

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background Of the Study

Ganjar Pranowo is a political figure in Indonesia and has announced himself to be one of the Indonesia presidential candidates for 2024. He had been in the political field for quite a while. He was the parliament for PDI Perjuangan from 2004 until 2009, before he became the governor for central Java from 2013 until 2023.

As a politician, he frequently uses political communication to convey messages because it is a way to communicate with the audiences. This political communication will shape the understanding and nuances of his communication to the audiences. Therefore, grasping what political communication is crucial. According to Norris (2001), Political communication is an interactive communication consisted of information exchanged between politicians, the media, and the public to transmit the ideas. In this context, Ganjar Pranowo's interview with "Mata Najwa" Talk show on YouTube served as a case that worth to be studied on how to examine political figures in utilizing web media, in this case is broadcasting interview in order to convey their ideas effectively.

Mata Najwa is a show hosted by Najwa Shihab, a well-known journalist in Indonesia. It has been running since 2009 and has consistently gained viewers' attention because of Shihab's critical conversations with her guests who usually come from a political background. The reason why the researcher chose Mata Najwa talk show as the data source because her YouTube account has reached 10

million subscribers and her overall episodes always reached one million viewers, another reason for choosing her show is because she understands about politics since her guests usually came from political background and she always show her critical thoughts to the guest and the viewers.

In this case, to examine the political communication tactics performed by Ganjar Pranowo on the "Mata Najwa" show is critical to investigate them through the lens of communication theories. As part of this exploration, Herbert Paul Grice introduced the Cooperative Principles as a theory of communication and implicature. As explained by Grice, the Cooperative Principle existed to lead the speakers to contribute information as is required during the conversation. This principles are consisted of four maxims that must be obeyed. The first one is *Maxim Quantity*; this type of maxim should just provide as information as required, no more nor less. The second is *Maxim Quality*; this type of maxim should just provide truth and avoid give false information; the speaker should not make any statement that is lacks of evidence or believes it would be false. The third one is *Maxim Relation*; this type of maxim should provide a statement that is stick to the topic. The last one is *the Maxim of Manner*; this type of maxim should provide clarity and be as communicative as possible. This principle aims to keep the conversation stick to the point and make both participants talk as the principles require.

However, some people tend to violate the maxim by not following the cooperative principles and answering more than is needed or having an implied meaning, possibly because communication has a purpose to understand and to be

understood. Therefore, cooperative conversation exists when the individuals can not follow the cooperative principles. The theory is conversational implicature, which aim to convey meaning beyond it is required, so it is not only what is being said, but there can also be another meaning behind the message (Huang, 2007:25-26). For example, a speaker asked, "Did you drink all the milk bottles in the fridge?" and someone answered , "I drank some." The implied meaning of this conversation is that the person did not drink all the bottles, yet they drank some of them. This is the type of conversational implicature.

Maxim Violation has been studied several times in many fields, especially in the field of politics. Prior study conducted by Akhyaruddin, et al (2018) has shown a comprehensive analysis about politeness maxim. This study aimed to describe the politeness maxim used by the Regent Head Kerinci candidates for 2018. The result show that the candidates did violate the politeness maxim for to inform, insinuate, express an opinion, suggest, criticize, complain, and defend.

Other study by Lodari, et al (2018) has aims to investigate kinds of maxims violated by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump during the second presidential debate in 2016 and to investigate possible purposes of violations applied by the speakers. The results revealed that both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump violated all of the maxims, with Clinton breaching 75 and Trump infringing 174. The most violated maxim by both speakers was the maxim of amount, while the least violated maxim was the maxim of way. Furthermore, the data suggested that

the speakers' transgressions were least likely motivated by a desire to convey a positive political image to the audience.

Furthermore, Rosyidah (2020) studied the maxim violation in a Indonesian presidential debate in 2019. This study aimed to know how does the President and Vice President candidates violate cooperative principle and what the meaning behind the violations. This investigation found that President and Vice President Candidate 01 breached the maxims of relevance and quality. The functions of violation are twofold: comMa'amive and aggressive. The meaning of the utterances is promising and opinionated. Candidate 02 compromised maximum quality by using assertive functions. The meaning of the statements is boasting.

Similarly, Wirduna & Wawadika (2022) also examined about the maxim violation performed by presidential candidates and vice presidential candidates in debate 2019. This study has two aims, the first one (1) is to identify violations of cooperation principles during the 2019 presidential and vice presidential debates in the Republic of Indonesia, and the second one (2) is to describe the intention behind such violations used by the presidential and vice presidential candidates during the debate 2019.

Moreover, Sari et al. (2020) using flouting maxims by Cuttinng, explored the types of flouting maxims by gubernatorial candidates of north Sumatra in the election debate in 2018. This study aimed to find out the flouting maxims done by the guernatorial candidates of north sumatera during the election debate in 2018.

The study found all the flouting maxims and the most dominant one is flouting maxim quantity.

The presented preliminary data below has provided new insight in this area of research.

Datum 15

Najwa: *"Ibu Mega sempat mengeluarkan pernyataan 'bubarin saja KPK tidak efektif'. Saya mau tanya, anda sependapat dengan ibu ketua umum?"*

Ganjar: *"Boleh nggak ada slide yang bisa ditampilkan ya dari sisi hukum tadi itu, baik dari jumlah pendidikan kasus korupsi yang ada di Indonesia 2018-2022?"*

Najwa: *"Ma'am Mega once issued a statement, 'Just disperse the KPK; it's not effective.' I want to ask if you agree with the chairwoman?"*

Ganjar: *"Is it possible to have a slide displayed regarding the legal aspect earlier, specifically the number of corruption cases in Indonesia from 2018-2022?"*

The datum showed Ganjar violated the maxim relation. The realization of the violation was that Ganjar did not answer the question by agreeing or disagreeing. Instead, he asked to display a slide. The reason why he violated the maxim is to hold himself back from answering the question in a clear and direct way because he could not answer it by agreeing or disagreeing. Therefore, in this violation, he used withhold politeness strategy in order to avoid the absence of the expected answer of politeness.

Datum 6 & 7

Najwa: *"Jadi anda meMbakntah keras politik identitas bermain di adzan itu?"*

Ganjar: *"Mbakk, ada identitas saya yang banyak dibaca. Mbakk saja sudah mengidentifikasi saya dengan identitas saya."*

Najwa: "So you strongly disprove the political identity play in the call to Adzan?"

Ganjar: "Ma'am, there is my identity which is widely read. Ma'am alone has identified me with my identity."

The datum above obtained from the interview violated four types of maxims: maxim quantity, maxim quality, maxim relation, and maxim manner in one sentence. The realization of the violated maxims was Ganjar did not answer the question; he didn't say that he agreed or disagreed. He also answered that his identity has been identified by Najwa wherein there is no evidence that Najwa has identified his identity through the conversation above. His answer had no relation to the question and showed ambiguity; he didn't answer it directly and in a straightforward manner. The cause of Ganjar violated the four maxims because he did the withhold politeness strategies, he chose to avoid answer the question by not provide relevant and adequate answer, holding himself to answer it directly.

Therefore, the researcher's motivation for conducting this research is to explore, describe, and elaborate on the maxim violations performed by Ganjar Pranowo on the interview with Mata Najwa.

Maxim violations has been studied years by years and in the political field this study has grown numerously. Several studies have studied how political figures violated the maxim on their communication in debates, speeches, medias, etc. However, a noticeable gap existed within this research. This research focus on one particular presidential candidate Ganjar Pranowo on his interview on Mata Najwa, while prior studies focus on formal debates and analyze more than one presidential candidate. This research also aims to find the cause of maxim violations done by the political figure using impoliteness strategies while existing researchers aimed to find the types of maxim violations and the functions of maxim violations.

This research is important to be studied in order to understand the political communication and the patterns to convey messages from political figures. It will give contribution to research about political communication.

B. Problems of the Study

From the background of the study, this research has formulated the problems of the study:

1. What types of maxim violations can be found on the interview of Ganjar Pranowo in “Mata Najwa”?
2. How the maxim violations are realized in the interview of Ganjar Pranowo in “Mata Najwa”?
3. Why do maxim violations occur in the interview of Ganjar Pranowo in “Mata Najwa”?

C. Objectives of the Study

From the problems of the study above, this research has formulated the objectives of the study:

1. To explore the maxim violations performed by Ganjar Pranowo in the interview in "Mata Najwa."
2. To describe the maxim violations realized on the interview of Ganjar Pranowo in "Mata Najwa"
3. To elaborate the reason of maximum violations occurred on Ganjar Pranowo's interview in "Mata Najwa,"

D. Scope of the Study

This research focused on the maxim violation employed by Ganjar Pranowo during his interview on "Mata Najwa" talk show which was posted on September 21, 2023, under the title "Ganjar Pranowo Bicara Gagasan | Mata Najwa." It also explored the communication aspect proposed by Grice on maxim violations: quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

E. The Significances Of the Study

Theoretically

This research will advance the discipline of linguistics, particularly on pragmatics in political discourse, can contribute to students' understanding about maxim violations, and the result can be a reference to other students who want to perform comparable study in the future.

Practically

This research has information that can increase communication efficacy in ordinary conversations, minimize misconceptions, and improve the delivery of intended messages. This study is also benefit to help students to improve communication efficacy.

