

Flouting Maxims by Indonesia Presidential Candidates in Najwa Shihab's Talk Show

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v5i2.984>

| Vivin Agustin^{1,*} | Sri Minda Murni² | Fauziah Khairani Lubis³ |

^{1,2,3} Postgraduate School,
State University of Medan,
Medan Indonesia

*agustin.vivin04@gmail.com



This work is licensed
under a Creative Commons Attribution-
ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the flouting of conversational maxims by Prabowo Subianto and Gibran Rakabuming Raka in the "13 Tahun Mata Najwa: Bergerak Bergerak Berdampak" episode of the Mata Najwa talk show. By analyzing the dialogues of Prabowo Subianto and Gibran Rakabuming Raka, the research aims to understand the strategies and reasons behind the flouting of Grice's maxims in a high-stakes political context. Using Grice's Cooperative Principle as a framework, the research identifies and analyzes instances where the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner are flouted. The analysis reveals that Gibran and Prabowo use strategies such as ambiguity, sarcasm, and metaphor are also used. Notably, Gibran is identified as the more frequent flouter of maxims compared to Prabowo. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of political communication and the strategic use of language in media interactions.

KEYWORDS

politic; election; flouting maxim; talk show

INTRODUCTION

Communication is the exchange of information and ideas between individuals, where language plays a key role. Effective communication involves not just the literal meanings of words, but also the subtleties and implied meanings behind them (Natsir et al., 2023). Pragmatics, the study of how context influences the interpretation of language, is crucial in understanding these subtleties. In conversations, speakers often flout conversational maxims, a concept introduced by Grice (1975), which includes the maxims of quality, quantity, relation, and manner.

Political communication, a subset of sociolinguistics, often involves the strategic use of language to influence and persuade (Juma'a, 2020). Politicians frequently flout conversational maxims to achieve specific rhetorical goals, as observed in political debates and discussions. This phenomenon is evident in the "13 Tahun Mata Najwa: Bergerak Bergerak Berdampak" talk show, featuring Prabowo and Gibran, presidential and vice-presidential candidates for Indonesia's 2024 General Election.

This study aims to analyze how Prabowo and Gibran flout conversational maxims during their appearance on the talk show. The analysis will focus on identifying instances of maxim flouting and understanding the underlying reasons behind these communicative strategies. The talk show, known for its probing questions, provides a rich context for examining how political figures navigate conversational norms under pressure (Aisyah, 2019). By exploring these deviations from expected communication practices, this research seeks to uncover the rhetorical techniques used by politicians to shape public perception and achieve their communicative goals (Larasati, 2016).

Previous studies have examined political discourse through the lens of Grice's theory, highlighting how politicians use language to maintain power and influence audiences. This research extends those findings by analyzing the political context and its impact on communication norms, focusing specifically on the interactions of Prabowo Subianto and Gibran Rakabuming Raka.

RESEARCH METHODS

The research employs qualitative document analysis, analyzing spoken words rather than numerical data. This method, as described by Bogdan et al. (1982), involves interpreting how theories apply across different phenomena. The specific focus here is on the flouting of maxims in a televised interview.

The primary data sources are the utterances of Prabowo and Gibran, candidates in the 2024 general election, featured in the specified video. The study uses purposive sampling to select relevant utterances for detailed analysis.

Data were collected from the YouTube video and transcribed for analysis. The analysis process follows the qualitative methods outlined by Ary et al. (2010), involving data familiarization, organization, summarization, and interpretation. The research categorizes and tabulates instances of flouting maxims, identifying strategies and reasons behind such flouting.

To ensure trustworthiness, the study adheres to the criteria of credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability. Techniques like triangulation, involving multiple data sources and cross-checks with advisors, were employed to bolster the credibility and reliability of the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Strategies of Flouting Maxims in Mata Najwa Talk Show

The flouting of conversational maxims can occur in various ways, and individuals actively engage in such behaviour during discussions, often being aware of their actions. This phenomenon, as explained by Cutting (2002), can manifest in different forms when flouting a maxim. Flouting the maxim of quantity can lead to either understatement (providing too little information) or overstatement (offering excessive information). When the maxim of quality is flouted, it may result in expressions such as hyperbole, metaphor, irony, banter, or sarcasm. Flouting the maxim of relation involves the use of irrelevant statements as a strategy, revealing the flouting of the relation maxim. Similarly, flouting the maxim of manner introduces ambiguity into statements. But some of these strategies were not realized in this talk show by Prabowo and Gibran as we can see in table 1.

Table 1. Strategies of Flouting in Conversational Maxims Percentages from Guest

No	Strategies of Flouting Maxim		Gibran	Prabowo
1	Maxim of Quality	Understatement	4	0
		Overstatement	1	
2	Maxim of Quantity	Irrelevant	3	0
3	Maxim of relation	Ambiguity	2	1
4	Maxim of Manner	Sarcasm	1	0
		Banter	1	1
		Metaphor		1
Total			13	3

Based on the data above, it can be seen that Gibran is the most dominant in implementing strategies in flouting maxims. The researcher found that Gibran used the strategy of flouting maxim 13 times, with understatement (from the strategy of flouting the maxim of quantity) being the most frequent strategy with four data points. This indicates that Gibran has a tendency to avoid elaborating on answers, possibly to avoid potential misunderstandings.

Furthermore, Prabowo is less dominant in implementing strategies in flouting maxim. Prabowo used the strategy of flouting maxim three times which are, ambiguous, banter, and metaphor with each strategies only has one data. This is due to a number of things. By using metaphors and ambiguous language, Prabowo tried to avoid taking a definitive position on a controversial issue. This can be a way to appeal to a wider range of voters or to avoid alienating any particular group. While Banter can create a more relaxed and informal atmosphere, making the politician seem more approachable and relatable to the audience. This can be especially effective in connecting with voters on an emotional level.

Strategy Used Flouting Maxim of Quality

1) Sarcasm

Data 1

Nana : Mas aku ada foto 13 tahun yang lalu mas Gibran ada foto ini wisuda kan mas, lulus atau apa? 'I have a photo from 13 years ago. Gibran, you have a photo from your graduation, right? Did you graduate or what?'

Gibran : Baru lulus. 'Just graduated'

Nana : Ini baru lulus? 'This is just after graduating?'

Gibran : Iya baru lulus 'Yes, just graduated'

Nana : Ini di Sidney atau Singapura mas? 'Is this in Sydney or Singapore?'

Gibran : Ini di Singapura, oiya tahan dulu mba ini foto nya lagi dipermasalahkan dua tokoh ini. Masalah fotonya katanya editan sama ijazah nya palsu. Gapapa besok temen temen media seperti biasa jam 7 pagi di balai kota entar saya bawain ijazah saya ya. Di cek aja asli atau palsu. Kalau gak percaya, saya pesanin tiket ke Singapur datengin ke sekolahnya. 'This is in Singapore. Oh, by the way, hold on, sis. This photo is being questioned by these two figures. They say the photo is edited and the diploma is fake. It's okay; tomorrow, media friends, as usual, at 7 in the morning at the city hall, I'll bring my diploma. Just check whether it's real or fake. If you don't believe it, I'll book a ticket to Singapore; come to the school yourself.'

In this response, Gibran introduces additional information that suggests the potential falsification of the photo and diploma. However, the tone of his response, particularly the matter-of-fact manner in which he suggests addressing the issue, hints at sarcasm. By proposing to bring his diploma to be verified by the media and even offering to arrange a trip to Singapore to verify its authenticity, he subtly mocks the notion that there could be any doubt about the legitimacy of his graduation. Overall, Gibran's responses exhibit a combination of understatement and sarcasm, which serves to flout the maxim of quality by providing information that may not be entirely truthful or straightforward, thereby adding layers of meaning through irony and implication.

Data 4

Nana : Beruntung Mas beruntung kalau bisa langsung tidur ada orang yang kadang suka makan waktu lama, jadi Mas Gibran, masa enggak ada yang dipikirin? 'You're

lucky if you can sleep right away. there are people who sometimes like to take a long time, so Gibran, is there nothing to think about?’

Gibran : Pulang dari mata najwa langsung tidur juga. Enggak usah terlalu banyak pikiranlah ya, masalah survei masalah apa siapa yang paling tinggi kita jalin aja Gus santai aja Gus. ‘After returning from Mata Najwa, I also go straight to sleep. No need to think too much, right, about surveys, about whatever, just relax, Gus.’

In this part of conversation, Gibran’s response is a form of sarcasm strategy. Gibran using sarcasm as a strategy to flout the maxim of quality in order to playfully dismiss Nana's comment about overthinking. By responding sarcastically, he's indirectly suggesting that Nana's concern about overthinking is unnecessary or exaggerated. This could be his way of lightening the mood or gently poking fun at the seriousness of Nana's comment. Additionally, using sarcasm can convey a sense of confidence or nonchalance about the topic being discussed.

Data 5

Nana : Jadi gak mikir apa-apa sebelum tidur ya? ‘So, you don't think about anything before going to bed’

Gibran : Saya sih santai, biasa saja. ‘Well, I'm relaxed, just normal’

In this part of conversation, Gibran flouts the maxim of quality by providing a sarcasm. Gibran is using sarcasm as a strategy to flout the maxim of quality, which suggests that his response might not be entirely truthful or sincere. By responding with sarcasm, he's implying that he actually does think about things before bed, but perhaps he doesn't want to share or elaborate on those thoughts. This could be due to various reasons, such as wanting to maintain privacy or avoid discussing personal matters. Sarcasm can serve as a way to deflect or downplay the seriousness of a question while still providing a response.

2) Hyperbole

Data 2

Nana : Apa yang diingat momen 13 tahun yang lalu ini mas? ‘What do you remember from this moment 13 years ago?’

Gibran : 13 tahun yang lalu ya Enggak nyangka sih mbak sampai di titik ini ya he awal-awal dulu apa diundang ke mata najwa kan saya juga belum jadi apa-apa sekarang bisa duduk bareng dengan orang-orang hebat Prof Mahfud, Gus Muhaimin. ‘13 years ago, huh? I never expected, that I would reach this point. In the beginning, I wasn't anything. Now, I can sit together with great people like Prof Mahfud and Gus Muhaimin. Back then, I hadn't even been invited to Mata Najwa’

From this data, Gibran's use of hyperbole serves as a rhetorical strategy to emphasize the dramatic transformation he perceives in his life over the past 13 years. By stating that he "wasn't anything" in the beginning and contrasting it with his current status of sitting with prominent figures, he magnifies the extent of his journey. This hyperbolic expression helps him to assert his achievement and implicitly highlight his gratitude for the progress he has made. Additionally, by employing exaggeration, he creates a more vivid and memorable narrative, enhancing the impact of his message. However, it also flouts the maxim of quality by stretching the truth for dramatic effect, prioritizing the impression he wants to convey over strict accuracy.

3) Banter

When a speaker, especially a political figure, responds with humor while flouting the maxim of quantity, they're essentially saying more or less than is necessary for effective communication. This flouting of the maxim could be intentional and strategic, aiming to achieve certain rhetorical effects or to convey nuanced messages. By responding with humor, the speaker can downplay the seriousness of the situation or the topic being discussed. This can be a tactic to diffuse tension or controversy, especially if the topic is sensitive or contentious.

Data 8

Nana : Jadi mas gibran bagian apa mas, mas gibran bagian apa biasanya dengan pak prabowo bagi tugasnya? 'So, Mas Gibran, what role do you usually have, and how do you and Pak Prabowo divide your tasks?'

Gibran : Ya kami kalau ke suatu tempat, atau belusukan ya kita kan lagi sering belusukan ni jarang berdua. Ya kita bagi tugas dibeberapa wilayah biar lebih efektif. Kalau saya yang lebih ke daerah-daerah, door to door, turun ke pasar dan lain lain dan kita juga lebih banyak ketemu anak anak muda, jadi itu yang kita sasar selama ini. 'Well, when we go to a certain place or explore, we often explore together. We divide tasks in several areas to be more effective. I usually focus on the local areas, going door to door, visiting markets, and so on. We also aim to connect with young people more, that's our target'

Nana : Pembagian nya? 'the division'

Prabowo: Lebih ke anak muda yah 'More towards the young people, right?'

Gibran : Iya anak anak muda 'the younger generation'

Prabowo: Kalau saya yang setengah muda 'I'm the half-young one then'

Prabowo is flouting the maxim of quality by making a joke about his age could diminish Prabowo's credibility, particularly in the eyes of younger audience members. It may be perceived as an attempt to deflect from addressing substantive issues or to avoid taking full responsibility for engaging with younger demographics effectively.

4) Irony

Data 10

Nana : Bapak, idealnya seperti itu politik asik, politik yang membawa kegembiraan tapi kenyataannya kan kontestasi pasti ada persaingan pak, dikontestasi justru kita mau ada perbedaan supaya orang bisa melihat mana yang lebih cocok, mana gagasan yang lebih ideal yang ditawarkan menurut persepsi maing masing. Bagaimana mencari keseimbangan itu? Kita gak mau semua nya sama. Harus ada beda nya dong. Tapi bagaimana ditengah perbedaan itu juga tidak kemudian membuat kita saling sensi satu sama lain. Mencari keseimbangan itu pak, beda tapi tetap tidak saling melukai. 'Ideally politics should be fun, politics that brings joy, but the reality is that there's always competition, right? In competition, we want there to be differences so people can see which one is more suitable, which idea is more ideal according to each person's perception. How do we find that balance? We don't want everything to be the same. There has to be differences. But how do we ensure that amidst those differences, we don't end up hurting each other? Finding that balance, being different but still not hurting each other'

Prabowo : Ya jadi saya kira bahwa sebagai pimpinan poilitik kita harus semakin hati hati

karena kalau di atas itu kelihatan istilahnya tidak sejuk, di bawah itu bisa lebih tidak sejuk. Jadi benar dala demokrasi kita, kita harus adu gagasan, harus adu program. Apa gagasan itu, apa program itu yaitu program yang bisa mengatasi kesulitan rakyat sekarang. Ini yang ditunggu oleh rakyat ini, yang ditunggu anak anak muda, karena anak anak muda ini sangat berkepentingan dengan masa depan karena masa depan miliki mereka. Jadi, mereka berkepentingan dengan pekerjaan, mereka berkepentingan dengan nanti penghasilan mereka, merek berkepentingan dengan mutu pendidikan. Jaid kita dalam kontestasi ini kita harus adu, adu gagasan, adu program. Ini demokrasi yang sebenarnya. Bukan demokrasi caci maki, bukan demokrasi curiga, bukan demokrasi pecha belah. Ini kita harus banak belajar dari banyak negara lain. Kita bersyukur kita bisa duduk disatu panggung begini. Ini lah saya berterimakasih sama mba Najwa, mba najwa yang punya kelebihan bisa ngatur kita. Jadi jangan salah ya, jadi ini wartawan punya power yang luar biasa. Jadi kalau kita salah salah, mereka yang ngatur ngatur kita. ‘Yes, so I think as political leaders, we have to be more careful because if it appears cold at the top, it can be even colder below. So, in our democracy, we have to compete with ideas, we have to compete with programs. What are those ideas, what are those programs? They are programs that can address the difficulties of the people now. This is what the people are waiting for, what young people are waiting for, because young people are very concerned about the future because the future belongs to them. So, they are concerned about jobs, they are concerned about their future income, they are concerned about the quality of education. So, in this competition, we have to compete, compete with ideas, compete with programs. This is true democracy. Not democracy of insults, not democracy of suspicion, not democracy of division. We have to learn a lot from many other countries. We are grateful we can sit on one stage like this. This is why I am thankful to Ms. Najwa, Ms. Najwa who has the ability to organize us. So don't get it wrong, journalists have extraordinary power. So if we make mistakes, they are the ones who organize us’

In this dialogue, Prabowo flouts the maxim of quality by introducing irony statements or topics into the conversation. Prabowo's use of irony in the last sentence about journalists can be seen as a strategy to subtly criticize the role of journalists in shaping public opinion and influencing political discourse. By mentioning the power of journalists in organizing or controlling the narrative, he may be implying that journalists have a significant influence on public perception, potentially suggesting that their reporting might not always be entirely truthful or unbiased.

By flouting the maxim of quality (which suggests that speakers should provide accurate information), Prabowo could be highlighting a perceived lack of objectivity or integrity in journalism, subtly questioning the trustworthiness of media sources. This tactic could serve to undermine the credibility of journalists and media institutions in the eyes of the audience, particularly if there is already a level of distrust or skepticism towards the media. Overall, Prabowo's use of irony in this context could be a strategic attempt to cast doubt on the reliability of media narratives and reinforce his own message or perspective, potentially appealing to audiences who may share his skepticism towards the media or who are receptive to criticism of journalistic practices.

Strategy Used Flouting Maxim of Quantity

When the speaker flouted the maxim quantity, they are usually giving too little information. This strategy also called as understatement as seen in the presented data.

1) Understatement

Data 3

Nana : Mas Gibran akhir-akhir ini sebelum tidur Mikirin apa Mas Gibran? ‘What do you think about lately before bedtime?’

Gibran : Sebelum tidur ya, saya kalau udah ketemu kasur langsung tidur sih Mbak. ‘Before bedtime, well, when I get to bed, I just go straight to sleep’

Gibran's use of understatement in response to Nana's question about his thoughts before bedtime appears to be a deliberate flouting of the maxim of quantity for negative reasons. Rather than providing additional information or insights into his pre-sleep contemplations, Gibran simply states that he goes straight to sleep upon reaching his bed. This could be interpreted as a tactic to evade the topic or withhold personal thoughts or emotions from the conversation. By downplaying the significance of his bedtime routine, Gibran may be seeking to maintain distance or avoid intimacy with Nana, perhaps due to discomfort or a desire to maintain privacy. Furthermore, his understated response could be indicative of a lack of interest in engaging in a deeper conversation or reluctance to share personal details with Nana.

Data 11

Nana : Kalau aku nanya satu nama udah ketahuan mas Didit jadi aku enggak tanya. Pak Prabowo minumnya teh atau kopi? ‘If I ask one name, we all already know about Mrs. Didit, so I won't ask. Does Mr. Prabowo drink tea or coffee?’

Gibran : Ah kegampangan ini semua orang tahu kopi ambaleng. ‘Ah, it's too obvious, everyone knows he drinks coffee, black coffee’

Nana : Wes berapa cangkir dalam sehari? ‘Well, how many cups a day?’

Gibran : Banyak ‘a lot’

Gibran's use of understatement in response to Nana's question about Prabowo's coffee consumption can be seen as a strategy to flout the maxim of quantity, which suggests providing just enough information without being overly informative. By responding with ‘banyak’ (a lot), Gibran intentionally gives a vague and minimalistic answer, which is contrary to what is expected in a cooperative conversation.

By providing minimalistic and ambiguous information, Gibran may be asserting a level of nonchalance regarding Prabowo's coffee habits, implying that such details are not significant or worthy of discussion. Furthermore, this understatement could also be interpreted as a means of maintaining privacy, as Gibran refrains from disclosing potentially sensitive information about Prabowo's personal habits. Overall, Gibran's use of understatement adds a layer of complexity to the conversation, allowing for interpretation while deliberately withholding expected details in a negative manner.

Strategy Used in Flouting Maxim of Relation

1) Irrelevant

If the speaker finds themselves in a situation where the current topic leads to uncomfortable questions or discussions, they might opt to change the subject to steer away from potential scrutiny or criticism. This tactic allows them to regain control of the conversation and shift focus to more favorable or less contentious issues. Changing the topic can serve as a strategic move to redirect attention away from their own shortcomings, mistakes, or controversial actions. By shifting the discussion to a different subject, they can

deflect criticism and possibly highlight achievements or policies they prefer to emphasize. It can be seen from the data presented.

Data 6

Nana : Mas Gibran bagaimana? ada tidak Wapres idola yang dijadikan panutan dan bagaimana menggambarkan relasi? bersiap jadi orang nomor dua? ‘Gibran, how about Vice President? Are there any idolized Vice Presidents who you take as role models? How do you depict the relationship? Are you ready to become the second person?’

Gibran : Wapres idola ya, Ada Pak Maruf Amin beliau kalau memberikan pidato atau ngendikan itu suasana langsung adem ayem atau mungkin Pak JK, Pak JK itu benar-benar orang yang ini apa problem solver. Pak JK luar biasa sekali apa ngerti lapangan ngerti teknis detail teknis beliau berdua sangat luar biasa sekali termasuk dua cawapres ini juga idola saya Prof Mahfud, Gus Muhaimin, beliau tokoh yang luar biasa sekali. ‘There is Mr. Ma’ruf Amin, when he gives a speech or speaks, the atmosphere is immediately calm or maybe Mr. JK, Mr. JK is really a problem solver. Mr. JK is extraordinary in understanding the technical details of the field, both of them are very extraordinary, including these two vice presidential candidates who are also my idols, Prof. Mahfud, Gus Muhaimin, they are extraordinary figure’

Gibran use irrelevant as a strategy to flout the maxim of relation as a negative tactic to evade directly answering the question. By introducing unrelated individuals like Prof. Mahfud, and Gus Muhaimin, he diverts attention away from the original inquiry about his own readiness for the vice presidency and idolized role models in that context. This tactic allows him to avoid committing to a specific answer or revealing his true thoughts on the matter, potentially indicating a lack of preparedness or discomfort with the topic. It could also signal a reluctance to align himself too closely with any particular political figure or ideology, thereby preserving his flexibility and avoiding potential controversy. Overall, the use of irrelevant examples serves as a deflective strategy to obscure his stance and maintain a sense of ambiguity.

Data 12

Nana : Mas Gibran apa ungkapan love language Anda kepada Pak Prabowo? ‘what is your expression of love language to Mr. Prabowo’

Gibran : Apa ya Pak ya kita biasa pakai telepati sih Mbak, diam-diam gini udah saling paham. ‘Well, we usually use telepathy. We already understand each other silently like this’

In this part of conversation, Gibran's response could be interpreted as flouting the maxim of relation due to a negative reason: his lack of knowledge about love languages. By providing an irrelevant answer about telepathy, he may be attempting to mask his ignorance on the topic. Instead of admitting he doesn't know about love languages, he chooses to divert the conversation with a humorous and seemingly outlandish response. This strategy allows him to avoid revealing his lack of understanding while maintaining a light-hearted tone in the conversation.

Strategy Used Flouting Maxim of Manner

1) Ambiguous

Data 7

Nana : Bapak Prabowo sehat bapak? ‘How are you Mr. Prabowo?’

Gibran : Terimakasih, terimakasih. ‘Thank you, thank you’

Prabowo responds to Nana's question about his health with the ambiguous response, "Terimakasih, terimakasih." This ambiguous response flouts the maxim of manner, introducing ambiguity into the statement. Prabowo might have privacy concerns regarding his health. By responding ambiguously, he avoids disclosing personal health information that he might consider private or sensitive. This aligns with the maxim of manner by keeping the statement less informative and more vague.

Data 9

Nana : Mas Gibran Apa sih yang kerap kali menurut Mas Gibran orang suka salah paham terhadap politik atau mungkin saja pemahamannya benar tapi tidak diakui oleh elit? ‘What is it about politics that you think people often misunderstand or perhaps understand correctly but are not recognized by the elite?’

Gibran : Biasanya ini apa kalau di atas elit saling bergandengan tapi kalau di bawah gaduh apalagi kalau di sosmed ini harus kita rubah Mbak jadi seperti apa yang disampaikan Pak Anis tadi, jadi politik itu dibikin asik dibikin riang gembira anak-anak muda jangan dipertontonkan yang buruk-buruk nanti jadi tambah apatis jadi pengen Golput ini jangan sampai makanya tadi Pak Ganjar bilang ayo anak muda kita libatkan saya juga anak muda saya juga pengen melibatkan anak muda lebih banyak lagi untuk berpartisipasi karena sekarang Pak Prabowo sudah memberi kesempatan saya untuk menjadi cawapres jadi kita pengen politik itu dibikin santai dibikin riang gembira kalau di sosmed ya kalau bisa jangan ada bulian-bulian lah meskipun eh kadang-kadang bulian-bulian itu juga seru karena saya memanfaatkan itu juga. ‘Usually, when the elites are at the top, they hold hands with each other, but when they are at the bottom, they get rowdy, especially on social media, we have to change it, Ma'am, so it's like what Mr. Anis said earlier, So politics should be made fun and joyful for young people, don't show the bad things, later they will become more apathetic, so we don't want abstention, that's why Mr. Ganjar said, let's involve young people, I am also a young person, I also want to involve more young people to participate because now Mr. Prabowo has given me the opportunity to become a vice president, so we want politics to be made relaxed, made joyful, if on social media, yes, if possible, there should be no bullying, although sometimes bullying is also fun because I use it too’

In this part, Gibran's response is quite long and contains multiple ideas. Gibran might use ambiguity as a strategy to flout the maxim of manner in order to maintain a certain level of diplomacy or avoid direct confrontation. By being ambiguous, he can convey his message in a less confrontational manner, allowing room for interpretation and avoiding explicitly criticizing any particular group or individual. This strategy may also help him appeal to a wider audience by leaving his statements open to multiple interpretations, thus avoiding alienating any particular group of people. Additionally, ambiguity can serve as a rhetorical device to make his statements more memorable or thought-provoking, prompting listeners to reflect on the message and draw their own conclusions.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the "13 Tahun Mata Najwa" episode reveals that flouting conversational maxims is a deliberate strategy used by political candidates to achieve various communicative goals. Understanding these strategies provides insight into the dynamics of

political discourse and the ways in which language is used to navigate complex social interactions.

REFERENCES

- Aisya, I., & Fitriwati. (2019). An Analysis of Flouting of Maxim Performed by Politician Guest in Mata Najwa Talkshow. *Journal of Linguistic Studies*, 8(2), 145-160.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). Introduction to research in education. 8th edition. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Bogdan, Robert C. and Biklen, Sari Knop. (1982). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse, A Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Juma'a, M. (2020). Political Discourse and Grice's Maxims: An Analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12(4), 567-582.
- Larasati, D. (2016). Conversational Implicature in the Television Talk Show with Anwar Ibrahim. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 47(3), 215-232.
- Natsir, M., Saragih, B., & Saragih, A. T. (2023). Analysis Application of Social Media Communication Effectiveness in Maritime English. *Randwick International of Education and Linguistics Science Journal*, 4(1), 158-163. <https://doi.org/10.47175/rielsj.v4i1.654>