

## Maxim Violation by Indonesian Government Officials with Different Cultures in Mata Najwa Talk Show

Berlin Sibarani

Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, North Sumatera

Meriani

STBA-PIA, Medan, North Sumatera

### Abstract

This research aimed at describing the violation of Grice Maxim's Cooperative Principle by the three government officials in Mata Najwa Talk Show and to seek out if the assumption of the different culture would be the reason why the subjects violated the maxim. To achieve the purpose, this research was designed with descriptive qualitative. Its data were collected with documentary techniques in which the data were collected from the utterances between the host and the subjects in Mata Najwa Talk Show videos. To analyze the data Miles' and Huberman analysis model was applied. The results of the research showed that, not all of the officials violated the maxims. LBP violated all of the maxims, but JK did not, he violated only maxim of quantity, quality and relevance. JW did not violate all the maxim either. He violated only maxim of relevance and maxim of quantity. The matrices showed that the different choice of what maxim to be violated was caused by their different culture. In the violation of more than one maxims, the three government officials did the violation in different sequence. LBP firstly obeyed the M.of RI and violated the M.of Qn, Meanwhile JK tends to violated M.of Qn and violated M.of RI and Jokowi violated the M.of RI and obeying the M.of Qn. This differences were due to the factor of social status, culture, education experience and their awareness of the communication format of talk show, in which the participants are of three parties, namely host, guest, and TV audience all over Indonesia.

Keywords: *Maxim Violation, Cooperative Principle, Talk Show*

### Introduction

Maxim violation is one of cooperative principle theories proposed by Grice (1975:45). This is one of the interesting phenomena in language use. The violation of a maxim can be found in any daily activity while conversing. When people say something, they do not always say what is true and what they have evidence for. The speakers also do not always make their contribution as informative as it is required. The contribution they make is also not always relevant to the interaction and the way in which they are saying something. In other words, it can be said that what the speaker says is sometimes unclear. If

the speakers do all of those intentionally, that means they violate the maxims of cooperative principle. Violation of maxim is a kind of non-observance of cooperative principle. Grice defines violation of maxims as the unostentatious non-observance of maxim. When violating the maxims, the hearers will tend to mislead the hearer, the speakers know that the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words. They intentionally generate a misleading implicature (Thomas, 1995: 73). Cooperative Principle, according to Grice, is a rough general principle which participants will be expected to observe when having conversation. The cooperative principle says “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, 1975:45). According to the Cooperative Principle both speaker and hearer converse with the willingness to deliver and interpret a message.

The researcher is interested in studying the maxim that is violated by the three high governmental officials in Indonesia with different culture, they are the President of Indonesia Joko Widodo who is Javanese, the Vice President of Indonesia Jusuf Kalla who is Buginese, and the Coordinating Minister for Maritime Affairs of Indonesia Luhut Binsar Pandjaitan who is Bataknese. Videos of Mata Najwa talk show will be used as the data resources. The resources have been collected from [www.metrotvnews.com](http://www.metrotvnews.com) which are accessible to millions of internet users. Different videos will have different topics and questions. The reasons behind choosing the video is, that it can be attributed to the fact that they serve as authentic data where one can best apply or disobeying Grice’s maxims.

### **Method**

This study used descriptive qualitative design which described the maxim violation by Indonesian government officials and the factor that caused the violation were described qualitatively. The source of the data was the utterances of Joko Widodo as the president of Indonesia, Jusuf Kalla the vice president of Indonesia and Luhut Binsar Panjaitan the Coordinating Minister for Maritime Affairs of Indonesia in the Mata Najwa talk show. The utterances were collected from the videos available in [www.metrotvnews.com](http://www.metrotvnews.com). There were three videos: “Pertaruhan Jokowi Ahok”, “Kala jadi JK” and “Kontroversi Luhut” with the duration of each of the videos was approximately one hour. Each of the governmental

official would have one video with different topics. In order to make the data analyzable, the conversation or interviews were transcribed.

## **Result**

### **Types of Maxim Violation by the Three Government Officials**

Theoretically, maxim violation consists of four types, they are (1) Violation of Maxim of Quantity, (2) Violation of Maxim of Quality, (3) Violation of Maxim of Relevant, and (4) Violation of Maxim of Manner. Maxim Violation is defined as disobeying the Cooperative Principle.

By using this concept as the base of the data analysis, it is found out that all of the four types of Maxim Violation are made by the subjects in the data of Mata Najwa Talk Show. Each of these Maxim of Violation is described in details as follows:

#### **Violation of Maxim of Quantity**

Theoretically, Maxim of Quantity is defined as the state that requires the speaker in being as informative as it required, in another words, they should give neither too little information nor too much.

By using this concept as the category of data analysis, it was found out that Violation of Maxim of Quantity occurred in the Mata Najwa Talk Show, as seen in data 1.

#### **Data 1**

- I: Umm.. Pak JK kita langsung mulai. Apa bedanya menjadi Wapresnya SBY dan jadi Wapresnya Jokowi Pak?  
JK: ....Tentu Pak SBY bukan Pak Jowoki, Pak Jokowi bukan Pak SBY. Yaa.. jadi ee, bagi saya tentu bagaimana berkerja sama saja itu, membantu.

In data 1, the interviewer asked about the difference between JK when being a Vice President of SBY and JK as the Vice President of Jokowi, but JK turned out giving a short quantity of information about the fact that SBY was not Jokowi, and so the otherwise. Since the answer was too short and uninformative, then the answer violates the maxim of quantity.

#### **Violation of Maxim of Quality**

Theoretically, Maxim of Quality is defined as a state when the speaker is expected to be sincere, honest, and saying something that they believe corresponds to reality (saying the truth).

By using this concept as the category of data analysis, it was found that Violation of Maxim of Quality occurred in the Mata Najwa Talk Show as seen in data 2.

### **Data 2**

- I: Masih.. , sesungguhnya masih ada lanjutanya itu Pak Luhut,tapi pada akhir ucapan Presiden Jokowi ia mengatakan ia netral, tapi pembacaan anda, anda katakan pada malam ini anda membacanya pak Jokowi memang mau Setya Novanto?
- L: Saya tidak bilang begitu dan karna yang saya katakan tadi, saya kan musti lihat tadi kira kira bos saya itu paling nyaman dengan mana, ya menurut saya mungkin dengan... Pak Novanto.

In data 2, the interviewer would like to clarify if Jokowi wanted Setya Novanto as the leader of Golkar, but Luhut denied that he said it that way.

### **Violation of Maxim of Relevant**

Theoretically, Maxim of Relevant is defined as a state that requires the speaker being relevant to the context and situation of the utterances.

By using this concept as the category of data analysis, it was found that Violation of Maxim of Relevant occurred in the Mata Najwa Talk Show as seen in data 3.

### **Data 3**

- I: Umm.. Pak JK kita langsung mulai. Apa bedanya menjadi Wapresnya SBY dan jadi Wapresnya Jokowi Pak?
- JK: Wah semuanya, jadi Wapres sama saja membantu Presiden, gitu kan...

In data 3, the interviewer question was about the difference between being a Vice President of SBY and the Vice President of Jokowi. The interviewer interest in asking about the difference between JK when being a Vice President of SBY and JK as the Vice President of Jokowi, was to get the information of whom he would be more harmonious with.

### **Violation of Maxim of Manner**

Theoretically maxim of manner is defined as a state when the speaker should be clear, avoid obscurity and ambiguity. The disobey of such requirement is called to Violate the maxim of Manner, the criteria of violation of manner maxim that are commonly happens in this research are; first, if the speaker uses ambiguous language, second, if the speaker exaggerates things, third, if the speaker uses slang in front of people who do not

understand it (Grice, 1975). By using this concept as the category of data analysis, it was found that Violation of Maxim of Manner occurred in the Mata Najwa Talk Show as seen in data 4.

#### **Data 4**

I: Jadi rekomendasi ini masih pending menunggu hasil symposium yang hari ini dan besok?

L: Gak juga memang kita maunya kumpulin semua dulu pendapat, sebenarnya ada juga kita buat team, dengan apa kejaksan agung, yang sudah bekerja lama. Saya kan melihatnya begini Najwa. Sudah sekian puluh tahun, masalah ini gak tuntas tuntas gitu, masalah HAM di sini, HAM di papua juga gak tuntas tuntas, dan ini menjadi selalu beban kita. Oleh karena itu saya lapor presiden, 'pak saya ijin pak ini mau saya tuntasin' gitu, karena kalau ndak nanti jadi masalah kedepan, kegenerasi yang akan datang, apakah bapak setuju kita buka saja? Salah benarnya nanti kan kita lihat saja, terus presiden bilang khusus mengenai pemberontakan G30SPKI, 'ini kan masalah politik pak luhut' gitu, 'betul pak', 'nah kalau masalah politik itu ya kebetulan yang menang TNI, coba kalau yang menang PKI, kan habis kita di potongin semua gitu.

In data 4, it was shown that, Luhut was exaggerates things by retelling what Jokowi's opinion about one of the topic that should not be open to public, what Jokowi said to him was, if PKI won at that time, all of us would be the victims and Luhut Exaggerated it by saying 'all of us will be cut onto pieces.' Since the answer was exaggerating people's statement, then it Violated the Maxim of Manner.

#### **Reasons for Violating Maxim**

Theoretically, violating maxim is defined as the disobeying of Cooperative Principles. One reason for disobeying the principle is to save the interlocutor's face. Saving the interlocutor's face means being polite, and considerate to the interlocutors. While the politeness and the consideration made by the interlocutors are caused by their culture. This means that one's culture cause him to perceive and conduct politeness differently from others with different culture (Spencer, 2008).

By using the theory of the interrelatedness among the violating maxim, politeness and culture, as presenting above, the data analysis on the utterances of the three government officials with different culture results in the fact that the three government officials violated the maxim as seen in data 5.

No	Different Culture Types violation	LBP	JK	JW
1.	Violation Maxim of Quantity	<p>I: jadi menkopohulkam tidak terlalu nikmat?</p> <p>L: ‘...jadi kalau saya sudah apa namanya... mengatakan ‘ya’ kepada atasan saya atau anak buah saya atau ...’</p>	<p>I: ‘..Apa bedanya menjadi Wapresnya SBY dan jadi Wapresnya Jokowi Pak?’</p> <p>JK: ‘....Tentu Pak SBY bukan Pak Jowoki, Pak Jokowi bukan Pak SBY’</p>	<p>I: masa kampanye putaran kedua, selebihnya tampaknya tdk ada tuh penampakan Jokowi Ahok duduk berdua ya?</p> <p>J: Ada kita setiap pagi duduk berdua</p>
2.	Violation Maxim of Quality	<p>I: ‘..anda katakan pada malam ini anda membacanya pak Jokowi memang mau Setya Novanto?..’</p> <p>L: ‘..Saya tidak bilang begitu dan karna yang saya katakan tadi,..’</p>	<p>I: Pak JK bilang kalau ... kalau ...’ dengan saya akan saya lantik’.</p> <p>JK: ‘oo.. itu kan sebenarnya ee.. pertanyaan wartawan..’</p>	-
3.	Violation Maxim of Relevant	<p>I: ‘Kenapa ketika Munaslub Golkar, anda mendukung Setya Novanto pak luhut?’</p> <p>L: ‘...dan tentu bos saya harus setuju kalau bos saya...’</p>	<p>I: ‘..Apa bedanya menjadi Wapresnya SBY dan jadi Wapresnya Jokowi Pak?’</p> <p>JK: ‘Wah semuanya, jadi Wapres sama saja membantu Presiden, gitu kan’</p>	<p>I: Kenapa tidak? apa yang sudah anda amati..’</p> <p>J: Saya kan sudah satu setengah tahun dengan Pak Ahok, saya lebih tau dari pada yang nyurvey itu</p>

4.	Violation Maxim of Manner	L: ‘...kalau yang menang PKI, kan habis kita di potongin semua gitu.’	-	-
----	---------------------------	---	---	---

Data 5 indicated that culture did affect the violation of maxim; meaning that their different culture cause them to violate maxim differently. In other words, in order for one to use or not use maxim violation could also depend on one’s culture; the three government officials also took other aspects into consideration to violate the maxim. The other aspect may include their education, experience as a high official government, their awareness of the communication structure of talk show which is different from that of natural communication (face to face communication).

Therefore, there was a different sequence between the three government officials. Sequence of maxim of violation was defined as the order of two or three maxim violation used in a conversation in which one maxim violation was preceded by the other. With this concept, the data analysis showed that the three government officials used the sequence differently as seen in data 6.

Data 6

No	Government officials	Quoted conversation	Sequence
1.	LBP	I: 'jadi menkopolkukam tidak terlalu nikmat?' L: ' <b>yaa tentu ada masing-masing nikmatnya, (obeying maxim relevance), tapi saya katakan mewarnai karna tadi di kopasus itu ...</b> ' (Violate maxim of quantity)	Obeying maxim relevance + Violating maxim of quantity
2.	JK	I: '...apa bedanya menjadi wapresnya SBY dan wapresnya Jokowi pak?' JK: ' <b>...wapres sama saja membantu presiden ..</b> ' (Violate maxim of relevance) <b>...tentu pak SBY bukan pak Jokowi, pak Jokowi bukan pak SBY.'</b> (Violate maxim of quantity)	Violating maxim of relevance + Violating maxim of quantity
3.	JW	I: '... ee bagaimana pak sesungguhnya pak Jokowi, ee.. perbedaan gaya ini bisa menjadi efektif, ada tidak kasus spesifik yang bisa anda ceritakan?' J: ' <b>...saya kan memang apa..ee..kombinasi yang bisa saling mengisi.. saling menutupi...</b> ' (Violate maxim of relevance) <b>..Itu sangat ini sekali... sangat .. sangat .. efektif sekali...</b> ' (Obeying maxim of quantity)	Violating maxim of relevance + Obeying maxim of quantity

As can be shown in the data 6, there were sequences in violating the maxims, in data 6 it can be shown that, the sequence that was occurred by Luhut (LBP) was first obeying the maxim of relevance and then he violated the maxim of quantity by saying too much information. Meanwhile JK tended to have a violate + violate sequence, in which not only he was being irrelevant, but he also said too little information, in the data above it was shown that he violated the maxim of relevant and followed by violating maxim of quantity and Jokowi violated the maxim of relevance by being irrelevant with the interviewer



question, and followed by obeying the maxim of quantity. This data showed that there were different sequences between the three government officials.

### Discussion

The findings showed that not all of the maxims were violated by the three government officials, violation of maxim of relevance, maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, and maxim of manner, in which the two of the officials did not break the maxim of quality and maxim of manner. The maxim of relevance was most frequently broken. They broke the maxim in order to avoid subjects that could be harmful for the listener, breaking the maxim of relevance was used to save the interlocutor from being hurt or to make the speaker's utterances sound less offensive than they were in order to avoid a confrontation. The maxim of relevance was violated 46 times (50.55%). The second most frequently broken maxim was Quantity maxim, the speaker tended to not wanting to reveal information, the speaker gave too little information than the situation required, or out of control when they said too much. The reason for that was that the subjects often mean to mislead the hearer. The maxim of quantity was violated 39 times (42.85%). The third less violating maxim that occurred was the quality maxim, which was occurred when they found no other way out of a discussion and they wanted to save face or to make a strong point, in this research the violating of quality maxims occurred 4 times (4.4%) and the last violated maxim that occurred was manner maxim, which only occurred 2 times (2.2%).

Sembiring & Pulungan (2014) analysed *the maxim violation in awas ada sule situation comedy*, by using descriptive qualitative design. The result of their study showed that there were four types violation maxims used in *Awas Ada Sule situation comedy*, namely 66% violation of maxim of quantity, 14% violation maxim of quality, 14% violation of maxim of relation, and 6% violation of maxim of manner. The study of Sembiring & Pulungan is different from the finding of the current study in terms of the number of maxim violated. In their study all maxims are violated while in the current study the violation of maxim depends of the speaker's consideration which may be affected by his culture, social status, experience, and awareness of the communicative structure. This difference may be due to the purpose of communicative event. The 'Awas ada Sule' aim at entertaining the audience, in which the violation of maxim may not be

very risky, as risky as the talk show participated by the three government officials. However, both those study found out that maxim are violated in the show.

Meanwhile, Tupan (2008) search the violation of maxims specifically for lying purposes in the *Desperate Housewives* film, by using the theory of lie by Christoffersen. Tupan (2008) found out that the characters in *Desperate Housewives* film used the violation of maxims as the strategy to tell lies. In her research it is found that some characters who wanted to cover the truth by focusing on cheering and convincing the hearer, violated a certain number of maxims, that was a combination of maxims of quantity, quality, relevance or maxims of quantity, quality, manner or maxims of quality, relevance and manner, it was found that if the characters had a tendency to lie gradually by building someone's belief, they violated two maxims, that was, a combination of either maxims of quality and quantity or maxims of quality and relevance. In this current study, despite of not using the same theory as in Tupan study, in which analysed the violation from the strategy of lying, this current research used another theory of culture in order to find out if the culture will affect the violation. Despite of the differences, in both of this study it was found that the there was a sequence in violated the maxims.

### References

- P. Grice, H. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Sembiring, M.B., & Pulungan, A.H. Violation Maxims in *Awas Ada Sule* Situation (Unpublished Thesis). Medan: Universitas Negeri Medan.
- Spencer, H. O. (2008). *Culturally Speaking: Culture Communication and Politeness Theory*. London: United Kingdom.
- Thomas, J. 1995. *The Meaning of Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Tupan, A. H., & Natalia, H. (n.d.). *The Multiple Violations of Conversational Maxims in Lying Done by the Characters in Some Episodes of Desperate Housewives*, 63–78.