



THE MAXIM VIOLATION ON MATA NAJWA TALK SHOW
“Selebriti Pengganda Simpati”

A FINAL PROJECT

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement
For S-1 Degree in American Cultural Studies
In English Department, Faculty of Humanities
Diponegoro University

Submitted by:
Ester Okta Alfina
13020111130079

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG
2016**

PRONOUNCEMENT

I state truthfully that this project is compiled by me without taking the results from other research in any university, in S-1, S-2, and S-3 degree and diploma. In addition, I ascertain that I do not take the material from other publications or someone's work except for the references mentioned in the bibliography.

Semarang, February 2016

Ester Okta Alfina

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

But seek first His Kingdom and His Righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well—(Matthew 6:33)

This final project is dedicated to my beloved parents and grandmother.

APPROVAL

Approved by

Advisor,

Dr. Agus Subiyanto, M.A.

NIP. 19640814 199001 001

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata I Final Academic Paper Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

On March 2016

Chair Person

First Member

Dr. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum
NIP. 196111091987032001

Ayu Ida Savitri, S.S., M.Hum
NIP.197980222008012013

Second Member

Third Member

Dr. J. Herudjati P., M.Sc
NIP.195303271981031006

Ariya Jati, S.S, M.A
NIP. 197802282005021001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise be to Jesus Christ, who always gives strength and spirit to the writer so that this final project on “The Identification of Maxim Violation on Mata Najwa *Talk Show “Selebriti Pengganda Simpati”*” came to a completion. On this occasion, the writer would like to thank everybody who has made their contribution to the completion of this extended essay.

The deepest gratitude and appreciation is extended to Dr. Agus Subiyanto, M.A., as my advisor, who had given his continuous guidance, helpful correction, moral support, advice and suggestion without which it is doubtful that this final project came into completion.

My deepest thank also goes to the followings person:

1. Dr. Redyanto Noor, M.Hum., as the Dean of Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University.
2. Sukarni Suryaningsih, S.S, M.Hum., as the head of English Studies Program, Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University.
3. All of the distinguished lecturers in the English Department, Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University who have shared their precious knowledge and experiences.

4. My beloved mama, papa, mbah, and Novan. Thank you for the endless love, pray, and support.
5. My beloved brother and sisters. Kak Gaby, kak Joko, kak Angie whom I always have been looking up to. Thank you for always teaching how to be a better person.
6. My beloved highschool friends, Galuh Arindita, Kristina Arum, Nona Septiana, whom I spent my eight years with. Thankyou always for the laughters.
7. My beloved Pastor Gavin, Pastor Jason and all BTM family. Thank you for the blessings and prayers you all have poured into my life.
8. My big sister Sandra Glaudia, my beloved imoutochans, Desy Eprila, Tania Marbun, Regina Manalu, Fefe Joanna, and all PMK familly where I had been growing up into.
9. My beloved Rully, Novia, Aya, Nissa, thankyou for always accompanying me during my project.

I realize that this final project is still far from perfect. I, therefore, will be glad to receive any constructive criticism and recommendation to make this final project better. Finally, I hope that this final project will be useful to the reader who wishes to learn something about Maxim Violation.

Semarang, February 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE.....	i
PRONOUNCEMENT	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION	iii
APPROVAL.....	iv
VALIDATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
1.....	Intr
oduction	1
2.....	Res
ults and Discussion.....	8
2.1	Vio
lation of Quantity Maxim.....	
2.2.....	Vio
lation of Quality Maxim.....	
2.3.....	Vio
lation of Relation Maxim.....	
2.4.....	Vio
lation of Manner Maxim.....	
3.....	CO
NCLUSION	15
REFERENCES.....	16

ABSTRACT

In interacting with other people, Cooperative Principle may be done in order to make a conversation run well and smoothly. However, there are chances when speakers have to violate a maxim in order to reinforce the self-esteem of others and to avoid offence and embarrassment. The purpose of the study is to find out the kinds of maxim violation done by the speakers on 'Mata Najwa' talk show and the motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims. The study used Non-Participant Observation Method to collect the data and *Padan* Method to identify the kinds of maxims violated by the speakers on 'Mata Najwa' talk show. The result of the study shows that there are fifteen utterances violating Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner maxims. The motivation behind the speakers violating the maxim is mostly because they want to show politeness and keep other's self-esteem.

Keywords: Maxim violation, Motivation, Mata Najwa, *Talk show*

1. Introduction

In society, if we want to build a good conversation, the relation between the speaker and listener should be created cooperatively. The cooperation of making a good conversation between the speaker and listener is well known as Cooperative Principle (Yule, 1996:36). It describes how people interact with each other. This rule should be done in order to make a conversation among them run well.

However, language is useless without meaning. Language actually has explicit and implicit (contextual) meanings. In relation to implicit meaning, there are four maxims (maxim of Quality, Quantity, Relevance and Manner) that should be fulfilled to make an ideal conversation. If speakers do not purposefully fulfill certain maxims, there will be maxim violation. Grice (1989 : 28) said that when the speaker does not fulfill or obey the maxims, the speaker is said to violate the maxims.

‘Mata Najwa’ is one kind of talk shows broadcasted by Metro TV. In the “*Selebriti Pengganda Simpati*” episode, Mata Najwa invited some celebrities like, Addie MS, Ahmad Dhani, and Tompi, to be interviewed about their political interest. The concept of the talkshow in this episode was inviting and interviewing some celebrities employed by parties to increase votes they can gain in the election. In this episode, the invited guests did some

maxim violations when being interviewed by Najwa. The purpose of the study is to identify maxim violation done by the guests of Mata Najwa talk show and the motivation behind the guests violating the maxims.

There are three theses that attempted to discuss maxim violation in several areas. They are: (1) “*Some Violations of Cooperative Principle in Ada Apa dengan Cinta*” by Ismail (2011), (2) “*Griceian’s Maxims on Investigation Report (Case Study of Corruption in District Attorney of Demak)*.” by Hutomo (2010), and “*Violations of Cooperative Principle on Morning Zone Programin Trax FM Semarang*” by Widanti (2009).

The first study by Ismail (2011) focused on what maxims violated most in *Ada Apa Dengan Cinta* movie. The data were sorted well and clearly presented by presenting a chart to count on the maxims that were violated in the movie. The result showed that Quantity maxim is the most violated maxim in the movie. Besides that, the study also found out the implicit meaning in every maxim that was violated.

The second study by Hutomo (2010) attempted to seek the maxim violation in a different area. The data used in this research are maxim violations found in the District Attorney of Demak Regency. He took samples from the population of the utterances in the ‘*Berita Acara Pemeriksaan*’ or Police Investigation Report that violated the Griceian Maxims. The result showed that a criminal suspect as a speaker tends to violate quality maxim the most because he was trying to cover up the things by saying lies.

The last study by Widanti (2009) tried to find out maxim violation in a radio program. She also discovered the implicit meaning of every maxim that was violated. Besides, the conclusion of the analysis mentioned that there was no violation in relation maxim.

The studies above show how many maxim violations happened in different situation such as in movie, radio, and even district attorney. However, we can raise a question on the motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims. In this study, I answer the following question, “what kind of maxim violations done by the speakers in ‘Mata Najwa’?” and “what is the motivation of the speakers violating the maxims?”. The purpose of the study is to identify maxim violation done by the speakers in ‘Mata Najwa’ talk show and the motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims.

In analyzing the data, I use Conversational Maxim Theory proposed by Grice to find out the kinds of maxim violations in ‘Mata Najwa’ talk show. In order to make a good conversation, speakers have to obey this Conversational Maxim.

1.1 Conversational Maxim

Grice (1989 : 28) argues that in order to implement the Cooperative Principles, the listener and speaker must obey four Conversational Maxims. They are maxim of Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner. We have to cooperate with the maxims if we want to make our conversation run smoothly. Each of the maxims will be explained as follows:

1.1.1 Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity requires the speaker to make contribution that is as informative as is required. When someone contributes more information than is required, then it can be said that he/she violated Quantity maxim. The speaker does not allow to make his contribution neither shorter nor longer than is required. Widdowson (2007:58) described maxim of Quantity in the conversation below:

Q: Could you tell the court what you did on the morning of February 10th?

A: I was woken by alarm clock at 7.15 in the morning. I got out of bed. I put on my slippers and went to the bathroom and turned on the cold tap over the washbasin, took my toothbrush and cleaned my teeth (Widdowson, 2007:58).

From the conversation above we know that the speaker was only asked about what speaker was doing in the morning of February 10th, yet the speaker provided too much information for the answer. By giving this answer, it can be implied that the speaker was trying to hide the real activities he was doing during the morning of February 10th. It is also clearly stated to us that the conversation above violated the maxim of Quantity.

1.1.2 Maxim of Quality

Quality maxim requires utterances that have enough evidence and are true. In this maxim, speakers do not allow to make contribution containing lies or untruth. Leech (1983:125) has an example of this:

A: Geoff has just borrowed your car

B: Well, I like THAT!

As in the conversation above, it can be seen that actually B really hates the fact that Geoff has borrowed his car, yet B's answer is contrary to what he actually feels. This conversation violated maxim of Quality by saying something that is not true. Quality maxim requires the utterances that have enough evidence and are true.

1.1.3 Maxim of Relation

The concept of this maxim is by saying something that is relevant to the topic. This maxim requires relevance between the speaker and the hearer. Widdowson (2007:61) has an example of this maxim. It is a little conversation between a husband and wife getting ready to go out for an evening. The wife asks the husband.

Wife : how do you like my new hat?

Husband: very much.

Husband: looks nice

Husband: well, not sure it is quite your color.

Husband: it is ten past eight already.

The husband for some reasons at the end chose not to comply with the maxim of relation. There are some implicatures regarding his answers violating the maxim. Perhaps he actually hated the hat or he just became impatient since they were already late to go out.

1.1.4 Maxim of Manner

Maxim of Manner requires contribution that is clear, brief, orderly, and unambiguous. Speakers are required to say things that avoid ambiguity

and obscurity of expression in order to not violate Manner maxim. There is an illustration from Kunjana (2007:57)

Daughter: Mom, I wanna go back to the town tomorrow.

Mother : I have already prepared in on the desk

This conversation involves a daughter who is still a student living in dormitory far away from her home and her mother. As we can see above, the daughter has an ambiguity of what she said. She did not just mean to inform her mother about her leaving but also she had intention to ask her mother for money yet she did not utter it well.

1.2 Motivation for Maxim Violation

One reason for disregarding the maxims is to assert territorial rights, so to speak, and to project one's self (Widdowson. 2007:64). Speakers tend to violate the maxims because they think it may cause offence, embarrassment toward others. They maintain good relations by a mutual respect for face and territorial rights of others. Widdowson (2007:64) stated that this kind of cooperation goes under the general name of politeness. There are chances when speakers have to violate the maxims because they just do not want to cause offence and undermine other's self-esteem. They choose to violate the maxims and leave their utterances to others to take the implicit meaning of what they said.

This paper is a qualitative descriptive research. The data of this research are utterances of violated maxims produced by the speakers at Mata Najwa talk show broadcasted nationally on Metro TV on 23 april 2014. I used the video "*Mata Najwa eps Selebriti Pegganda Simpati FULL version - YouTube*" downloaded via internet to explain maxim violation produced by the speakers.

This research used Descriptive Method to explain and describe the study deeply. I construed the phenomenon of maxim violation existing in the speakers' utterances through Griceian maxims. In addition, this research used non-participant observation method meaning that I did not involve in the conversation.

In collecting the data, I used Documentation Method in which the data were taken from the video downloaded from internet as the data source (<http://www.youtube.com>). After that, I used Note-Taking Technique to collect the data. The writer took utterances which contain maxim violation produced by the guests of 'Mata Najwa' talk show and classified the data based on four types of maxims.

To analyze the data, I used Reflective-Introspective Method to find out the motivation behind the maxim violation done by the guests of 'Mata Najwa' talk show. Pragmatic Identity Method or *Padan* Method was also used to identify the kinds of maxims violated by the speakers in 'Mata Najwa' talk show.

sults and Discussion

In this chapter, I will present the analysis of the utterances containing maxim violation used by the guests in 'Mata Najwa' Talk show. The data of this paper were taken from guests in "*Selebriti Pengganda Simpati*" episode presenting Addie MS, Ahmad Dhani, and Tompi as the guests.

After watching this episode, I found fifteen utterances containing maxim violation done by the guests. Ahmad Dhani is the guests that has violated maxim the most. From his utterances, he violated Quantity and Quality maxim two times and Relation and Manner maxim three times. Meanwhile Tompi only once violated Quantity, Relation, and Manner maxim. Addie MS is the speaker mostly obeying the maxims. He only once violated Quantity and Manner maxim. In the data. there are four utterances containing violation of Quantity and Relation maxim, two utterances of Quality maxim vioation, and five utterances of Manner maxim violation. The followings are some of the data found.

2.1 Violation of Quantity Maxim

Quantity maxim requires contribution that is as informative as is required. When someone contributes more information than is required, then it can be said that he/she violated Quantity maxim. In the data, I found four utterances containing violation of Quantity maxim done by all the speakers.

The following example shows violation of Quantity maxim that has been done by Addie MS.

- (1) Najwa: *“Apakah sekarang dengan Jokowi mau menjadi capres, Sikap anda (mendukung) masihsamasepertipilgublalu?*
That Jokowi will be a president candidate now, is your stance (to support Jokowi) still the same as the last governor election?
- Addie: *“Saya sebenarnya melihat Jokowi punya potensi ya (untuk menjadi presiden), jadi mungkin kita sudah dua term dengan pak SBY (Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono) kita melihat ada masalah HAM, korupsi, dan yang lainnya, sementara pak SBY punya karakter yang santun, proper, nah kelihatannya orang (Indonesia) ingin keluar dari situasi yang stagnan ini.*
Actually, I see Jokowi has potency (to be a president), so maybe, we already had two terms (presidential period) with Mr. SBY, we see there are still human rights problems, corruption, and etc. Meanwhile Mr. SBY (Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono) are polite, proper, so it seems that (Indonesian) people want to get out of this stagnant situation.

Based on the data above, we can see that Najwa only asked whether Addie still supports Jokowi or not. However, Addie answered too much than was required and even did not answer the actual question. Addie also switched the topic by talking about Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono eventhough Najwa did not ask about that. From the explanation above we know that Addie’s utterances violated Quantity maxim by answering too much than was required as he talked about Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono which is irrelevant to the topic.

By violating the maxim, Addie may want to reinforce Jokowi’s image and keep his good relation with Jokowi. The possible implicature is that his support for Jokowi is not as much as his support for Jokowi in the last

governor election. This can be proven from his utterance switching the topic into the answer that was not even being asked by Najwa.

2.2 Violation of Quality Maxim

Utterances that can be said violating Quality maxim are the ones that say something that is not true. Quality maxim requires utterances that have enough evidence and are true. I found two utterances violated Quality maxim done only by Ahmad Dhani. Here is one example of his utterances that has violated Quality maxim.

- (2) Najwa: *“Diberi janji untuk jadi menteri kalau dapat berapa persen (suara pemilu) PKB?”*
Given the promise to be a minister if PKB gets how many percent (in the election)?
Dhani: *“Oh tidak ada. Kalau PKB koalisinya berhasil saja dengan presiden yang mereka usung”*
Oh, nothing. If only PKB’s coalition succeeds with the president they carry.
Najwa: *“Akan menjadi menteri Ahmad Dhani?”*
Will you become a minister, Ahmad Dhani?
Dhani: *“Ya kalau Cak Imin menepati janjinya”*
Yes, if Cak Imin keeps his promise.
Najwa: *“Ada keraguan akan (Cak Imin) ingkarjanji?”*
Is there any doubt that (Cak Imin) will break the promise?
Dhani: *“Oh enggak, enggak”*
Oh, no.

When Dhani said that he would become minister if Cak Imin keeps his promise, we can see there is a doubt in Dhani that Cak Imin will keep his promise. Then when Najwa asked whether he was doubtful or not that Cak Imin would break his promise, he answered no. We can see from his utterances that he actually doubted that Cak Imin can keep the promise, yet

he denied it at the end. In society, there is also a ‘common sense’ in politicians to make promises without realization . Dhani seems doubtful Cak Imin would keep his promise too. Dhani as the speaker violated maxim of Quality by answering the thing that is not in accordance with what he felt is true.

By saying ‘no’ at the end, Dhani broke the assumption that he doubted Cak Imin would keep his promise. He chose to violate Quality maxim because he wants to keep Cak Imin’s reputation as a politician. Moreover Dhani is still employed in the party Cak Imin leads. Dhani seems to maintain Cak Imin’s reputation and also his relation with Cak Imin as a working partner.

2.3 Violation of Relation Maxim

Relation maxim requires relevance between the speaker and the hearer. This maxim demands the speakers to be relevant to the topic that is being talked about. There are four utterances containing violation of Relation maxim in the data done by Ahmad Dhani and Tompi. One of the examples can be seen below.

- (3) Najwa: *“Kira-kira apa saja yang dilakukan Tompi untuk mendukung orang agar percaya pada sosok Gita Wiryawan?”*
Roughly, what are the things Tompi has done to support people to believe in Gita Wiryawan?
- Tompi: *“saya pikir Indonesia cuma perlu tau punya seseorang yang Bernama Gita Wiryawan dengan segala kapasitas yang dia punya.”*
I think, Indonesia only needs to know a person named Gita Wiryawan with all the capacity he has.

From the conversation above, we can see that Tompi's answer is irrelevant to the topic that was being asked. He was asked about what support he has done to support Gita Wiryawan, yet his answer did not relevant to the topic. Tompi is supposed to give the answer which is related to the question like what kind of support he gives or what he has done to support Gita Wiryawan yet Tompi did not do that. It can be said that Tompi violated Relation maxim.

By violating Relation maxim, Tompi may not want to cause embarrassment on his own self because he may not do anything yet to support Gita Wiryawan. He chose to make an irrelevant answer because he actually wants to discover the truth of doing nothing to support Gita Wiryawan. Furthermore, he also has a good relation with Gita Wiryawan for years, if Tompi really answers that he has not done anything yet to support Gita Wiryawan, it may ruin Tompi's image as a good friend of Gita Wiryawan.

2.4 Violation of Manner Maxim

Maxim of manner requires contribution that is clear, brief, orderly, and unambiguous. Speakers are required to say things that avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression in order to not violate Manner maxim. In the data, Manner maxim is the most violated maxim by the speakers. I found five utterances containing violation of manner maxim done by all the speakers, as seen from the examples below.

- (4) Najwa: “*kalau capres usungan Golkar (Aburizal Bakrie) menarik hati tidak?*”
Is Golkar’s president candidate (Aburizal Bakrie) appealing or not?
- Tompi: “*kalau buatsaya tidak setuju ya, karena saya tidak melihat penyelesaian yang baik terhadap apa yang pernah dilakukan.*”
For me, I do not agree, because I do not see a good solution for what he had done.
- (5) Najwa: “*Tetapi saya mau pastikan saja, berarti memang tidak ada Keuntungan komersil apapun (yang didapat dari partai)?*”
But I just want to make sure, so there is surely no commercial benefit (you get from the party)?
- Dhani: “*Ya nggak adalah, paling uang jajan aja.*”
Nothing, it is only pocket money.
- Najwa: “*uang jajan tuh berapa sih?*”
How much is the pocket money?
- Dhani: “*uang jajan ya lumayanlah buat makan sebulan*”
Yeah, pocket money that is enough for monthly meal.

Both of the examples above do not show clear statements. When Tompi was asked about Golkar’s president candidate, Aburizal Bakrie, he said that he did not agree because he did not see a good solution for what Bakrie had done. His answer may cause people think of what Aburizal had done in the past. From his utterance, Tompi violated manner maxim by talking something that is not clear.

By doing so, Tompi may have motivation to keep the ethics by not talking about someone’s past on the media. He did not give a clear statement about what Bakrie had done because he may assume that people already know about that and also it is not good to talk about someone’s disreputation on the media.

Meanwhile in data (5), Dhani was asked about the commercial benefit he got from the party. We can see Dhani did not give a clear statement about how many commercial benefit he got from the party. He said that it was only pocket money for monthly meal, but of course, everyone's monthly meal is different. Dhani's monthly meal as a public figure is certainly different from usual people. Here, Dhani did not mention clearly how much he got.

Dhani did it because it is not appropriate to mention the amount of his salary on the television. By violating manner maxim, Dhani also wants to keep his good relation with Cak Imin who has employed him on the party. If the amount of the money Dhani got from the party is not that much, it also can cause embarrassment on the party who paid him. The possible implicature is that the amount of the money Dhani got from the party is too big so it is not appropriate to talk about it on the television, or even less than people imagine about the income of an artist who is employed by a party.

Conclusion

This paper analyzed the conversational maxims that have been violated by the speakers in the talk show of 'Mata Najwa' talk show. The purpose of the study is to find out the kinds of maxim violation done by the speakers in 'Mata Najwa' talk show and the motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims.

There are fifteen utterances containing maxim violation found in the talk show. The motivation behind the speakers violating the maxims is because they want to show politeness and keep other's pride or good image. They also do not want to cause offence and embarrassment by violating the maxims. Speakers choose to violate the maxims and leave their utterances to others to take the appropriate implicature of what they said.

References

- Grice, H. P. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hutomo, Antares. 2010. "Griceian's Maxxims on Investigation Report (Case Study of Corruption in District Attorney of Demak)" S1 Thesis.Semarang: UniversitasDiponegoro.
- Ismail, Assaniyah. 2011. "Some Violations of Cooperative Principle in Ada Apa dengan Cinta" S1 Thesis.Semarang: UniversitasDiponegoro.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Rahardi, Kunjana. 2007. *Berkenalan dengan Ilmu Bahasa Pragmatik*. Malang: DIOMA.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Widanti, Retno. 2009. "Violations of Cooperative Principle in Morning Zone Program in Trax FM Semarang" S1 Thesis.Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.
- Widdowson, H. G. 2007. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G.1996. *Pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIXES

1. Violation of Quantity Maxim

1.1 Najwa: *“Jadi memang sejak dulu menjadi pendukung PKB lebih karena sudah cinta Gus Dur atau karena hal yang lain?”*

So, you have been a supporter of PKB because you have loved Gus Dur or because of something else

Dhani: *“basicnya saya secara pribadi dekat dan bisa disebut sebagai penyambung lidah Gus Dur. Tapi di sepanjang perjalanan saya juga punya perusahaan baru yang dikhususkan untuk memenangkan caleg-caleg atau partai. Dan kebetulan yang dilirik Cak Imin (ketum PKB) itu saya pribadi.”*

Basicly I am personally close to and can be said as a Gus Dur’s spokesman. But along the way, I also have new company which is specified to win legislative candidates or parties. And coincidentally the one that glimpsed by Cak Imin is me.

1.2 Najwa: *“Apakah anda mendukung Gita Wiryawan karena memang memiliki kedekatan secara personal?”*

You support Gita Wiryawan because you are close personally, is it?

Tompi: *“Pada dasarnya saya kenal beliau pada tahun 2001 di Singapore, itu pertama kalinya saya ke singapore dan saya sempat tinggal di rumah beliau, dan sejak saat itu saya mulai mengenalnya secara pribadi”*

Basically I started to know him in 2001 in Singapore, it was the first time I had been in Singapore and I managed to stay in his home, and since that I started to know him personally.

1.3 Najwa: *“menurut anda, kan ada tiga nama yang diajukan (dari PKB) untuk jadi cawapres. Ada pak Jusuf Kalla, Mahfud MD, Rhoma Irama. Siapa yang paling punya kapasitas untuk (jadi cawapres) republik ini?”*

In your opinion, there are three names proposed (by PKB) to be vice president candidate. There are Mr. Jusuf Kalla, Mahfud MD, Rhoma Irama. Who has the most capacity to (be vice president candidate) this republic?

Dhani: *“tergantung presidennya siapa. Saya sih nggak liat partainya, sekarang saya lebih concern ke sosok. Jadi kalau misalkan presidennya Jokowi, menurut saya ideal wapresnya adalah seorang militer.”*

It depends on who is the president. I do not look at its party, now I am more concern to figure. So, if the president is Jokowi, in my opinion,

the vice president shall be a soldier.

2. Violation of Quality Maxim

2.1 Najwa: *“Tetapi saya mau pastikan saja, berarti memang tidak ada keuntungan komersil apapun (yang didapat)?”*

But I just want to make sure, so there is surely no commercial benefit (you get)?

Dhani: *“Ya nggak ada lah, paling uang jajan aja.”*

Nothing, it is only pocket money.

3. Violation of Relation Maxim

3.1 Najwa: *“Nah, kalau kita melihat koalisi politik sekarang, koalisi partai PKB dengan partai tertentu, anda sendiri kira-kira ada referensi tidak?”*

So, if we see the political coalition now, do you have reference of PKB’s coalition with certain party?

Dhani: *“Saya sebenarnya kalau PDIP dan Gerindra bisa bersatu, itu sebenarnya saya lebih suka itu.”*

I actually like if PDIP and Gerindra can be united, I actually prefer that.

3.2 Najwa: *“kira-kira kalau Jokowi ini di mata anda orang yang seperti apa?”*

In your opinion, what does Jokowi look like in people’s sights?

Dhani: “saya belum melihat sebenarnya pembuktian Jokowi memimpin Jakarta sampai 5 tahun. Belum dibuktikan tapi sudah mau jadi presiden.

I have not seen yet the realization of Jokowi leading Jakarta for 5 years. It has not been proven yet he will run for president.

3.4 Najwa: “kira-kira apa saja yang dilakukan Tompi untuk mendukung orang agar percaya pada sosok Gita Wiryawan?”

Roughly, what are the things Tompi has done to support people to believe in Gita Wiryawan?

Tompi: “saya pikir Indonesia cuma perlu tau punya seseorang yang bernama Gita Wiryawan dengan segala kapasitas yang dia punya.”

I think, Indonesia only needs to know a person named Gita Wiryawan with all the capacity he has.

4. Violation of Manner Maxim

4.1 Najwa: “ketika ditawarkan jadi jurkamnas, apakah ada embel-embel (untuk) masuk ke struktur partai atau bahkan menjadi caleg misalnya?”

When offered to be a jurkamnas, is there any detail to enter the party structure or even become legislative candidate?

Dhani: “kalau struktur partai belum, tetapi sebenarnya sama seperti bang Haji Rhoma yang diberi janji jadi wapres kalau jadi 20% (perolehan suara) PKB. Ya sama-sama saya lah kalau jadi menteri.

Not yet for party structure, but actually it is the same as Bang Haji Rhoma who is given promise to be a vice president candidate if PKB gets 20% in the election. It is the same with me if I become a minister.

Najwa: “*Diberi janji untuk jadi menteri kalau dapat berapa persen (suara pemilu) PKB?*”

Given promise to be a minister if PKB gets how many percent (in the election)?

Dhani: “Oh tidak ada. Kalau PKB koalisinya berhasil saja dengan presiden yang mereka usung.”

Oh, nothing. If PKB coalition gets succeed with the president they carry.

4.2 Najwa: “*apakah Prabowo Subianto menarik hati?*”

Whether Prabowo Subianto is appealing?

Addie: “*sebenarnya dia berpeluang sekali, tapi juga masih ada beban masa lalu yang dia bawa.*”

Actually, he really has chance, but he still has the past burden he carries.

4.3 Dhani: *“kalau menurut saya ya (kekurangan Jokowi) nomor satu, dia bukan dari militer. Saya masih suka pemimpin yang memang punya pendidikan militer.”*

In my opinion, (Jokowi's lack) number one, he does not come from military. I still prefer leader who has military education.

Najwa: *“berarti suka (kepemimpinan) SBY kemarin?”*

So do you like SBY (leadership) in the past?

Dhani: *“nah itu tadi, waktu itu saya gak milih SBY.”*

Nah, I did not choose SBY at that time.