2017). *The observance of Gricean Conversational Maxims by Tanzanian Politicians in T.V. Hosted Interviews*. Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, University of Dar es Salaam.
- Novebry, A., & Rosa, R. N., (2019). An Analysis of Maxim Violation in Situational Comedy The Big Bang Theory. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*. 8(1). 2-12. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id>
- Paltridge, Brian. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. New York: Continuum
- Rahmi, S. S., Refnaldi, & Wahyuni, D. (2018). The Violation of Conversational Maxim Found in Political Conversation at Rosi Talk Show. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*. 7(1). 178-183. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id>
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language, fourth edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Zhang, F., & You, H. (2009). Motives of Indirectness in Daily Communication An Asian PerspectiVe. *Asian Culture and History*, 1, 99-102