

THE USE OF NON-OBSERVANCE MAXIMS THAT TRIGGER IMPLICATURE IN GANJAR PRANOWO'S INTERVIEW

Jihan Nurul Fadilah¹, Dinda Syifa Saiddina², Cecep Agus³

^{1,2,3} Prima Bangsa Cirebon Institute

jihanurulfadilah@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the use of non-observance maxims that trigger implicatures in the interview with Ganjar Pranowo, a prominent political figure in Indonesia. Employing a qualitative approach, the primary data source utilized was Youtube video of the exclusive interview with Ganjar Pranowo by TvOne, which were transcribed for analysis. Drawing on Grice's theory of conversational implicature, highlighting the implicit meanings conveyed through deviations from the four maxims of effective communication: quantity, quality, relation, and manner, this research delves into Ganjar Pranowo's communication strategies, particularly focusing on deviations from the cooperative principles in communication. This study reveals that Ganjar Pranowo frequently employs particularized implicatures to convey additional messages beyond the literal meaning of his words. This approach not only adds layers of meaning but also showcases the strategic use of language to imply information indirectly. Additionally, the study identifies instances where Ganjar Pranowo deliberately limits the information provided during interviews, further complicating the interpretative process for listeners. These findings illustrate the complexity of human communication dynamics, where implied messages and implicit communication strategies significantly influence the understanding of spoken words. This study offers profound insights into Ganjar Pranowo's adept use of language and implicatures to communicate nuanced messages. It highlights the intricacies of human communication processes and the subtle dynamics of interaction between speakers, emphasizing the importance of context and inference in effective communication.

Keywords: *cooperative principle; Ganjar Pranowo; implicature; interview; non-observance maxim*

INTRODUCTION

As social creatures, humans naturally engage in communication processes throughout their lives. Communication is the foundation of human interaction, allowing them to convey ideas, emotions, and information to others (Gunatika et al., 2021). Whether verbal or non-verbal, communication plays an important role in strengthening interpersonal relationships and facilitating understanding between individuals.

Conversation, as one of the most common forms of communication, is interesting to analyze as it offers valuable insights into the dynamics of human interaction. In conversation, messages are conveyed through words, intonation, facial expressions, and body language, all of which shape the meanings understood by the participants of the conversation (Saradifa, 2020). The study of conversation therefore provides a deeper understanding of how humans communicate, build

relationships, and interpret the world around them.

In a conversation, speakers and listeners work together to convey and understand information. According to Rachmah et al. (2022), and as quoted by Yule (2016), there are four principles in Grice's cooperative principles that must be followed: the Maxim of Quantity, which emphasizes providing the right amount of information—no more, no less—ensuring clarity without overwhelming the listener; the Maxim of Quality, which stresses sharing accurate and reliable information, supported by evidence and free from inaccuracies; the Maxim of Relation, which ensures relevance by aligning the information with the context of the conversation; and the Maxim of Manner, which encourages communicating clearly, concisely, and in an organized way, avoiding ambiguity and unnecessary complexity. These principles help achieve effective communication by balancing detail, accuracy, relevance, and clarity.

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, by following such principles, communicators can increase the effectiveness of their interactions and ensure that their messages are accurately understood by their audience. Unfortunately, speakers often do not adhere to them either intentionally or unintentionally (Rachmah et al., 2022). In fact, sometimes the speaker is hiding some information, give wrong information and speaking unclearly to imply something (Evayanti Munthe, 2021). Situations where people fail to comply with maxims are commonly known as non-observance maxim. People might have different reasons on why they choose to disobey maxims (Gunatika et al., 2021). As a result, their conversations cannot go well and smoothly. It is called violation maxims. When the listeners do maxim violation, the conversation between the speakers and the listeners can be unsuccessful since they will misunderstand each other (Rahmawati et al., 2022).

As cited from Saradifa (2020), failure to comply with maxims has several types, namely flouting a maxim, violating a maxim, infringing a maxim, opting out of a maxim, and suspending a maxim. Firstly, flouting a maxim occurs when a speaker deliberately gives an implicature without directly stating it, often leading the hearer to understand the implied meaning without much thought. In contrast, the violation of maxims involves implicatures that are insincere, irrelevant, or ambiguous, resulting in confusion for the listener who must interpret the intended message. This often results in misinterpretation during conversation and it can be that he or she may use hyperbole, metaphor or irony in uttering the information (Khusna et al., 2021).

Next, infringing a maxim occurs due to the speaker's inability to effectively convey their message, influenced by factors such as nervousness or language proficiency. Zahra & Suyudi (2023) gave the statement that it can be performed by a speaker who has a lack of a language such as a kid or a learner of foreign language who is not fluent. Opting out, on the other hand, arises when a speaker refrains from speaking the truth to avoid causing discomfort or appearing uncooperative. Lastly, suspending a maxim is commonly observed in funeral speeches or obituaries, where speakers aim to honor participants and preserve their feelings.

These phenomena collectively contribute to the complexities of communication, impacting how messages are perceived and understood in various contexts. The implicatures that arise are influenced by the non-observance of maxims, as noted by Grice in Yule (2016). Conversational implicature, a concept introduced by Grice, refers to the additional meaning conveyed beyond the literal interpretation of an utterance, arising from the context of the conversation. This is to describe when any context in which non-observed maxims are followed or obeyed is called non-observance (Jalal Sa et al., 2022)

In pragmatics, implicature studies are used to take into account certain messages that are implicit in communication between speakers and speech partners (Pertiwi, 2023). According to Grice in Yule (2016), he categorizes implicatures into two types: conventional and conversational. Conventional implicatures are derived from the conventional meaning of words or phrases, while conversational implicatures arise from the context of the conversation. Grice's logic of conversation is based on the idea that contributors to a conversation are rational agents; that is, that they obey the cooperative principle (Moeschler, 2012). Within conversational implicatures,

Grice further distinguishes between generalized and particularized implicatures. Generalized implicatures involve broad, context-independent inferences, while particularized implicatures are more specific and context-dependent. As in verbal communication, there are maxims that can be violated, especially during interviews. According to Basya (2017), the variety of utterances produced by the interviewer may not fulfill the conversational maxims. However, in actual communication scenarios, the Principle of Cooperation can be violated for various reasons, giving rise to conversational implicatures and non-compliance with the maxims. Even in political interviews, as was the case in the BBC interview with president Joko Widodo where several maxim violations were found; violations of the maxims of quantity, quality, and relevance were identified, with no violations of the maxim of manner (Adena & Mulia, 2024).

Certainly, anyone can disobey the maxims, but often the utterances of public figures are interesting to examine, including political figures. Similar research has been conducted previously by Aisya (2019) on several Indonesian political figures who were guests on the Mata Najwa show. The results of this research indicate that political guests flouted maxims in 55 of their utterances for various reasons related to their roles as politicians holding power and responsibility. Therefore, the researcher is interested in exploring conversational implicatures triggered by the use of non-observance maxims in the Exclusive Interview between Ganjar Pranowo as a politician and Kabar Petang tvOne regarding his response to the decision of the General Election Commission (KPU) regarding the determination of the president and vice president in the 2024 election.

METHOD

As an integral component of linguistic research that studies the complexities of speaker intent and utterance interpretation, this study adopts a qualitative research methodology. According to Rachman et al. (2024), qualitative research is characterized by its in-depth and comprehensive approach, which aims to understand and explain phenomena in their natural contextual environment. The main data source for this investigation consisted of video recordings of exclusive interviews that can be accessed on tvOneNews' YouTube channel under the title "*Wawancara Eksklusif, Tanggapan Ganjar terhadap Prabowo dan Gibran | Kabar Petang tvOne*". The researcher conducted an analytical check of the dataset by carefully reviewing the 14 minutes and 38 seconds of interview footage. Following this initial review, the researcher transcribed the interview content into a written text format, facilitating the systematic categorization and analysis of instances where non-observance maxims were used and the resulting implicatures, with reference to Grice's theoretical framework as outlined in (Yule, 2016).

Grice's theory of conversational implicature guides this study, highlighting the implicit meanings conveyed through deviations from the four maxims of effective communication: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Deviations, or maxim non-observance, occur when speakers use implicatures to add deeper meaning beyond their words. The researcher applied Grice's framework to analyze Ganjar Pranowo's responses in an interview about the KPU's decision on the 2024 presidential and vice-presidential winners. This study, through transcription and analysis, aims to uncover the implicit communication strategies in political discourse.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The use of non-observance maxims in Ganjar Pranowo's interview is the main focus of this results chapter. This chapter delves into how the use of these maxims triggers implicatures in the context of political interview. Through careful analysis, this chapter aims to uncover how communication strategies employed by Ganjar Pranowo through non-observance maxims shape a deeper understanding of the messages conveyed in the interview. Additionally, we have collected the data to support our findings. The data are presented in the table below:

Tabel 1. Data of Non-Observance and Implicature by Ganjar Pranowo Interview

No	Data	Non-Observance Maxim	Implicature
1.	<p>News Anchor : Oke Baik Eh gini Pak Ganjar yang jadi pertanyaan banyak orang juga nih pak Ganjar mungkin juga akan mudah-mudahan tidak bosan ya menjawab pertanyaan. Seputar agenda hari ini begitu Pak Ganjar Pak Mahfud dengan alasan tadi yang disampaikan Pak Ganjar dan juga Pak Mahfud tidak hadir karena alasan undangan, tapi pak Ganjar juga dapatkan informasi kok teman-teman PDIP yang lain juga nggak kelihatan gitu loh di KPU hari ini pak Ganjar?</p> <p>Ganjar : Kalau hari ini saya posisi di Jakarta dan Umpama itu satu hari sebelumnya, meskipun saya di Jogja begitu ya Saya pasti akan datang.</p>	Opting out of the Maxim of Quality	Conversational (Particularized)
2.	<p>News Anchor : Pak Ganjar dalam kesempatan kali ini karena undangannya tibanya telat ke tangan Pak Ganjar Pranowo. Ada hal tidak yang ingin disampaikan kepada presiden terpilih yang sudah ditetapkan pada hari ini oleh KPU termasuk juga kepada KPU baik itu kepada Prabowo Subianto dan Gibran Rakabuming Raka dan juga mungkin kepada KPU?</p> <p>Ganjar : Enggak sih. Kalau saya sih esensinya sudah ditetapkan selamat bekerja kepada Pak Prabowo dan Mas Gibran gitu itu saja.</p>	Opting out of the Maxim of Quantity	Conversational (Particularized)
3.	<p>News Anchor : kalau soal teman-teman PDIP gitu Pak Ganjar juga punya komentar tidak Pak Ganjar?</p> <p>Ganjar : saya kebetulan tidak berkomunikasi setelah saya bertemu dengan Bu Mega setelah pengumuman. Saya memang langsung ke Jogja. Setelah itu saya justru ditanya oleh banyak orang begitu, “Pak Ganjar besok datang enggak?” begitu loh acara apa ini yang nanya apa relawan loh acara apa gitu katanya besok mau ada pengumuman penetapan KPU dan itu masih katanya maka saya sampaikan posisi saya di Jogja sehingga saya berharap betul Umpama nih Umpama ada konfirmasi apakah dari Sekjen apakah dari mungkin komisioner karena saya kenal semua dengan komisioner bisa jadi ditelepon. Waktu MK itu sekjennya juga tanya apakah besok Pak Ganjar dan Pak Mahfud mau hadir begitu dan kita jawab kita hadir jadi ada konfirmasi juga bahkan mereka menyiapkan Tata kursinya dan sebagainya begitu.</p>	Opting out of the Maxim of Quantity and Relevance	Conversational (Particularized)

- | | | | |
|----|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 4. | <p>News Anchor : Meskipun ada ajakan dari Pak Prabowo sendiri untuk merangkul semua elemen untuk membangun bangsa begitu Pak dalam pemerintahan mendatang?</p> <p>Pak Ganjar : Iya semua orang punya keinginan tapi semua juga punya sikap yang penting saling menghormati dan saling menghargai demi kebaikan bangsa dan negara.</p> | Floating of the Maxim
Relevance | Conversational
(Particularized) |
| 5. | <p>News Anchor : Pak seperti yang Pak Ganjar sampaikan tapi mungkin ada tidak rencana bertemu atau mengucapkan selamat secara personal begitu atau mungkin sudah lewat WA gitu Pak Ganjar ?</p> <p>Ganjar : Ya saya kebetulan tidak punya wa-nya dan saya sampaikan di depan eh tvOne dan pada kesempatan pertama setelah putusan MK saya sampaikan itu di depan seluruh media yang ada jadi rasanya mudah-mudahan sampai dan saya kira pasti sampai.</p> | Flouting of the Maxim
Quantity | Conversational
(Particularized) |
| 6. | <p>News Anchor : Oke kalau seandainya Pak Prabowo Subianto menemui Anda Anda welcome ya?</p> <p>Ganjar : Iya saya setelah lebaran itu empat kali Open house di empat titik yang berbeda seluruh masyarakat hadir maka siapapun boleh hadir saya tidak membedakan.</p> | Flouting of the Maxim
Relevance | Conversational
(Particularized) |
| 7. | <p>News Anchor : Nah setelah setelah keputusan MK kemudian penetapan hari ini wacana yang berkembang adalah soal koalisi-koalisi, nah rencana nih pak Ganjar gitu kita juga tahu Kita paham teman-teman PDIP kan juga sedang mengajukan gugatan ya di PTUN gitu tapi kalau di dalam konteks koalisi koalisi antar capres-capres atau koalisi antara parpol-parpol yang mendukung capres-capres kemarin ada yang bertanya Pak Ganjar ini siap berposisi dengan pdip-nya atau mungkin membuka opsi untuk bergabung di pemerintahan Pak Prabowo dan Gibran?</p> <p>Ganjar : kalau partai nanti partai yang akan memutuskan. Rencana PDIP akan ada Rakernas untuk merespon semuanya ini dan ini prosesnya kan masih panjang sampai Oktober tapi kalau Anda bertanya kepada saya, saya memberikan penghormatan kepada pemenang untuk menyusun kabinet dan akan sangat baik kalau saya tidak ada di dalamnya. Satu menghormati pemenang pasti akan banyak orang yang ingin duduk dalam jabatan-jabatan strategis begitu dan saya kira dengan saya di luar, saya akan bisa melakukan apa kontrol check and balances yang kita bisa lakukan dan ini sangat mengedukasi kepada masyarakat itu menurut</p> | Flouting of the Maxim
Quantity | Conversational
(Particularized) |

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>8. News Anchor : Pak Ganjar artinya kalau diajak berkesempatan untuk bergabung membantu pemerintahan terpilih Pak Ganjar dengan yakin 100% menolak tawaran tersebut Pak Ganjar?
 Ganjar : Saya kira saya akan mengulangi memberikan kesempatan mereka untuk menyusun kabinet, memberikan kesempatan dari partai koalisi mereka untuk bisa bersama-sama menjadi tim nya dan akan jauh lebih baik kalau saya ada di luar pemerintahan dan itu memberikan edukasi kepada semuanya. Saya kira kepada publik kepada relawan agar ini sedang tidak cerita bagi-bagi kue tidak sedang cerita bagi-bagi jabatan dan tidak sedang bercerita mencari pekerjaan dan jabatan</p> | <p>Flouting of the Maxim
Quantity and Quality</p> | <p>Conversational (Particularized)</p> |
| <p>9. News Anchor : Oke Pak Ganjar kita ingin tahu alasan tidak datang ke KPU dalam undangan hari ini apakah betul karena memang undangannya telat tiba di pak Ganjar atau mungkin ada alasan lain?
 Ganjar : Iya saya kira begitu karena tadi malam saya juga sudah bertanya kepada staf saya adakah undangan dan tidak ada ternyata baru pagi-pagi tadi saya dikasih tahu bahwa eh ada undangan Pak begitu sehingga Posisi saya di Jogja sehingga tidak bisa datang.</p> | <p>Violating of the Maxim
Quantity</p> | <p>Conversational of (Particularized)</p> |
| <p>10. News Anchor : pak Ganjar kalau gitu kenapa nggak standby di Jakarta aja Pak Ganjar di masa-masa seperti ini?
 Pak Ganjar : saya tidak dikasih tahu kalau akan ada pengumuman. kecuali tvOne mewakili KPU, sehingga anda bisa meminta kepada saya. Maksud saya begini pertanyaan ini mesti dikoreksi dong artinya begini Kenapa “Pak Ganjar tidak standby di Jakarta” kenapa kemudian pemberitahuannya tidak lebih awal karena niatan saya pasti datang ya. Saya pasti menghormati sebuah keputusan dari institusi terkait dengan sesuatu yang sangat penting menurut saya. Saya juga akan menghormati Mitra tanding saya sesama kontestan begitu.</p> | <p>Violating of the Maxim
Quantity</p> | <p>Conversational of (Particularized)</p> |

As presented in the table, the interview data from Ganjar Pranowo show the existence of a non-observance maxim with similar implications, namely conversational (particularized). All types of data belong to non-observance maxim Ganjar Pranowo in an interview delivered at following section:

Discussion

This chapter delves into non-observance maxims and implicatures based on Grice's theory, analyzing 10 interviews with Ganjar Pranowo. The interviews reveal how communication principles are applied or violated and how implicature arises from such violations. Using Grice's approach, we see that conversations are not just about literal words but also about implied meanings from context and situation. This analysis aims to enhance our understanding of effective communication in this context. The data include seven types of non-observance maxims: opting

out of the maxims of quantity, quality, and relevance; flouting the maxims of quantity, quality, and relevance; and violating the maxim of quantity. The following data analysis:

Opting Out of the Maxim

According to Grice, as cited in (Gunatika et al., 2021), opting out of maxims occurs when the speaker is unwilling to cooperate as the maxims urge. Suspending maxims happens when there is no expectation to meet the maxim, often due to cultural reasons. In this case, the speaker violates the maxims of quality, quantity, and relevance.

Firstly, opting out of the quality maxim occurs when a speaker intentionally provides false or misleading information, violates the conversational norm of honesty, or fails to provide sufficient evidence to support their statements. Secondly, opting out of the quantity maxim occurs when a speaker provides more or less information than required for effective communication, leading to verbosity or excessive brevity, which causes ambiguity or lack of clarity. Lastly, opting out of the relevance maxim happens when a speaker deviates from the topic at hand or fails to address the question or statement posed by their interlocutor, introducing irrelevant information or sidetracking the conversation, which hinders effective communication and creates confusion.

Here is an example of data showing opting out of the maxims of quality, quantity, and relevance found in Ganjar Pranowo's interview:

Data 1

News Anchor: Oke baik, eh gini Pak Ganjar yang jadi pertanyaan banyak orang juga nih pak Ganjar mungkin juga akan mudah-mudahan tidak bosan ya menjawab pertanyaan. Seputar agenda hari ini begitu Pak Ganjar Pak Mahfud dengan alasan tadi yang disampaikan Pak Ganjar dan juga Pak Mahfud tidak hadir karena alasan undangan, tapi Pak Ganjar juga dapatkan informasi kok teman-teman PDIP yang lain juga nggak kelihatan gitu loh di KPU hari ini Pak Ganjar?

Ganjar: Kalau hari ini saya posisi di Jakarta dan umpama itu satu hari sebelumnya, meskipun saya di Jogja begitu ya saya pasti akan datang.

Translation:

A: "Alright. Mr. Ganjar, many people are also wondering, Mr. Ganjar, hopefully you won't be bored answering questions about today's agenda. Mr. Ganjar and Mr. Mahfud, with the reasons you mentioned, were not present due to the invitation issue. But did you also receive information about why other PDIP members weren't visible at the KPU today, Mr. Ganjar?"

Ganjar: "Yes, if I were in Jakarta today and let's say even if it were a day earlier, despite being in Jogja, I would definitely have come."

Ganjar's response to the News Anchor's inquiry regarding his absence at the KPU event appears evasive and lacking in transparency. Instead of directly addressing the question posed to him, Ganjar sidesteps the issue by engaging in a hypothetical scenario. His statement, "*Kalau hari ini saya posisi di Jakarta dan umpama itu satu hari sebelumnya, meskipun saya di Jogja begitu ya saya pasti akan datang,*" implies a potential willingness to attend the event if circumstances were different. However, this response fails to provide a concrete explanation for his absence or that of his PDIP colleagues. By opting to discuss a hypothetical situation rather than providing factual information about the actual events, Ganjar skirts the expectation of providing truthful and relevant responses. This evasion tactic not only creates ambiguity but also undermines the transparency expected from public figures. Consequently, Ganjar's response raises concerns about his commitment to upholding the principles of honesty and integrity in communication, thus aligning with the concept of opting out of the Maxim of Quality.

Furthermore, Ganjar's response can be seen as an example of conversational implicature, specifically particularized implicature. Conversational implicature refers to the implied meaning

that arises from what is said, often relying on context and the speaker's intentions. In this case, Ganjar's mention of a hypothetical scenario implicitly suggests that there may be undisclosed reasons for his absence at the KPU event. By choosing to discuss what he would have done in a different situation, Ganjar indirectly communicates that there are factors influencing his attendance beyond what he explicitly states. This particularized implicature allows Ganjar to convey additional information without directly stating it, thus further contributing to the ambiguity surrounding his absence.

Data 2

News Anchor: Pak Ganjar dalam kesempatan kali ini karena undangannya tibanya telat ke tangan Pak Ganjar Pranowo. Ada hal tidak yang ingin disampaikan kepada presiden terpilih yang sudah ditetapkan pada hari ini oleh KPU termasuk juga kepada KPU baik itu kepada Prabowo Subianto dan Gibran Rakabuming Raka dan juga mungkin kepada KPU?

Ganjar: Enggak sih. Kalau saya sih esensinya sudah ditetapkan selamat bekerja kepada Pak Prabowo dan Mas Gibran gitu itu saja.

Translation:

A: "Yes, Mr. Ganjar, in this opportunity, since the invitation arrived late to Mr. Ganjar Pranowo, is there anything you would like to convey to the elected president, as announced today by the KPU, including to Mr. Prabowo Subianto and Mr. Gibran Rakabuming Raka, and perhaps to the KPU as well?"

G: "Not really, no. For me, the essence is already set. Congratulations to Mr. Prabowo and Mr. Gibran on their new roles."

Ganjar's response not only veers away from the maxim of quantity but also indicates a disregard for the expectation of providing comprehensive information. By addressing only one aspect of the question posed by the news anchor and dismissing further inquiry with the curt phrase "gitu itu saja," Ganjar limits the amount of information he shares, thereby demonstrating a reluctance to fully engage with the interviewer. This selective response suggests a deliberate choice to withhold details about his absence at the KPU event, signaling a lack of cooperation in communication.

In addition to disregarding the maxim of quantity and exhibiting a reluctance to provide comprehensive information, Ganjar's response also involves conversational implicature, particularly of the particularized kind. By selectively addressing only one aspect of the question and using the dismissive phrase "gitu itu saja," Ganjar implies more than what is explicitly stated. The particular implicature suggests that there are underlying reasons or information that he is choosing not to disclose regarding his absence at the KPU event. This implicit communication strategy allows Ganjar to convey a message beyond the literal meaning of his words, further contributing to the ambiguity surrounding his response. Thus, his use of particularized implicature adds another layer to his communication style, emphasizing his reluctance to fully cooperate in providing transparent information about his actions and decisions.

Data 3

News Anchor : Kalau soal teman-teman PDIP gitu Pak Ganjar juga punya komentar tidak Pak Ganjar?

Ganjar : Saya kebetulan tidak berkomunikasi setelah saya bertemu dengan Bu Mega setelah pengumuman. Saya memang langsung ke Jogja. Setelah itu, saya justru ditanya oleh banyak orang begitu, "Pak Ganjar besok datang enggak?" begitu loh acara apa ini yang nanya apa relawan loh acara apa gitu katanya besok mau ada pengumuman penetapan KPU dan itu masih katanya maka saya sampaikan posisi saya di Jogja sehingga saya berharap betul Umpama nih Umpama ada konfirmasi apakah dari Sekjen apakah dari mungkin komisioner

karena saya kenal semua dengan komisioner bisa jadi ditelepon. Waktu MK itu sekjennya juga tanya apakah besok Pak Ganjar dan Pak Mahfud mau hadir begitu dan kita jawab kita hadir jadi ada konfirmasi juga bahkan mereka menyiapkan Tata kursinya dan sebagainya begitu.

Translation:

News Anchor : "Now, what about your PDIP friends, Mr. Ganjar? Do you have any comments, Mr. Ganjar?"

Ganjar : "Well, I happened not to have communicated after meeting with Bu Mega. After the announcement, I immediately went to Jogja. After that, many people actually asked me, 'Is Mr. Ganjar coming tomorrow?' It's like that. What event is this? It's the volunteers who asked. What event is it? They said there will be an announcement from the KPU tomorrow, and it's still hearsay. So, I conveyed my position in Jogja, hoping that if there's confirmation, perhaps from the Secretary General or maybe from a commissioner because I know them all, I might get a call. During the Constitutional Court (MK), the Secretary General also asked, 'Will Mr. Ganjar and Mr. Mahfud attend tomorrow?' like that, and we answered, 'We'll attend.' So, there was confirmation. They even prepared the seating arrangement and so on."

In Ganjar's response to the News Anchor's inquiry about his comments regarding his PDIP colleagues, he markedly deviates from the expected norms of cooperative communication. Instead of directly addressing the anchor's question, Ganjar embarks on a verbose explanation detailing his post-meeting activities with Bu Mega and his subsequent journey to Jogja. This lengthy digression not only violates the maxim of relevance by straying from the anchor's query but also breaches the maxim of quantity by inundating the conversation with extraneous information. By neglecting to provide a concise and pertinent response, Ganjar effectively opts out of cooperative communication, demonstrating a reluctance to engage with the anchor's inquiry directly.

This departure from conversational norms gives rise to implicature, particularly of the particularized kind, as it suggests that Ganjar is intentionally avoiding discussing his PDIP colleagues. By choosing to delve into unrelated matters, Ganjar implies that he either has no comments to offer on his PDIP colleagues or is deliberately sidestepping the issue. Overall, Ganjar's response exemplifies a strategic communication approach aimed at deflecting from the anchor's question while subtly conveying a message through implicature.

Floating of the Maxim

According to Grice's theory, flouting maxims occurs when the speaker fails to fulfill the maxims because their utterance might have a different meaning than what is being said. In this case, the speaker violates the maxims of quality, quantity, and relevance.

First, flouting the quality maxim refers to situations where strict adherence to truthfulness and accuracy may vary depending on the context, the speaker's intentions, or cultural norms. It allows for some flexibility in providing completely truthful information, acknowledging that complete honesty may not always be feasible or appropriate.

Secondly, flouting the quantity maxim involves a flexible approach to providing information, where speakers may offer more or less information than strictly necessary based on factors such as the conversational context, the interlocutor's prior knowledge, or the speaker's communicative goals. This acknowledges that the amount of information provided can vary, allowing for adaptability in communication.

Lastly, flouting the relevance maxim refers to a flexible interpretation of the expectation to stay on topic or address specific points in a conversation. It recognizes that discussions may naturally drift between related topics or that speakers may introduce tangential information that contributes to the overall understanding or progression of the conversation. This flexibility allows

for a more organic and dynamic exchange of ideas while maintaining coherence in communication.

Let's take a look at the data example of flouting maxims of quality, quantity, and relevance found in Ganjar Pranowo's interview:

Data 4

News Anchor: Meskipun ada ajakan dari Pak Prabowo sendiri untuk merangkul semua elemen untuk membangun bangsa begitu Pak dalam pemerintahan mendatang?

Ganjar: Iya semua orang punya keinginan tapi semua juga punya sikap yang penting saling menghormati dan saling menghargai demi kebaikan bangsa dan negara.

Translation:

News Anchor: "Okay, even though there's an invitation from Mr. Prabowo himself to embrace all elements to build the nation, in the upcoming government?"

Ganjar: "Yes, everyone has desires. Everyone also has attitudes. What's important is mutual respect and appreciation for the good of the nation and the country."

In the conversation, the News Anchor asked a question about Prabowo's invitation to embrace all elements in building the nation. However, the response given by Ganjar seems to have a violation of the cooperative principle, especially in terms of relevance. Ganjar consciously avoids giving an answer that is directly relevant to the call, and this can be seen as a violation of the principle of precision. He ambiguously states that everyone has the desire to build the nation, but emphasizes the importance of mutual respect and appreciation, without explicitly referring to the call made by Prabowo. This suggests that Ganjar may have intentionally avoided giving a direct response to the question, with the aim of providing a certain implicature.

The implicature that emerges from his response can be interpreted as a rejection of it, without stating it directly. Thus, Ganjar's response shows the use of implicature, especially in the context of conversational implicature (particularized), which indicates his decision not to join the invitation proposed by Prabowo.

Data 5

News Anchor: Pak seperti yang Pak Ganjar sampaikan tapi mungkin ada tidak rencana bertemu atau mengucapkan selamat secara personal begitu atau mungkin sudah lewat WA gitu Pak Ganjar?

Ganjar: Ya saya kebetulan tidak punya wa-nya dan saya sampaikan di depan eh tvOne dan pada kesempatan pertama setelah putusan MK saya sampaikan itu di depan seluruh media yang ada jadi rasanya mudah-mudahan sampai dan saya kira pasti sampai.

Translation:

News Anchor : "Okay, there are no grudges after the contest, as Mr. Ganjar mentioned. But is there a plan to meet or convey congratulations personally, or perhaps it has been done through WhatsApp, Mr. Ganjar?"

Ganjar : "Well, I happen to not have WhatsApp, and I conveyed it in front of tvOne and on the first opportunity after the Constitutional Court decision, I conveyed it in front of all the media available, so I think it should reach them, and I believe it has."

In this dialogue, the News Anchor asked whether there was a plan for Ganjar to personally meet or congratulate President-elect Prabowo Subianto. However, the response given by Ganjar seemed to ignore the quantity principle in conversation. Instead of giving a direct answer of "yes" or "no", Ganjar stated that he had congratulated TVOne as a television station, without indicating any intention or plan to congratulate him personally. This creates ambiguity in the

communication, as the inquiring party may expect a more informative direct response. By not providing an answer that fulfills the quantity principle, Ganjar may be trying to avoid talking openly about his personal plans, but this may cause uncertainty in the conversation.

The use of this particularized conversational implicature creates ambiguity in communication, allowing Ganjar to keep his personal plans private while still giving a response that is not entirely clear. Thus, this approach allows Ganjar to avoid directly discussing his personal plans in the conversation, while providing clues about his intentions or wishes through implied implicature.

Data 6

*News Anchor: Oke kalau seandainya Pak Prabowo Subianto menemui Anda Anda welcome ya?
Ganjar : Iya saya setelah lebaran itu empat kali Open house di empat titik yang berbeda seluruh masyarakat hadir maka siapapun boleh hadir saya tidak membeda-bedakan.*

Translation:

News Anchor: "Okay, if Mr. Prabowo Subianto were to meet you, you would welcome him, right?"

Ganjar: "Yes, after Eid, I held Open House four times at four different locations. The whole community attended, so anyone is welcome. I don't discriminate."

In this conversation, the News Anchor asked whether Ganjar would welcome Prabowo Subianto if they met. However, Ganjar's response seemed to flout the maxim of relevance. Instead of directly answering the question, Ganjar mentioned that he had held open houses four times and stated that the events were open to anyone, including Prabowo, without any political agenda or special event. By responding in this way, Ganjar does not directly comply with the relevance of the question asked but provides information about the open houses he has held. This implies that although he is open to meeting Prabowo, there is no particular political plan or agenda associated with the meeting.

Additionally, Ganjar uses particularized conversational implicature by not directly answering the News Anchor's question. Instead, he chose to provide information about the open house he had held, which implicitly indicated that although he was open to meeting Prabowo, there was no specific political agenda or event associated with the meeting. By doing so, Ganjar creates particularized implicature, indicating that he is not explicitly stating an intention or plan to welcome Prabowo if they meet, but is providing hints about the open and inclusive nature of the open houses he has held. This allows Ganjar to maintain flexibility in his communication while giving an idea of the attitudes and principles underlying his actions.

Data 7

News Anchor: Nah setelah setelah keputusan MK kemudian penetapan hari ini wacana yang berkembang adalah soal koalisi-koalisi, nah rencana nih pak Ganjar gitu kita juga tahu Kita paham teman-teman PDIP kan juga sedang mengajukan gugatan ya di PTUN gitu tapi kalau di dalam konteks koalisi koalisi antar capres-capres atau koalisi antara parpol-parpol yang mengusung capres-capres kemarin ada yang bertanya Pak Ganjar ini siap berposisi dengan pdip-nya atau mungkin membuka opsi untuk bergabung di pemerintahan Pak Prabowo dan Gibran?

Ganjar : kalau partai nanti partai yang akan memutuskan. Rencana PDIP akan ada Rakernas untuk merespon semuanya ini dan ini prosesnya kan masih panjang sampai Oktober tapi kalau Anda bertanya kepada saya, saya memberikan penghormatan kepada pemenang untuk menyusun kabinet dan akan sangat baik kalau saya tidak ada di dalamnya. Satu menghormati pemenang pasti akan banyak orang yang ingin duduk dalam jabatan-jabatan strategis begitu dan saya kira dengan saya di luar, saya akan bisa melakukan apa

kontrol check and balances yang kita bisa lakukan dan ini sangat mengedukasi kepada masyarakat itu menurut saya.

Translation:

News Anchor : "Okay, understood. Now, after the decision of the Constitutional Court and today's announcement, there's been discussion about coalitions, Mr. Ganjar. We also understand that your PDIP friends are filing a lawsuit with the Administrative Court (PTUN), but in the context of coalitions between presidential candidates or between parties that endorsed presidential and vice-presidential candidates, there's a question: 'Mr. Ganjar, are you ready to oppose PDIP or perhaps open the option to join the government with Mr. Prabowo and Mr. Gibran?'"

Ganjar : "If we're talking about the party, it's the party that will decide. PDIP will have a national meeting to respond to all of this, and this process will continue until October. But if you're asking me, I respect the winner to form a cabinet, and it would be very good if I'm not part of it. By being outside, I can provide checks and balances, which I believe would be educational for the public."

In his response, Ganjar clearly refused to join the same party as Prabowo, but his answer is not concise, thus violating the principle of quantity. This deliberate deviation creates a new meaning through flouting, as Ganjar does not explicitly state his refusal. Instead, he states that the party will determine the decision and that he will respect the winner's choice to draft the cabinet. He added that it would be best if he were not included in the cabinet, as it would allow him to exercise the necessary checks and balances from the outside. This conversational (particular) implicature implies that although he does not directly refuse to join Prabowo and Gibran's government, he prefers to remain independent and exercise control from outside the government. Ganjar's answer provides clues about his attitudes and preferences regarding possible future political coalitions.

Data 8

News Anchor: Pak ganjar artinya kalau diajak berkesempatan untuk bergabung membantu pemerintahan terpilih Pak Ganjar dengan yakin 100% menolak tawaran tersebut Pak Ganjar?

Ganjar: Saya kira saya akan mengulangi memberikan kesempatan mereka untuk menyusun kabinet, memberikan kesempatan dari partai koalisi mereka untuk bisa bersama-sama menjadi tim nya dan akan jauh lebih baik kalau saya ada di luar pemerintahan dan itu memberikan edukasi kepada semuanya. Saya kira kepada publik kepada relawan agar ini sedang tidak cerita bagi-bagi kue tidak sedang cerita bagi-bagi jabatan dan tidak sedang bercerita mencari pekerjaan dan jabatan

Translation:

News Anchor : "So, Mr. Ganjar, does that mean if you were invited to join the elected government, you would confidently reject the offer, 100%, Mr. Ganjar?"

Ganjar : "I think I'll reiterate, giving them the opportunity to form a cabinet. Giving the coalition parties the opportunity to collectively be at the helm, and it would be much better if I were outside the government, providing education to everyone. I think to the public, to the volunteers, let's not make this about dividing the cake, not about distributing positions, not about seeking employment and positions."

Ganjar's response indirectly suggests that he is refusing the offer to join the government. He implies that it is better for him to stay outside the government and give others the opportunity to take on that position. This can be seen as an example of noncompliance. Because the previous

question asked if he rejected the offer with 100% certainty, he does not directly answer it. Therefore, from Ganjar's answer, there is an implication that he refuses to join. Furthermore, this leads to a conservative (particular) implicature, where we can infer Ganjar's true intention that he is not interested in joining the government. Thus, Ganjar's response provides clues about his attitude and preferences in the context of the offer to join the government.

Violating of the Maxim

The Grice's theory suggests that maxim violation occurs when a speaker intentionally misleads the listener by violating the maxim. A specific type of maxim violation is the violation of the quantity maxim. This happens when a speaker provides more or less information than is necessary or expected in a given context. It can manifest in different ways, such as being too verbose and giving excessive details, or being too brief and not providing enough information to address the topic or question at hand. Essentially, it involves not meeting the expectations of effective communication in a given situation. The examples from Ganjar Pranowo's interview exemplify instances of maxim violation.

Data 9

News Anchor : Oke Pak Ganjar kita ingin tahu alasan tidak datang ke KPU dalam undangan hari ini apakah betul karena memang undangannya telat tiba di pak Ganjar atau mungkin ada alasan lain?

Ganjar : Iya saya kira begitu karena tadi malam saya juga sudah bertanya kepada staf saya adakah undangan dan tidak ada ternyata baru pagi-pagi tadi saya dikasih tahu bahwa eh ada undangan Pak begitu sehingga Posisi saya di Jogja sehingga tidak bisa datang.

Translation:

News Anchor: "Alright, Mr. Ganjar, we'd like to know the reason for not attending the General Election Commission (KPU) invitation today. Is it true that the invitation arrived late to you, Mr. Ganjar, or were there other reasons?"

Ganjar : "Yes, I believe so because last night I also asked my staff if there was an invitation, but there wasn't. It was only this morning that I was informed, 'There's an invitation, sir.' So, I'm currently in Jogja, making it impossible for me to attend."

During a news interview, the anchor asked Ganjar why he was absent from the KPU event. Ganjar's response was lengthy and provided detailed information about the circumstances that caused his absence. This violation of the principle of quantity in communication resulted in a conversational implicature. In other words, listeners inferred something based on specific information given in the conversation. In Ganjar's case, the implicature was the reason for his absence. He explained that he had received the invitation late, which led to his absence as he was in Jogja at the time. While Ganjar's answer was too wordy, it provided specific details that hinted at the reason for his absence.

Data 10

News Anchor: pak Ganjar kalau gitu kenapa nggak standby di Jakarta aja Pak Ganjar di masa-masa seperti ini?

Pak Ganjar: saya tidak dikasih tahu kalau akan ada pengumuman. kecuali tvOne mewakili KPU, sehingga anda bisa meminta kepada saya. Maksud saya begini pertanyaan ini mesti dikoreksi dong artinya begini Kenapa "Pak Ganjar tidak standby di Jakarta" kenapa kemudian pemberituannya tidak lebih awal karena niatan saya pasti datang ya. Saya pasti menghormati sebuah keputusan dari institusi terkait dengan sesuatu yang sangat penting menurut saya. Saya juga akan menghormati Mitra tanding saya sesama kontestan begitu.

Translation:

News Anchor : "Mr. Ganjar, then why didn't you stay in Jakarta during times like these, Mr. Ganjar?"

Ganjar : "Why wasn't I informed beforehand about the announcement? Except if TVOne represented the KPU. So, you could have asked me. Yes, what I mean is this question needs correction, right? It means, why didn't Mr. Ganjar stay in Jakarta? Why wasn't the notification given earlier? Because my intention was definitely to come. Yes, I will definitely respect a decision from an institution related to something very important, in my opinion. I will also respect my fellow contestants."

In a conversation, Mr. Ganjar was asked by an anchor why he was not on standby in Jakarta during an important time. However, Mr. Ganjar's response was not directly related to the question and was too lengthy, which violates the principle of quantity in communication. This violation of the quantity principle leads to conversational implicature, where listeners make assumptions or inferences based on specific information given in the conversation. In this case, the specific implicature that emerges is the reason for Mr. Ganjar's absence at the KPU. Based on his story about receiving a late invitation and being in Jogja, it can be inferred that this is why he was not on standby in Jakarta.

Maxim quantity violations are apparently not uncommon. The same thing was done by president Joko Widodo in his interview with the BBC News Indonesia when asked about whether energy subsidies will be further reduced due to fuel price hikes. He did not answer directly but gave more information about the number of subsidies that have been allocated (Adena & Mulia, 2024).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research conducted on Ganjar Pranowo's exclusive interview, it can be concluded that Ganjar Pranowo uses careful and complex communication strategies in interacting with his interlocutors. By utilizing the concept of non-observance maxims and conversational implicature based on Grice's theory, Ganjar Pranowo seems to choose not to always adhere to the principles of cooperation in communication. This is reflected in his selective responses, limited information conveyed, and the use of particularized implicature to imply additional messages beyond the literal meaning. Ganjar Pranowo's reluctance to provide comprehensive and transparent information demonstrates the complexity in communication dynamics, where implied messages and implicit communication strategies play an important role in understanding the meaning behind his words. In particular, Ganjar often violates the maxims of quantity and quality, and sometimes violates these maxims to convey implicit messages during interviews. For example, he often provides too much or too little information, giving rise to conversational implicatures that add layers of meaning beyond literal interpretation.

However, this analysis has limitations. This analysis only focuses on one interview, which may not fully represent Ganjar Pranowo's communication style as a whole. In addition, the subjective nature of this analysis may lead to bias. To overcome these limitations, future research should expand its scope to include multiple interviews and public appearances, providing a more comprehensive view of his communication strategy. Although this study provides valuable insights into Ganjar Pranowo's communication tactics, further research is needed to fully understand the scope and impact of these strategies in political discourse.

REFERENCES

Adena, T., & Mulia, H. (2024). *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra Implicatures Generated from Non-Observances Maxim in The Interview of the Indonesian President Implikatur yang dihasilkan dari Prinsip yang tidak dipatuhi dalam Wawancara dengan Presiden Indonesia*. 3(2). <https://online->

- Aisya, N. (2019). E-Journal of English Language & Literature 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. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*, 8(4). <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jell>
- Basya, A. F. (2017). *AN ANALYSIS ON THE NON-OBSERVANCE MAXIMS OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN LARRY KING SHOW SPECIAL: JOHNNY DEPP*.
- Evayanti Munthe, D. (2021). NON-OBSERVANCE MAXIMS IN “SONIC THE HEDGEHOG” MOVIE. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 9(1).
- Gunatika, I. M. W. A., Candra, K. D. P., & Utami, N. M. V. (2021). The Types of Non-Observance Maxims Performed by the Main Character in Knives Out Movie. *ELYSIAN JOURNAL English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 1, 88–97.
- Jalal Sa, A., Hassan, dullah, & Info, A. (2022). A Pragmatic Study of Non-Observance Maxims in Selected Political Speeches Keywords:-cooperative principle-observance-non-observance-conversational maxims. In *Journal of Language Studies* (Vol. 5, Issue 2).
- Khusna, F. A., Aliyah, S. L., & Asyifah, D. A. (2021). INVESTIGATING THE USE OF MAXIMS IN THE EFL CLASS PRESENTATION: A PRAGMATIC STUDY. *SAGA: Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 133–144. <https://doi.org/10.21460/saga.2021.22.80>
- Moeschler, J. (2012). *Conversational and conventional implicatures*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260319066>
- Pertiwi, W. E. (2023). Non-Observance Maxims in Banyumasan Humor Speech. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(3), 234–243. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v2i3.124>
- Rachmah, Z., Widya, & Putri, E. J. (2022). The Non-observance of Maxims that Trigger Implicature in Cruella Movie (2021). *E-Journal of Linguistics*, 16(2), 264–272.
- Rachman, A., Yochanan, E., Samanlangi, A. I., & Purnomo, H. (2024). *METODE PENELITIAN KUANTITATIF, KUALITATIF DAN R&D* (B. Ismaya, Ed.; Vol. 1). CV Saba Jaya Publisher. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377469385_METODE PENELITIAN KUANTITATIF KUALITATIF DAN RD?enrichId=rgreq-e00af6a849f98c2d2de4f653ebcbd5da-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzM3NzQ2OTM4NTtBUzoxMTQzMTI4MTIxODI4NzE0MUAXNzA1NTQ1NzZmNDc5&el=1_x_2&_esc=publicationCoverPdf
- Rahmawati, W., Haryanti, D., & Laila, M. (2022). *A Pragmatic Equivalence of Violating Maxims in Novel Translation of Divergent*. 7(2). <https://journal.iaingorontalo.ac.id/index.php/al>
- Saradifa, A. S. (2020). Non-Observance Of Grice’s Maxims Found In “The Grapevine: Gossip At Work, What Should You Do As A Leader?” Drama Series Script Produced By The Calvin Company. *Journal of English Literature, Linguistic, and Education*, 1(1), 1–8.
- Yule, G. (2016). *PRAGMATIK*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Zahra, T. N., & Suyudi, I. (2023). THE NON-OBSERVANCE OF MAXIMS IN DIALOGUES OF HARRY POTTER AND THE CURSED CHILD BOOK. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 11(2), 209–218. <https://doi.org/10.35760/jll.2023.v11i2.9169>

