



An Analysis of Maxim Violation in *Gibran di Antara Ganjar dan Prabowo-Rosi* Podcast

Ninok Narindra

Universitas Trunojoyo Madura

ninoknarindra@gmail.com

Zakiyatul Lathifah

Universitas Trunojoyo Madura

ifahzakiyatul@gmail.com

Afiifah Al Rosyidah

Universitas Trunojoyo Madura

afiifah.rosyidah@trunojoyo.ac.id

Abstract- In effective communication, the speaker tries to follow certain rules to ensure the message is understood. This study will analyze a conversation from the YouTube video *Gibran di Antara Ganjar dan Prabowo – ROSI* using the cooperative principles theory by Grice (1989), as explained in Yule (1996) Pragmatics. The aim of this research is to identify how participants, especially politician Gibran, follow or violate the four Gricean Maxims such as Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relation, and Maxim of Manner. This study uses the qualitative method. This approach is chosen because the focus is on analyzing and interpreting the meaning and context of the language. The data studied comes from the conversation of the YouTube video *Gibran di Antara Ganjar dan Prabowo – ROSI*. The findings show that Gibran sometimes gives limited or vague answers that violating the maxim of Quantity and Manner, avoids the direct relevance to sensitive questions that violating the maxim of Relation, and speaks carefully to maintain truthfulness that partly following the maxim of Quality. These patterns reveal that his communication style mixes cooperation with strategic violations, reflecting how political figures use language to manage topics and protect their image in public discussions.

Keywords: Gibran; Maxim Violation; YouTube Video

I. INTRODUCTION

In these recent years, podcasts and talk shows have become popular platforms for public figures and politicians to share their opinions and interact with the public. Analyzing their speech is interesting when it viewed from a pragmatic perspective, because it shows how meaning and conversational behavior are shaped in real life communication. One of the important theories in pragmatics that fits best for this analysis is the Cooperative Principle. The cooperative principle is introduced by Grice, (1989) and explained by Yule (1996), is based on the idea that people cooperate

when they talk so that conversations remain clear and meaningful. According to Grice (1989), speakers are expected to follow four maxims such as maxim of Quantity that give enough information, not too much or too little, maxim of Quality that be truthful and avoid falsehoods, maxim of Relation that be relevant to the topic, and the maxim of Manner that be clear, brief, and orderly. When the speakers fail to follow these rules, it is called a maxim violation Widiastih et al., (2022). Such violations can be intentional or strategic, especially in political contexts.

Several previous studies have applied this theory. For example, Astuti &



Syamsi (2022), that analyzed the intention of Gricean maxim violations in Joko Widodo's exclusive interview with BBC Indonesia. The next researchers are Sari et al., (2019) that focused on the types of maxim violations and their impacts on effective communication in the movie *Confessions of a Shopaholic*. Then, Serlin, (2017) conducted a study entitled *An Analysis of Violation of Cooperative Principle in Alice in Wonderland Movie Script*, which found that the most dominant violation was the maxim of quantity. The other researchers are Dong & Huang, (2019), which analyzed the violations of cooperative principles in *The Little Prince* and revealed how maxim violations highlight character traits and deeper meanings in literary works. These studies share similarities with the previous research because they use conversational data, but different in focus. Most of them analyze fictional or scripted conversations, while only a few explore real world, high stakes communication by public figures.

The limitation of previous research is the lack of attention to non-fictional political interviews, where speakers face pressure and must manage sensitive topics. This study aims to fill that gap by analyzing the YouTube podcast *Gibran di Antara Ganjar dan Prabowo – ROSI*. The novelty of this research lies in applying Grice's Cooperative Principle to a real political setting, showing how maxim violations are used strategically by politicians.

The objective of this study is to investigate the types and pragmatic functions of maxim violations in Gibran Rakabuming Raka's podcast with Rosi, and to explain how these violations serve as tools for managing conflict, creating implicatures, and delivering hidden strategic messages to the public.

The video podcast of *Gibran di Antara Ganjar dan Prabowo – ROSI* is perfect for a pragmatic analysis of the cooperative principle because it shows the strategic and high-pressure communication

in a real-world context. This is not a fictional story, but rather a serious political interview recorded on video. When the host asks Gibran difficult questions about his divided political loyalties and potential political tricks, Gibran must be very careful with his words. He often gives short and vague answers, or avoids the main topic. This behaviour provides us with a clear and concrete example of a speaker violating, or perhaps intentionally violating the cooperative principle of Maxims. Analysing this video allows us to understand how real the politicians use these cooperative principle violations as a powerful tool to manage conflict and create implicatures or strategic messages and hidden messages for the public.

II. METHODS

The method of this study was a qualitative method. The main goal of this study is to identify and explain the violations of Gricean Maxims in the conversation between Gibran Rakabuming Raka and Rosi Silalahi. The qualitative methods are used to analyse how language is used in situations, focusing on meaning, purpose, and implication. It requires researchers to work closely with the data, use a clear framework such as the cooperative principle theory to explain the findings, and then organize the information into systematic categories Creswell, (2009).

The data used for this study comes from the YouTube podcast video *Gibran di Antara Ganjar dan Prabowo -ROSI*, uploaded by KompasTV on 28 July 2023. The video was transcribed textual to enable a closer look at how language is used in the conversation. The main focus will be at what Gibran says, particularly where Gibran's responses may violate the Gricean Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Questions asked by the host are also taken into account to better understand the overall conversation.

The data analysis was conducted in several steps followed Creswell, (2009) framework for qualitative research. First, the recorded conversations were carefully examined for responses that appeared to deviate from the topic. Each response was then examined using Grice's cooperative principle to determine whether any maxims were violated and to what extent. The context of the conversation, such as the political nature of the topic, the role of the interviewee, and the host's questions, were taken into account to understand the meaning behind these violated maxims. Finally, the results were sorted based on which maxims were violated and discussed in relation to Gibran's communication style.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This part displayed all the information regarding the conversational maxims that were violated during the course of the podcast process, which was produced by the host Rosi and Gibran Rakabuming Raka. The results of this study demonstrated that the interviewee violated four maxims during the political interview activity such as the Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relation, and Maxim of Manner. The following table contains information about how much Gibran deviated from the cooperative principle.

Table 1. Maxim Violation found in “Gibran di Antara Ganjar dan Prabowo-ROSI

No	Maxim	Gibran
1	Maxim of Quantity	3
2	Maxim of Quality	3
3	Maxim of Relation	2
4	Maxim of Manner	2
Total		10

Violation of Maxim Quantity

Violation of the Maxim of Quantity happens when a speaker provides too much or too little information compared to what is required in the conversational context. According to Grice, (1989), Maxim of Quantity expects the speakers to be as informative as necessary, but not more or less. In the interview data with Gibran, this violation is clearly shown.

Data 1

Rosi: “Mas Gibran juru kampanye Pak Ganjar atau tidak?”

Gibran: “Setahu saya di internal itu belum ada secara resmi personilnya ini ini ini gibran sebagai ini ini ini belum ada yang resmi seperti itu tapi sekali lagi kalo ada arahan mendampingi pak ganjar kesini saya berangkat ada acara ini saya berangkat itu, suruh ngumpulin relawan saya kumpulin.”

The situation happened in the podcast when Rosi asked Gibran: “Mas Gibran juru kampanye Pak Ganjar atau tidak?” The deviation occurred because the host expected a clear and short answer, either “yes” or “no.” However, Gibran replied: “Setahu saya di internal itu belum ada secara resmi personilnya ini ini ini gibran sebagai ini ini ini belum ada yang resmi seperti itu tapi sekali lagi kalo ada arahan mendampingi pak ganjar kesini saya berangkat ada acara ini saya berangkat itu, suruh ngumpulin relawan saya kumpulin”

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of quantity maxim. The host’s question was direct, but Gibran gave a longer answer that avoided the main point. Thus, his utterance deviates the quantity maxim as it showed insufficient information and did not meet the expectation of the question.

Data 2

Rosi: “Jika MK meloloskan uji materi ini dan membuka batas minimal capres dan

cawapres mas gibran akan ikut dalam bursa dalam calon Presiden?"

Gibran: *"Ndak usah lah, itu ndak ada yang milih nanti."*

The situation happened when Rosi asked, "Jika MK meloloskan uji materi ini dan membuka batas minimal capres dan cawapres mas gibran akan ikut dalam bursa dalam calon Presiden?" The deviation occurred because the host wanted a serious and informative answer about Gibran's political position. However, Gibran answered, "Ndak usah lah, itu ndak ada yang milih nanti."

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of quantity maxim. The host's question required a clear explanation, but Gibran gave a short and humorous answer that avoided the real issue. Thus, his utterance deviates the quantity maxim as it showed lack of detail and did not provide the information needed.

Data 3

Rosi: *"Ada juga mas gibran yang kemudian menarasikan secara terus menerus bahwa presiden jokowi dan bu mega ini retak hubungannya?"*

Gibran: *"Nggak, baik-baik aja."*

The situation happened when Rosi asked, "Ada juga mas gibran yang kemudian menarasikan secara terus menerus bahwa presiden jokowi dan bu mega ini retak hubungannya?" The deviation occurred because the host expected a detailed explanation about the political relationship. However, Gibran answered only, "Nggak, baik-baik aja."

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of quantity maxim. The host's question was complex, but Gibran gave a very short answer without any supporting detail. Thus, his utterance deviates the quantity maxim as it showed minimal information and did not satisfy the need for clarity.

The results can be connected with the findings of Sari et al. (2019) that focused on the movie *Confessions of a Shopaholic* and found that maxim violations influenced the effectiveness of communication, showing how too much or too little information can change the listener's understanding, and it's also happened in Gibran's responses. Therefore, while previous study focused on fictional or scripted conversations, this research adds to the discussion by showing how maxim violations, especially maxim of quantity, also play a significant role in authentic political interviews and can shape public perception.

Violation of Maxim Quality

Violation of the Maxim of Quality occurs when a speaker provides information that is not truthful, lacks evidence, or deliberately hides the truth. According to Grice, (1989), Maxim of Quality requires speakers to say what they believe to be true and to avoid giving false or unsupported statements. In the podcast interview data with Gibran, this violation is clearly shown.

Data 4

Rosi: *"Jika MK meloloskan uji materi ini dan membuka batas minimal capres dan cawapres, mas gibran akan ikut dalam bursa dalam calon Presiden?"*

Gibran: *"Ndak usah lah itu, ndak ada yang milih nanti."*

The situation happened in the podcast when Rosi asked Gibran, "Jika MK meloloskan uji materi ini dan membuka batas minimal capres dan cawapres, mas gibran akan ikut dalam bursa dalam calon Presiden?" The deviation occurred because the host expected a serious and factual answer about Gibran's political position. However, Gibran replied: "Ndak usah lah, itu ndak ada yang milih nanti."

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of

quality maxim. The host's question required a truthful and evidence-based answer, but Gibran avoided it by giving a humorous and dismissive reply. Thus, his utterance deviates the quality maxim as it showed avoidance of truth and lack of factual support.

Data 5

Rosi: *"Konsultan politik Mas Gibran siapa?"*

Gibran: *"Rahasia, kalau nggak tau ya nggak usah tau."*

The situation happened when Rosi asked, "Konsultan politik Mas Gibran siapa?" The deviation occurred because the host expected Gibran to reveal the name of his political consultant. However, Gibran answered "Rahasia, kalau nggak tau ya nggak usah tau."

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of quality maxim. The host's question required real information, but Gibran refused to give it and deliberately hid the truth. Thus, his utterance deviates the quality maxim as it showed secrecy and lack of honesty in communication.

Data 6

Rosi: *"Kok bisa ada relawan pengumpulan relawan itu?"*

Gibran: *"Orang sekali Pak Prabowo pun kemana-mana pasti diikuti banyak orang entah itu caleg entah itu orang-orang dari struktur partai entah itu relawan ke semua tempat pasti diikuti, ya saya janjinya hanya dengan pak menteri saja tapi habis itu ada relawan-relawan nah itu diluar kendali saya."*

The situation happened when Rosi asked: "Kok bisa ada relawan pengumpulan relawan itu?" The deviation occurred because the host expected Gibran to explain the reason behind the support of his

volunteers. However, Gibran answered "Orang sekali Pak Prabowo pun kemana-mana pasti diikuti banyak orang entah itu caleg entah itu orang-orang dari struktur partai entah itu relawan ke semua tempat pasti diikuti, ya saya janjinya hanya dengan pak menteri saja tapi habis itu ada relawan-relawan nah itu diluar kendali saya." Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of quality maxim. The host's question required a clear and truthful explanation, but Gibran avoided responsibility by saying it was "outside his control." Thus, his utterance deviates the quality maxim as it showed lack of factual detail and avoidance of accountability.

This finding is consistent with other study that analyzed violations of the Maxim of Quality in different contexts. Serlin, (2017) analyzed *Alice in Wonderland* and discovered that the Maxim of Quality was often violated when characters gave statements that were clearly untrue, which contributed to the absurdity of the story.

Violation of Maxim Relation

Violation of the Maxim of Relation occurs when a speaker's response is not relevant to the topic or question being asked. According to Grice, (1989), Maxim of Relation requires speakers to make their contributions relevant to the ongoing conversation. When this maxim is violated, the speaker's answer may shift the topic, avoid the issue, or provide information that does not directly address the interlocutor's expectation. In the podcast data with Gibran, this violation is clearly shown.

Data 7

Rosi: *"Karena banyak, misalnya dari PDI Perjuangan misalnya dengan hadirnya mas Ganjar di acara bersama ehh dengan hadirnya mas Gibran bersama bakal calon Presiden PDIP mas Ganjar itu dianggap wah ada mas Gibran maka ini juga berarti*

dukungan Presiden Jokowi pada pak Ganjar?”

Gibran: *“Ya kalo soal itu silahkan ditanyakan langsung ke beliau.”*

The situation happened in the podcast when Rosi asked Gibran, “Karena banyak, misalnya dari PDI Perjuangan misalnya dengan hadirnya mas Ganjar di acara bersama ehh dengan hadirnya mas Gibran bersama bakal calon Presiden PDIP mas Ganjar itu dianggap wah ada mas Gibran maka ini juga berarti dukungan Presiden Jokowi pada pak Ganjar?” The deviation occurred because the host expected Gibran to explain clearly about Jokowi’s political support for Ganjar. However, Gibran answered with “Ya kalo soal itu silahkan ditanyakan langsung ke beliau.”

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of relation maxim. The host’s question was about Jokowi’s stance, but Gibran avoided the topic and shifted responsibility to Jokowi himself. Thus, his utterance deviates the relation maxim as it showed irrelevance to the question and avoided giving the expected explanation.

Data 8

Rosi: *“Mas gibran kemarin akhirnya udah damai dengan pak panda, yang mengatakan anda apa dibilang apa sama Pak Panda?”*

Rosi: *“Nggak nggak pernah berantem tapi kan ada statement soal anak ingusan.”*

Gibran: *“Nggak nggak, intinya saya banyak berguru pada beliau saya langsung sungkem waktu bertemu dimana ya di citerup kemarin langsung sungkem, pak panda mohon maaf jika ada yang salah dari saya, beliau ngasih banyak masukan ngasih buku juga tebal banget, beliau orang baik.”*

The situation happened when Rosi asked: “Mas gibran kemarin akhirnya udah damai dengan pak panda, yang mengatakan anda apa dibilang apa sama Pak Panda?” The deviation occurred because the host

wanted Gibran to explain the feedback or the criticism he received from senior politician Pak Panda. However, Gibran answered with “Nggak nggak, intinya saya banyak berguru pada beliau saya langsung sungkem waktu bertemu dimana ya di citerup kemarin langsung sungkem, pak panda mohon maaf jika ada yang salah dari saya, beliau ngasih banyak masukan ngasih buku juga tebal banget beliau orang baik.”

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of relation maxim. The host’s question was about the content of Pak Panda’s input, but Gibran gave an answer about his respectful gesture and receiving a book. Thus, his utterance deviates the relation maxim as it showed irrelevance to the main point and did not provide the information requested.

These findings are consistent with other study that analyzed violations of the Maxim of Relation. Sari et al., (2019), in their analysis of Confessions of a Shopaholic, showed that characters violated the Maxim of Relation when they shifted topics to hide uncomfortable truths, which reduced the effectiveness of communication.

Violation of Maxim Manner

Violation of the Maxim of Manner occurs when a speaker’s utterance is not clear, orderly, or straightforward. According to Grice, (1989), Maxim of Manner requires speakers to avoid ambiguity, obscurity, and unnecessary complexity, and instead communicate in a way that is easy to understand. When this maxim is violated, the speaker’s response may become confusing, dramatic, or mixed with irrelevant elements, which prevents the listener from receiving a direct and comprehensible answer.

In the podcast interview data with Gibran, this violation is clearly shown.

Data 9

Rosi: “Mas gibran dalam banyak survey, pak ganjar ini justru turun loh di Jawa Tengah, tidakkah ini juga kontribusi mas gibran yang bermanufer dengan relawannya atau kontribusi relawan bolone mase yang pindah?”

Gibran: “Ini survei mana nih? kalo setahu saya Jawa Tengah nggak turun loh, setahu saya masih oke.”

The situation happened in the podcast when Rosi asked Gibran, “Mas gibran dalam banyak survey, pak ganjar ini justru turun loh di Jawa Tengah, tidakkah ini juga kontribusi mas gibran yang bermanufer dengan relawannya atau kontribusi relawan bolone mase yang pindah?” The deviation occurred because the host expected a clear and direct answer about Ganjar’s electability. However, Gibran replied with “Ini survei mana nih? kalo setahu saya Jawa Tengah nggak turun loh, setahu saya masih oke.”

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of manner maxim. The host’s question was straightforward, but Gibran gave a long and unclear answer that mixed different ideas. Thus, his utterance deviates the manner maxim as it showed ambiguity and lack of clarity in communication.

Data 11

Rosi: “Mas gibran sedang ini ya sedang mengevaluasi partai nya sendiri ya?”

Gibran: “Oh enggak, eiihh haduh mbak-mbak jangan mbak plis-plis ndak-ndak jangan-jangan, saya tidak berkapasitas mengevaluasi siapapun, partai apapun saya tidak mewakili siapapun ya.”

The situation happened when Rosi asked, “Mas gibran sedang ini ya sedang mengevaluasi partai nya sendiri ya?” The deviation occurred because the host expected Gibran to confirm or deny clearly. However, Gibran answered with “Oh enggak, eiihh haduh mbak-mbak jangan

mbak plis-plis ndak-ndak jangan-jangan, saya tidak berkapasitas mengevaluasi siapapun, partai apapun saya tidak mewakili siapapun ya.”

Based on the interaction, the utterance was included into the type of deviation of maxim of manner. The host’s question was simple, but Gibran responded with dramatic and unclear language. Thus, his utterance deviates the manner maxim as it showed avoidance and lack of orderly explanation.

These findings are consistent with other research that analyzed violations of the Maxim of Manner. Astuti & Syamsi, (2022), in their study of Joko Widodo’s interview with BBC Indonesia, found that politicians often violated the Maxim of Manner by using vague or indirect language to avoid sensitive issues.

Overall, the analysis shows that Gibran’s responses often deviated from Grice’s principles of Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relation, and Maxim of Manner, and highlighting how political discourse can strategically manipulate conversational norms to avoid directness, detail, or accountability.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study shows that Gibran Rakabuming Raka, in his podcast with Rosi Silalahi, violated all four of Grice’s maxims such as Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relation, and Maxim of Manner. In total, 10 cases were found that is 3 Maxim of Quantity, 3 Maxim of Quality, 2 Maxim of Relation, and 2 Maxim of Manner. The most common violations were quantity and quality, which reveal that Gibran often gave too little information or avoided giving factual answers. These patterns reflect the sensitive nature of political interviews, where politicians must protect their position and manage public perception by using vague, indirect, or humorous language. Relation and manner violations also appeared when Gibran gave answers that were irrelevant, unclear, or



overly dramatic. The findings highlight that maxim violations are not random mistakes but can be used as strategies in political communication to avoid direct answers, shift responsibility, or create hidden meanings. In theory, this research adds to the study of Pragmatics by showing how the cooperative principle works in real political contexts.

REFERENCES

- Astuti, S., & Syamsi, K. (2022). Analysis of The Intention of Gricean Maxim's Violation in Joko Widodo-Bbc's Exclusive Interview. *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)*, 5(3), 1–8. www.ijlrhss.com
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design* (V. Knight (ed.); 3rd ed.). Sage Publication.
- Dong, T., & Huang, X. (2019). Violations of the Cooperative Principle: Analysis of Conversations in The Little Prince. *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 04(09), 587–591. <https://doi.org/10.36348/sjhss.2019.v04i09.003>
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words* (P. Grice (ed.)). Harvard University Press.
- Sari, D. F., Nuraini, L. N., & Muthalib, K. A. (2019). An Analysis of Maxim Violations in a Movie and Their Impacts on Effective Communication. *The 28th International Conference on Literature (ICoL) XXVIII*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.24815/v1i1.14532>
- Serlin. (2017). An Analysis of Violation of Cooperative Principle in Alice in Wonderland Movie Script. *ELITE Journal*, 2(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/1033772>
- Widiasih, N. W. B. A., Ayomi, P. N., & Winarta, I. B. G. N. (2022). The Types of Maxim Violation Found in Luca Movie. *ELLITE: Journal of Education, Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, 5(01), 7. <https://doi.org/10.33059>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics* (H. Widdowson (ed.)). Oxford University Press.