

VIOLATION OF THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN THE MATA NAJWA TALK SHOW, EPISODE “3 BACAPRES BICARA GAGASAN”

Prima Hariyanto^a

Muhammad Wildan Suyuti^b

Nuri Hermawan^c

^aNational Research and Innovation Agency

^bGadjah Mada University

^cAirlangga University

Corresponding Author: prim008@brin.go.id

Received: 21th August 2025

Revised: 27th August 2025

Accepted: 1st September 2025

DOI: <https://doi/10.55981/salls.2025.13328>

ABSTRACT

The Presidential Election in Indonesia has always been a major event that gives rise to various aspects of communication. The Mata Najwa talk show edition “3 Presidential Candidates Discuss Ideas” received significant attention from the public and observers. This study aims to explain the forms of violations, the pragmatic functions of the violations, and the factors influencing the occurrence of violations of the cooperative principle in the Mata Najwa on Stage Yogyakarta edition “3 Presidential Candidates Discuss Ideas.” This research is a descriptive qualitative study. Data analysis employed a pragmatic equivalent approach. Based on the percentage, Anies Baswedan most frequently adhered to the cooperative principle, namely 29 times (72.50%), whereas Prabowo Subianto most frequently violated the cooperative principle, namely 15 times (38.46%). The pragmatic functions identified were assertive, directive, and

expressive. The violations of the cooperative principle were in the form of violations of the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. The factors influencing the occurrence of violations of the cooperative principle were sustaining communication, modesty, providing additional information, concealing messages/contradictions/predictions, covering up intentions, and preserving reputation. These findings contribute to the advancement of political discourse research by revealing how presidential candidates strategically employ conversational violations to achieve specific communicative goals, offering practical insights for understanding political communication strategies and their effects on public perception during electoral processes.

Keywords: cooperative principle; Mata Najwa; presidential candidates; presidential election

Introduction

On September 19, 2023, three prospective presidential candidates attended Gadjah Mada University to present their ideas. The event, organized through a collaboration between Narasi and Gadjah Mada University, was framed within the Mata Najwa on Stage Yogyakarta talk show. This activity, which is part of political education as well as an effort to improve the quality of democracy, attracted significant attention from the public and observers (Rukmorini, 2023). The three candidates, namely Anies Baswedan, Ganjar Pranowo, and Prabowo Subianto, appeared alternately in three talk show sessions.

The Presidential Election (Pilpres) in Indonesia has consistently been a major event that generates various aspects of communication (Efendi, et al, 2023; Lemhanas, 2022; Rani, 2020), including the talk shows of presidential candidates. Such talk shows serve as a platform for presidential candidates to convey their ideas, visions, and missions to the public. The program, moderated by Najwa Shihab, featured interactive question-and-answer sessions among the speakers, the host, and the audience. The process of interaction in these exchanges is particularly interesting to examine through the cooperative principle (Grice, 1975).

Grice's cooperative principle, introduced by the philosopher and linguist Paul Grice, provides guidelines on how speakers and listeners collaborate to achieve effective understanding. According to Grice, to establish good communication, speakers and interlocutors must adhere to the cooperative principle. This principle involves four maxims: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner.

In general, violations of the maxims within the cooperative principle result in less effective communication. However, there are instances where such violations instead extend the communication due to reciprocal exchanges between the speaker and the interlocutor. Violations of the maxims are also employed by speakers or interlocutors for specific purposes, such as creating humor, obscuring messages, concealing ignorance, adding other information, refusing, denying, and so forth.

The presidential candidate talk show is ideally expected to generate speech events that comply with the cooperative principle. However, in reality, there are violations of the cooperative principle. For the speakers, such violations certainly have particular intentions and purposes. This study aims to explain (a) the forms of violations of the cooperative principle, (b) the pragmatic functions of such violations, and (c) the factors influencing the occurrence of violations of the cooperative principle in the Mata Najwa on Stage Yogyakarta talk show edition "3 Presidential Candidates Discuss Ideas."

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the meaning of utterances in relation to their context. This is in accordance with Leech (1983), who states, "Pragmatics studies meaning in relation to speech situation." Wijana (1996) explains that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the external structure of language, namely how linguistic units are used in communication. Yule (2006) adds that pragmatics is the study of the meaning conveyed by the speaker and interpreted by the listener. Nadar (2013) further defines pragmatics as the study of language used for communication in specific situations.

Austin (1962) classifies speech acts into locutionary (the act of saying something), illocutionary (the act of doing something), and perlocutionary (the act of affecting someone). Searle (1979) elaborates the functions of speech acts as follows: (1) assertives, namely speech acts that commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition; (2) directives, namely speech acts intended to bring about an effect through the actions of the interlocutor; (3) commissives, namely speech acts that commit the speaker to a future action; (4) expressives, namely speech acts that express or reveal the speaker's psychological attitude; and (5) declaratives, namely speech acts that, if successfully performed, bring about a correspondence between the propositional content and reality.

Hymes (1974) states that in every speech event, there are eight components that can be used to reveal important factors of the event. These eight components are known by the acronym SPEAKING. The details are: S (setting and scene), P (participants), E (ends: purpose and goal), A (act sequences), K (key: tone or spirit of the act), I (instrumentalities), N (norms of interaction and interpretation), and G (genres).

Grice's cooperative principle (1975) is a set of guidelines or maxims designed to guide speakers and interlocutors in creating and understanding conversations effectively, in order to achieve cooperation in communication. These maxims consist of the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner.

Research on the cooperative principle has been widely conducted by previous scholars. Saleh et al. (2023) examined the cooperative principle in the Bugis comedy short film *Ambo Nai Anak Jalanan*. Dalman (2022) applied Grice's cooperative principle to explain the distinctiveness of legislative contexts. Fatmawati (2022) investigated the reasons for violations of the maxim of manner in Grice's cooperative principle within the culture of the Riau community. Prasasti et al. (2022) analyzed the cooperative principle in the comedy show *Stand Up Comedy Season 2*. Citra and Fatmawati (2021) studied the reasons for violations of Grice's cooperative principle in the *Mata Najwa* program on Trans 7. Lestari and Yuniawan (2021) discussed compliance with and violations of Grice's cooperative principle in the film *Preman Pensium The Movie*. Other studies include Hasanah (2021), Moghaddam (2019), Arvianto (2019), Malayu et al. (2013), Osman and Yusoff (2010), and Ahlsen (1993).

From the various studies employing Grice's cooperative principle, few have analyzed the speech of political figures, particularly presidential candidates. Yet, political contestants often employ specific communication strategies to construct a positive image of themselves in the eyes of the public while attempting to conceal their negative aspects through the utterances they deliver in public. Based on this, the present study discusses violations of the cooperative principle by the presidential candidates who will contest the 2024 Presidential Election in Indonesia.

Methods

This research is a descriptive qualitative study. Data collection employed the observation method (*metode simak*), followed by the note-taking technique. The observation method was carried out by watching the replay of the Mata Najwa on Stage Yogyakarta talk show edition “3 Presidential Candidates Discuss Ideas” on Najwa Shihab’s YouTube channel https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C2aZPjVdqyA&t=12747s&ab_channel=NajwaShihab, which has a total duration of 6 hours, 37 minutes, and 13 seconds. The following table presents the session times and durations of each prospective presidential candidate.

Table 1. Session Times and Durations of Prospective Presidential Candidates

No.	Prospective Presidential Candidate	Start Time	End Time	Duration
1.	Anies Baswedan (AB)	00:25:18	01:42:21	1 hour 24 minutes
2.	Ganjar Pranowo (GP)	03:00:10	04:23:12	1 hour 23 minutes
3.	Prabowo Subianto (PS)	05:05:14	06:25:41	1 hour 20 minutes

The broadcast was then transcribed into text with the assistance of <https://www.transkrip.xyz>, resulting in a transcript of 145 pages or a total of 37,380 words. The transcription was subsequently cross-checked for accuracy against the video. Afterward, the transcript was reduced and segmented based on speech events involving the three prospective presidential candidates, Najwa Shihab, and the participating audience. Each speech event was then assigned a code (coding) to facilitate analysis. The coding categories used included: (1) maxim violations (quantity, quality, relevance, manner); (2) types of utterances (assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, declarative); and (3) contextual factors influencing violations.

These speech events were analyzed in terms of adherence to or violations of the cooperative principle. The data were further examined in accordance with the research objectives using the relevant theoretical frameworks. The analysis employed a pragmatic equivalent approach. The forms of violations of the cooperative principle were analyzed using Grice’s cooperative principle (1975); the pragmatic functions of violations of the cooperative principle were examined through Searle’s theory (1969); and the factors influencing violations of the cooperative principle were investigated using Hymes’ SPEAKING model.

Results

The presentation of the findings is arranged according to the order of appearance of the three prospective presidential candidates (hereafter referred to as *bacapres*) in the Mata Najwa on Stage Yogyakarta talk show. Based on the analysis conducted on the data, speech events were identified between the three *bacapres* and Najwa Shihab (hereafter abbreviated as NS) as well as the audience, with the details presented as follows.

Table 2. Recapitulation of the Number of Adherence to and Violations of the Cooperative Principle

No.	Prospective Presidential Candidate	Number of Speech Events	Adherence to the Cooperative Principle		Violations of the Cooperative Principle	
			Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.	Anies Baswedan (AB)	40	29	72,50%	11	27,50%
2.	Ganjar Pranowo (GP)	53	34	64,15%	19	35,85%
3.	Prabowo Subianto (PS)	39	24	61,54%	15	38,46%

Based on the table above, it can be seen that GP’s session contained the highest number of speech events. One reason for this is that at the beginning of the session, NS “tested” GP’s knowledge of UGM, considering that GP was the Chair of Kagama (the Gadjah Mada University Alumni Association). This generated a substantial number of speech events. In addition, the varying number of speech events was also influenced by the fact that NS’s questions could be exploratory, depending on the answers given by the *bacapres*.

In terms of quantity, GP was the *bacapres* with the highest number of both adherence (34 instances) and violations (19 instances) of the cooperative principle, whereas PS was the *bacapres* with the fewest instances of adherence to the cooperative principle, and AB was the one with the fewest violations of the cooperative principle.

However, when viewed in terms of percentage of adherence to and violations of the cooperative principle, AB was the *bacapres* with the highest percentage of adherence, whereas PS was the *bacapres* with the highest percentage of violations. Nevertheless, this does not automatically indicate the quality of communication of each *bacapres*. As explained earlier, violations of the cooperative principle are not always intended negatively; there are also violations that aim to sustain communication, add information, and so forth. Therefore, the percentages above should be examined more deeply in relation to the context and purposes of the violations of the cooperative principle within the speech events.

Violations of the Cooperative Principle by Anies Baswedan

Based on the analysis, it was found that AB committed 11 violations (27.5%) of the cooperative principle. The following are several examples of the violations that occurred and their analysis.

Data [AB.1] (00:28:54—00:29:06)

NS: *Sehat-sehat, Mas?* (Are you well, Mas?)

AB: *Sehat. Baik. Senang sekali bisa kembali ke UGM. Alhamdulillah.* (Well. Fine. Very happy to be back at UGM. Alhamdulillah.)

In data [AB.1], a violation of the cooperative principle occurred in the maxim of quantity by AB. If observed closely, NS only asked about AB's condition with "*Sehat-sehat, Mas?*" (Are you well, Mas?), but AB responded beyond what NS requested. Such speech events often occur to sustain the conversation so that it continues. AB added that he was happy to return to UGM, where he had once studied. This response was not requested by NS, but NS instead followed it up with "*Pulang kampus, Mas Anies.*" (Back to campus, Mas Anies).

Based on its function, AB's utterance is an assertive speech act, namely expressing his emotional state. AB stated that he was in a happy mood. Based on the components of speech, the context of this utterance is the initial encounter of two individuals at the same time and place, and one common practice in Indonesian culture is to ask about one's well-being. The purpose of AB's response to NS's question was to convey both his state of health and his emotional state.

Data [AB.6] (00:40:48—00:41:57)

NS: *Pertanyaan yang sama juga akan saya ajukan ke bakal calon presiden yang lain. Mas Anies, Anda bacapres yang dideklarasikan paling awal. Oktober 2022 sudah dideklarasikan. Dan sejak itu, kegiatan politik sudah beragam, termasuk sosialisasi, kampanye ke berbagai daerah. Pertanyaan saya, sudah habis uang berapa, Mas?*

(I will also pose the same question to the other presidential candidates. Mas Anies, you are the presidential candidate (*bacapres*) who was declared the earliest. In October 2022, you had already been declared. Since then, your political activities have been diverse, including socialization and campaigning in various regions. My question is, how much money has already been spent, Mas?)

AB: *Mudah-mudahan di sini ada yang mau nyumbang nanti. Ya, dari semua barangkali saya yang asetnya paling kecil. Saya menjadi calon presiden tidak pernah mendaftar, tidak pernah mengajukan diri. Saya diajukan oleh partai Nasdem pertama kali, partai yang dulu berposisi ketika di Jakarta. Mereka melakukan proses dan mereka mencalonkan. Habis itu kemudian PKS, Demokrat, walaupun sekarang di tempat lain, kemudian PKB.*

(Hopefully, there will be someone here who is willing to make a donation later. Yes, among all of us, perhaps I am the one with the smallest assets. I never registered to become a presidential candidate, nor did I ever propose myself. I was first nominated by the Nasdem Party, the party that had previously been in opposition during my time in Jakarta. They conducted a process and nominated me. After that came PKS, Demokrat, although now they are elsewhere, and then PKB.)

In data [AB.6], a violation of the cooperative principle occurs in the maxims of quantity and relevance by AB. NS explicitly asked how much money had been spent on his presidential candidacy. Thus, the expected response from NS was a specific nominal figure in rupiah. However, AB responded by stating that he did not nominate himself and proceeded to recount the chronology of his candidacy by the supporting parties. Feeling dissatisfied with AB's response, NS refuted it by saying "*Itu 'kan modal suara politik*" (*That is political capital*). Only after this did AB explain that the assistance he received was not solely in monetary form. In this subsequent response, the maxim of relevance was then observed because he clarified the form of assistance, although he still did not mention the nominal amount of money as originally asked.

In terms of function, AB's utterance is an assertive act, namely informing and reporting. AB was unable to state the nominal amount of money spent on his candidacy because, according to him, many aspects could not be expressed in monetary terms. Therefore, in responding to NS's utterance "*Sudah habis uang berapa, Mas?*" (*How much money has*

been spent, Sir?), AB instead informed about the process of his nomination by the supporting parties and reported how many parties assisted him in the process.

Based on the components of speech, the context of this utterance is the background that AB's candidacy was declared earlier than the other presidential candidates, which prompted NS to inquire about the extent of funds expended for that purpose. However, NS's intended purpose was not achieved because AB instead emphasized political capital. In the end, AB was only able to explain that financing came from multiple parties and was not always in the form of money.

Data [AB.8] (00:44:41—00:44:52)

NS: *Hutangnya berapa, Mas? Coba, berapa mungkin Mas Anies, tapi nggak ada pinjol kan, Mas?* (How much is the debt, Mas? Tell us, how much might it be, Mas Anies—but there are no online loans (*pinjol*), right, Mas?)
 AB: *Dari 11 miliar itu, mayoritas bentuknya hutang karena saya masih kredit rumah sampai sekarang.* (Out of that 11 billion, the majority is in the form of debt because I am still paying a mortgage for my house until now)

In data [AB.8], a violation of the cooperative principle occurs in the maxim of quality. AB stated that of his assets amounting to Rp11 billion, the majority consisted of debt. According to the *User Manual E-LHKPN*, debt is listed under the assets menu along with land/buildings, machinery/transportation equipment, movable assets, securities, cash/cash equivalents, and other assets (KPK, 2023). However, debt is recorded as a negative value (-), whereas other assets are positive (+). Therefore, the total net worth is already reduced by the amount of debt. This is consistent with the *Pengumuman Laporan Harta Kekayaan Penyelenggara Negara: Anies Rasyid Baswedan* dated 13 October 2023. His assets were recorded at Rp18,458,068,653, while his debt amounted to Rp 6,668,710,430. Thus, his total net worth after deduction of debt was Rp11,789,358,223. Consequently, AB's utterance, "*Dari 11 miliar itu, mayoritas bentuknya hutang ...*" is inaccurate and factually incorrect, as the Rp11 billion did not include debt.

Functionally, AB's speech act constitutes an assertive utterance, namely informing and reporting about his wealth, in which he stated that the Rp11 billion mentioned by NS largely consisted of debt. In this way, AB sought to reinforce NS's previous statement that he was the poorest *bacapres* (presidential candidate). AB's intended image was to present himself as belonging to the common people rather than the upper class or conglomerates.

Based on the components of speech, the context of this utterance relates to AB's *LHKPN* that NS sought to highlight before the public. As a public official, personal wealth is not something to be concealed. The aspect of *key* (tone and manner) used by NS was humorous, framing AB as the poorest *bacapres*, while AB's *key* was cheerful, despite being labeled as the poorest. The *ends* (purpose) of this utterance was to appear modest and avoid projecting himself as wealthy. The ultimate purpose was to garner public sympathy by projecting an image of being *rakyat biasa* (ordinary people), not a conglomerate.

Data [AB.14] (00:46:55—00:47:18)

NS: *Dan itu kalau alat negara berarti yang memerintahkan aparat negara setinggi apa?* (And if it involves state apparatus, then at what level of authority are the state officials being commanded?)
 AB: *Saya tidak tahu yang merintahkan siapa, tapi fakta di lapangannya seperti itu. Dan saya mau tanya kepada diri saya sendiri dan kita semua, akankah kita membiarkan republik ini berada dalam rasa takut? Akankah kita membiarkan rasa kebebasan itu hilang? Saya rasa tidak. Ini adalah perjuangan kita dan saya mengajak kepada semuanya, termasuk pengusaha-pengusaha itu. Bapak jangan takut, Insya Allah kalau ada perubahan kita akan buat negeri ini menjadi aman bagi semuanya.* (I do not know who gave the orders, but the facts on the ground are like that. And I want to ask myself and all of us: will we allow this republic to live in fear? Will we allow that sense of freedom to disappear? I think not. This is our struggle, and I invite everyone, including those businessmen. *Bapak* (sir), do not be afraid. *Insya Allah* (God willing), if there is change, we will make this country safe for everyone.)

In data [AB.14], a violation of the cooperative principle occurs in the maxim of quantity. NS asks about the level of state apparatus involved in intimidating individuals who supported his candidacy. AB responds by stating that he does not know who gave the orders, but that such intimidation indeed occurred in the field. Instead of providing a direct answer, AB conveys his concern and apprehension about the condition of the nation, which he views as overshadowed by fear and the absence of freedom. The response expected by NS is not obtained from AB. Instead, AB adds other information that is not actually requested by NS's question.

Functionally, AB's utterance constitutes an *assertive speech act*, namely providing information and expressing opinion. AB provides information about the existence of intimidation, although he does not mention or does not know who carried it out. AB also expresses his opinion regarding the condition of the republic, which he claims is unsafe and does not guarantee freedom for its citizens. In addition, AB's utterance also constitutes a *directive speech act*, namely inviting others to join in the struggle to make the nation better.

SALLS Vol. 2 No. 1 April | ISSN 3064-2019 © (2025) Prima Hariyanto. Published by Research Centre for Language, Literature, and Community. This is an open access article CC BY-SA license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0>). |

Based on the speech components, the context of this utterance is AB's statement that no conglomerates are close to him in the context of his candidacy. He then recounts that businessmen who interacted with and supported him were audited and had their taxes investigated, which in turn generated fear. AB expresses his concern that no entrepreneurs are willing to support his candidacy. NS seeks clarification of this claim, which AB fails to provide regarding which state apparatus was involved. The *ends* (purpose and intent) of AB's utterance is to demonstrate to the public that the Indonesian people currently lack freedom of action, resulting in fear. Therefore, AB invites the people, particularly entrepreneurs, to struggle together to make Indonesia safe. When connected to the preceding context, AB indirectly encourages entrepreneurs to support his candidacy.

Violations of the Cooperative Principle by Ganjar Pranowo

Based on the analysis, it was found that GP committed 19 instances (35.85%) of violations of the cooperative principle. The following are several examples of such violations and their corresponding explanations.

Data [GP.4] (03:02:27—03:02:33)

NS: *Sampai hari ini masih ketua alumni UGM?* (Until today are you still the chairperson of UGM alumni?)

GP: *Tapi gak boleh ada conflict of interest loh. Saya Ganjar aja.* (But there must not be any conflict of interest. Just consider me as Ganjar.)

In data [GP.4], a violation of the cooperative principle occurred with regard to the maxim of quantity. NS asked whether GP was still the chairperson of *Kagama* (*Keluarga Alumni UGM*). In fact, GP had already answered by stating that he still held the position. NS repeated GP's answer and then responded that GP's position in the event should be as an individual presidential candidate, not as the chairperson of *Kagama*, so as to avoid a conflict of interest. GP's response violated the maxim of quantity because it went beyond what was expected from NS's question. Functionally, GP's utterance constitutes a directive speech act, namely requesting that he be positioned as GP the presidential candidate rather than GP the chairperson of *Kagama*. Based on the components of speech, the context of this utterance is NS's effort to associate GP with the university where the talk show was being held. NS used this strategy to build social closeness with UGM. One way of doing so was by reminding the public that the presidential candidate at that session was also the chairperson of *Kagama*. This was the *ends* NS sought to achieve, whereas the *ends* of GP's utterance was to avoid a conflict of interest by being linked to his status as chairperson of *Kagama*.

Data [GP.18] (03:17:20—03:17:50)

NS: *Mas, diajak oleh MNC dan Anda katakan pasti punya kepentingan lain. Kalau kepentingan Anda pribadi mau diajak apa, Mas?* (Mas, you were invited by MNC and you said that they surely have other interests. If it were for your personal interest, what would you like to be invited for, Mas?)

GP: *Saya sebenarnya diajak pada banyak program berikutnya dan nanti Mbak Nana boleh menunggu. Sudah kita siapkan program berikutnya yang lain dan pasti akan juga tayang di sana. Dan pada saat itu saya hanya mengingatkan kalau ini nanti masuk pada wilayah kampanye, tolong dipertimbangkan. Kecuali bukan wilayah kampanye, silahkan Anda pakai. Dan itu akan terjadi.* (Actually, I was invited to many upcoming programs, and later Ms. Nana may wait. We have already prepared other subsequent programs that will surely be broadcast there as well. At that time, I only reminded them that if it later enters the realm of campaigning, please consider it. Unless it is not within the realm of campaigning, you may use it. And that will happen.)

In data [GP.18], a violation of the cooperative principle occurred with regard to the maxim of relevance and the maxim of quantity. NS asked about GP's personal interest in appearing in the *azan* video aired on MNC TV. GP did not provide an explanation of his interest, but instead responded with a description of his future plans related to cooperation programs with MNC TV and the rules that had to be observed. Such a response was not expected by NS's question. The response provided was less relevant to the intended meaning of the question, thereby violating the maxim of relevance. The information given also exceeded what was expected from NS's question, thereby violating the maxim of quantity.

Functionally, GP's utterance constitutes an assertive speech act, namely informing and reporting that GP and MNC TV had already arranged cooperation for upcoming programs to be broadcast. Based on the components of speech, the context of this utterance was NS's attempt to obtain an explanation regarding GP's appearance in the MNC TV *azan* broadcast. The *ends* (purpose and intention) of GP's utterance was to avoid explaining his personal interest in appearing in the *azan* broadcast. Therefore, GP substituted it with an explanation of his future plans with MNC TV. In

order not to deviate too far from the topic of interest, GP linked it with the rules of the program to ensure it did not fall into the realm of campaigning.

Data [GP.28] (03:27:57—03:29:04)

NS: *Masuk, Mas Ganjar. Ya. Korupsi dan penegakan hukum, Mas. Saya mau tanya soal ini, Mas. Ketua Umum Anda, Mas, Ibu Megawati Soekarno Putri. Ibu Mega sempat mengeluarkan pernyataan, "Bubarin saja KPK, tidak efektif." Saya mau tanya Anda sependapat dengan Ibu Ketua Umum?* (Please come in, Mas Ganjar. Yes. Corruption and law enforcement, Mas. I would like to ask about this. Your Party Chairwoman, Madam Megawati Soekarnoputri. Madam Mega once made a statement, "Just disband the KPK, it is ineffective." I want to ask, do you agree with the Chairwoman?)

GP: *Dalam konteks penegakan hukum. Boleh nggak ada slide yang bisa ditampilkan, ya, dari sisi hukum tadi? Baik dari jumlah penindakan kasus korupsi yang ada di Indonesia 2018-2022 biar semua publik audiens tau sikap saya sebagai capres. Agar tidak terjadi konfus siapa berpendapat, siapa yang sedang duduk di sini.* (In the context of law enforcement. May I request a slide to be displayed regarding the legal aspect just mentioned? Specifically, the number of corruption cases prosecuted in Indonesia from 2018 to 2022, so that the entire public audience is aware of my stance as a presidential candidate. This is to avoid confusion regarding who holds which opinion and who is present here.)

NS: *Kita sambil tunggu slide-nya disiapkan, Mas.* (While we wait for the slide to be prepared, Mas.)

GP: *Silakan. Baik. Lalu saya tanya, tantangannya tadi sudah saya sampaikan pada teman-teman. Yang pertama, kebiasaan kita korup, kerja nyogok, mau dapat proyek nyogok. Dan kemudian ketemu seseorang, ketangkap OTT, KPK, siapa? Aktor. Analisis aktor. Atau barangkali kebijakan yang korup, karena regulasi menguntungkan sebagian, dan kemudian itu dijadikan seolah-olah ini untuk kepentingan bersama, tapi yang bermain itu beberapa orang saja. Atau sistem aturan yang korup dari kelembagaannya. Jangan-jangan memang aturannya kurang bagus. Atau Atau terakhir, ya praktiknya yang tiap hari tertolerir itu udah biasa kok, gak apa-apa. Namanya juga orang kuasa, power tends to corrupt. Gak Gak bisa. Ini tantangannya. Maka saya tuliskan, Mbak, di dalam solusi ini. Penguatan kejaksaaan, KPK, dan kepolisian yang disebut sebagai APH. Clear?* (Please, go ahead. Alright. Then let me continue. The challenges have already been conveyed to my colleagues. First, our culture of corruption: bribery in order to secure projects, and subsequently, when an individual encounters such a situation, he is caught in an OTT (hand-catching operation) by the KPK. Who is involved then? The actor. An analysis of the actor. Or perhaps it is the policies themselves that are corrupt, because the regulations benefit only a certain group, while being presented as if they were in the interest of the public, although in reality only a few are playing the game. Or it may be that the system and its institutional regulations are corrupt, as the rules themselves are inadequate. Or finally, the everyday practices that are tolerated—"It is normal, it does not matter, those in power will always abuse power." No, it cannot be. This is the real challenge. Therefore, as I have written here, Mbak, the solution is the strengthening of the Attorney General's Office, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), and the National Police, which are collectively referred to as the Law Enforcement Agencies (Aparat Penegak Hukum, APH). Clear?)

In data [GP.28], a violation of the cooperative principle occurs in the maxim of relevance and the maxim of quantity. NS asks whether GP agrees with Megawati's statement to dissolve the KPK because it is ineffective. GP's response becomes irrelevant because it does not clarify his position and attitude toward Megawati's statement. From his explanation, it can be seen that GP does not agree with Megawati regarding the dissolution of the KPK, yet such a statement never explicitly comes from GP. The violation of the maxim of quantity occurs because GP provides a response that exceeds what is expected from NS's question. NS's question anticipates an answer concerning his stance toward Megawati's statement and the reasons behind it. However, the response that emerges instead is an explanation about the state of law enforcement, the culture of corruption in Indonesia, and the solution to strengthen APH (*alat penegak hukum*).

Based on its function, GP's utterance is assertive in nature, namely expressing his opinion about law enforcement in Indonesia, thereby suggesting solutions to strengthen the KPK, the Attorney General's Office, and the police. The *ends* (purpose and goal) of NS's utterance is to ascertain GP's attitude toward Megawati's statement, but this *ends* is diverted by GP into the *ends* of his commitment to strengthening the KPK. This commitment actually implies that GP disagrees with Megawati's statement. However, GP does not want to explicitly say so. This is, of course, because of his position as a party cadre who is supposed to support the party leader rather than contradict her.

Data [GP.51] (04:15:54—04:16:48)

SA: *Baik, sebelumnya saya mohon maaf jika pertanyaan ini mungkin akan menyinggung atau bagaimana. Pertanyaan saya, bagaimana tanggapan Bapak soal isu presiden boneka? Dan bagaimana tanggapan Bapak mengenai citra PDIP di mata masyarakat saat ini? Yang kita tahu, tanda kutip selalu jadi bahan ejekan di sosial media. Bukankah itu sebuah sinyal penolakan? Terima kasih. Assalamualaikum Assalamualaikum Wr. Wb.* (Well, first of all, I would like to apologize if my question might be somewhat offensive. My question is, what is your response regarding the issue of a "puppet president"? And what is your response concerning the image of the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) in

SALLS Vol. 2 No. 1 April | ISSN 3064-2019 © (2025) Prima Hariyanto. Published by Research Centre for Language, Literature, and Community. This is an open access article CC BY-SA license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0>). |

the eyes of society today? As we know, in quotation marks, it is always made into ridicule on social media. Is that not a signal of rejection? Thank you. *Assalamualaikum Warahmatullahi Wabarakatuh.*)

GP: *Terima kasih. Presiden adalah presiden. Dia menjalankan amanat penuh dari konstitusi yang ada. Titik tidak ada komanya. Oke? Dari waktu ke waktu, kamu bisa menilai bagaimana sebuah keputusan bisa diambil. Seboneka apa mereka mendapatkan pengaruh dari luar? Apakah dari pengusungnya, apakah intervensi dari proksi negara lain, atautkah dari kelompok? Kalau kemudian satu per satu bisa diperbandingkan, maka penilaian itu akan bisa kamu dapatkan. Tapi Presiden adalah orang yang disumpah untuk menjalankan konstitusi. Dia punya independensi penuh.* (Thank you. A president is a president. He carries out the full mandate of the existing Constitution. Period. No comma. Okay? From time to time, you can assess how a decision can be made. To what extent are they, so to speak, puppets who receive external influence? Whether it is from their political backers, whether it is intervention from the proxies of other states, or from certain groups? If one by one these can be compared, then such an assessment can be drawn. But a president is someone who has sworn to uphold the Constitution. He has full independence.)

In data [GP.51], a violation of the cooperative principle occurred in the maxim of quantity. This question was posed by one of the audience members named Syarifa Asia (SA). SA asked three things about the *presiden boneka* ("puppet president"), the image of PDIP in society, and the signals of public rejection toward PDIP. GP responded by explaining that the president is independent and cannot be influenced or intervened by any party. GP ended his response to SA's question at this point. GP lowered the microphone and changed his position from standing at the front to turning around and walking toward his seat. There was a pause of about five seconds before NS finally asked GP to respond to the question about PDIP's image. Thus, in this speech event, a violation of the maxim of quantity occurred by GP because the response given was less than what was expected from SA's question.

Based on its function, GP's speech act is assertive, namely expressing his opinion on the independence of a president so that it is inappropriate to refer to him as a *presiden boneka* ("puppet president"). Based on the speech components, the context of this utterance is the public's curiosity, represented by one of Mata Najwa's audience members, about GP's opinion on the idiom *presiden boneka* and PDIP's image in society. The *ends* of GP's utterance are to correct public perception about the president (in this case President Jokowi), who is considered a puppet and party officer. GP's utterance also aims to elevate the image of PDIP, showing that his party does not intervene in presidential policies.

Violation of the Cooperative Principle by Prabowo Subianto

Based on the analysis, it was found that PS committed 15 violations (38.46%) of the cooperative principle. The following are some examples of the violations and their analysis.

Data [PS.8] (05:23:14—05:23:49)

NS: *Apa kira-kira tujuan? Kalau Pak Prabowo menebak-nebak tujuannya membuat rumor seperti itu, Pak Prabowo emosional, menampar bahkan mencekik di rapat kabinet disebutnya?* (What might be the purpose? If Mr. Prabowo speculates that the purpose of making such rumors is to portray you as emotional, slapping, even strangling during cabinet meetings, as they say?)

PS: *Tapi saya dulu di fitnah lebih gawat lagi Pak. Mau kudeta lah, mau inilah, mau itu. Sedikit-sedikit mau berontak, gak tau, muka saya muka kudeta kali ya. Jadi ini ya, ini koreksi kita ya. Ini adik-adik mahasiswa. Aku manggilnya adik-adik ya. (But in the past, I was slandered with far more serious accusations, Sir. They said I wanted to stage a coup, this and that. They always claimed I wanted to rebel, I don't know, maybe my face looks like a coup-plotter. So, this is it, this is our correction. These are my younger brothers and sisters, the students. I call them younger brothers and sisters.)*

In data [PS.8], there is a violation of the cooperative principle in terms of the maxim of relevance and the maxim of quantity. NS asked PS about his opinion regarding the purpose of people spreading rumors about him. The maxim of relevance was violated because the response given did not align with what was expected from NS's question. Instead, PS responded by recounting past slanders directed at him. The maxim of quantity was violated because PS provided a response that exceeded what was required by NS's question.

In terms of its function, PS's utterance is an assertive speech act, namely informing about slanders he experienced in the past. In terms of the components of speech, the context of this utterance is NS's curiosity about PS's opinion on the rumor that he slapped and strangled the Deputy Minister of Defense, Harfiq Hasnul Kolbi, during a cabinet meeting. The *ends* of PS's utterance is to construct an image of himself as someone who is accustomed to being slandered and therefore no longer troubled by accusations made against him at present. According to him, slander signifies that he is being considered significant by others.

Data [PS.16] (05:30:32—05:32:33)

NS: Pak Prabowo, tadi dua bakal calon presiden lainnya, saya tunjukkan LHKPN mereka. Jadi saya juga ingin tunjukkan harta kekayaan Pak Prabowo. Kita lihat, bakal calon presiden dari Koalisi Indonesia Maju, harta Prabowo Subianto tertinggi di antara bacapres yang lain Pak, 2,04 triliun rupiah. Pak Prabowo, apakah kalau disambungkan dengan perbincangan kita sebelumnya, biaya politik yang tinggi, apakah itu artinya bapak relatif aman karena toh duit bapak banyak, padahal sudah nyapres tiga kali? (Mr. Prabowo, earlier I presented the Asset and Wealth Report (LHKPN) of the other two presidential candidates. So now, I would also like to show your declared wealth. Let us see: as the presidential candidate from the *Koalisi Indonesia Maju*, Prabowo Subianto's wealth is the highest among the other candidates, amounting to 2.04 trillion rupiah. Mr. Prabowo, if we connect this to our earlier discussion regarding the high cost of politics, does this mean that you are relatively safe since you possess substantial wealth, despite having already run for president three times?)

PS: Mbak Nana, saya sudah jadi pengusaha 20 tahun lebih. Dan kalau Anda mengerti bisnis, ada perbedaan antara aset yang dinilai, tanah aset dinilai, ada nilainya, dan cash, uang yang bisa dipakai. Aset saya kalau dipelajari banyak aset, tapi juga yang tidak bersifat cash. Bahkan banyak aset saya, pabrik saya yang mandek karena saya tidak dapat kredit, karena saya tidak berkuasa 20 tahun. Mbak, saya punya karyawan ribuan, tidak saya PHK. Karena ya ini realita saudara-saudara, ini realita. Jadi, tidak malu-malu, saya memang jadi pengusaha. Karena saya waktu pensiun, pensiun saya waktu itu hanya Rp 900.000. Sekarang pensiun saya Rp 4,8 juta. Jadi kalau saya tidak bisnis, saya tidak bisa hidup. (Ms. Nana, I have been an entrepreneur for more than 20 years. And if you understand business, there is a clear distinction between valued assets—such as land, which is appraised and has a market value—and cash, money that is readily available for use. If you examine my assets, many of them are indeed in the form of property or businesses, not cash. In fact, many of my factories have stalled because I was unable to obtain credit, as I have not held political power for 20 years. Ms., I have thousands of employees, and I have never laid them off. Because this, ladies and gentlemen, is the reality. This is the reality. So, I have nothing to hide. I truly am an entrepreneur. When I retired, my pension was only 900,000 rupiah. Now, my pension is 4.8 million rupiah. If I had not gone into business, I would not have been able to survive.)

In the data [PS.16], there is a violation of the cooperative principle in terms of the maxim of relevance and the maxim of quantity. NS asked PS whether his substantial wealth rendered him secure in terms of political financing, noting beforehand that PS is the wealthiest among the presidential candidates. PS's response violates the maxim of relevance because he did not address NS's question regarding financial security in politics. Instead, his response focused on the background context of the question—namely, the fact that he is a wealthy businessman with many assets. This response, being more elaborate than expected, also violates the maxim of quantity. Consequently, NS interrupted PS's speech and sharpened her question by refocusing on the issue of high political costs.

Based on its function, PS's utterance constitutes an assertive speech act, namely, informing why he is the wealthiest candidate, which is due to his businesses and assets. PS also explained how he managed to become wealthy despite receiving a relatively small pension. The *Ends* of PS's utterance is to portray himself as someone who worked diligently as an entrepreneur for 20 years until he accumulated such wealth. From the aspect of *Key*, PS's tone of voice was impassioned. This was intended to emphasize that his wealth was indeed the result of his own business efforts. Furthermore, his impassioned tone also served to clarify why his wealth reached 2.04 trillion rupiah—because it consisted of both assets and cash.

Data [PS.21] (05:39:43—05:40:45)

NS: Bapak Prabowo, bicara soal penegakan hukum dan aparatnya penting juga untuk memastikan kelembagaan yang solid. Dan tadi saya berdiskusi soal isu KPK dan kepolisian dengan dua bakal calon presiden yang lain. Karenanya saya juga ingin tahu pendapat Anda soal itu. Mulai dengan kepolisian, Pak. Apakah ada rencana Anda untuk mereformasi kepolisian? (Mr. Prabowo, speaking about law enforcement and its apparatus, it is also important to ensure solid institutional frameworks. Earlier, I discussed the issue of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and the police with the two other presidential candidates. Therefore, I would also like to know your view on this matter. Let us begin with the police, Sir. Do you have any plans to reform the police force?)

PS: Saya kira semua institusi harus kita kaji, yang mana kita rasakan kurang pas ya kita perbaiki. Itu namanya reformasi. Reformasi hukum, reformasi institusi, dan sebagainya. Saya kira yang paling penting adalah pengawasan diri. Auto kritik atau auto pengawasan. Kita minta semua institusi membenahi diri dan itu harus dikendalikan oleh sistem yang kuat. Dengan sistem audit, dengan BPK yang aktif, dengan BPKP yang aktif, dengan KPK yang aktif, ini membuat jerat. Kalau kita lihat kepolisian sekarang, kita lihat beberapa jendral-jendral pun dihukum. Jendral-jendral yang seolah berkuasa bisa dihukum. Ini juga terjadi di lingkungan komunitas pertahanan. Ada beberapa jendral yang menyeleweng di lembaga-lembaga kita. Kita minta kejaksaan untuk usut. Kita berikan kejaksaan dan kalau tidak salah mereka sudah dihukum, mereka dalam penjara sekarang. Jadi saya termasuk yang undang BPKP, BPK, KPK dan Kejaksaan untuk masuk ke lingkungan Kementerian Pertahanan dan TNI semuanya. (I think all institutions must be reviewed; whichever we feel

is not functioning properly must be improved. That is what reform means. Legal reform, institutional reform, and so forth. I think the most important element is self-supervision. Self-criticism or self-monitoring. We must ask all institutions to reform themselves, and this must be controlled by a strong system. With an auditing system, with an active Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), with an active Finance and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP), with an active KPK, this creates constraints. If we look at the police now, we see that even some generals have been punished. Generals who seemed powerful could be prosecuted. This has also happened within the defense community. There are some generals who committed misconduct in our institutions. We asked the Attorney General's Office to investigate. We gave them the mandate, and if I am not mistaken, they have already been prosecuted, and they are now in prison. Therefore, I am among those who invited BPKP, BPK, KPK, and the Attorney General's Office to enter the Ministry of Defense and the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI).)

In data [PS.21], there is a violation of the principle of cooperation, specifically the maxim of manner and the maxim of quantity. NS asked PS about plans to reform the police, and PS responded with his plan. The maxim of manner requires the speaker to provide information in a direct, unambiguous, and clear manner. In the utterance above, PS did not directly state specifically about reform in the police force. Instead, PS mentioned that all institutions that are not functioning properly must undergo reform. The violation of the maxim of quantity occurs because PS did not only explain about police reform but also added information about what happened in the Ministry of Defense and the TNI. This exceeded what was expected by NS's question. Based on its function, PS's utterance constitutes an assertive speech act, namely informing and explaining his plans in improving institutions and the measures taken within the defense sector. Based on the components of speech, the context of this utterance is NS's desire to elicit PS's opinion on police reform. The ends pursued were not only to address the police but also all institutions whose performance was deemed unsatisfactory and, therefore, subject to reform.

Data [PS.27] (05:45:13—05:47:09)

NS: *Dan tentunya penilaian itu bisa berbeda tergantung dari sudut pandang yang mana. Tapi saya ingin tanya kalau begitu spesifik soal ini Pak. Soal pasal penghinaan terhadap presiden dan kekuasaan umum yang ada di KUHP yang kerap jadi pasal karet yang menjerat mereka yang mengkritik presiden atau mengkritik kekuasaan umum. Seberapa itu menurut Anda penting untuk dipertahankan? Itu sebetulnya belum berlaku pasalnya, tetapi banyak yang bilang itu salah satu indikator yang akan membuat orang ragu kritik kepada presiden? Dan apakah ketika Anda menjabat sebagai presiden nanti, Anda akan menggunakan pasal itu kepada orang yang Anda rasa menyerang kehormatan Anda, Pak Prabowo?* (And certainly, such an assessment can differ depending on the point of view. But I would like to ask, then, specifically about this issue, Sir. Concerning the article on insulting the president and public authorities contained in the Criminal Code, which often becomes a rubber article that ensnares those who criticize the president or criticize public authorities. To what extent, in your view, is it important to maintain such an article? In fact, the article has not yet come into force, but many argue that it is one of the indicators that will make people hesitant to criticize the president. And when you serve as president in the future, will you use that article against those whom you feel have attacked your honor, Mr. Prabowo?)

PS: *Kalau saya pribadi, sudah sering saya difitnah, jadi saya itu gak terlalu menanggapi, saya pribadi. Tapi kalau kita lihat Pak Joko Widodo sendiri kan ada seorang intelektual yang mengatakan dia bodo, tolol, dan sebagainya. Kan Pak Jokowi biasa-biasa aja, gak nanggapi juga. Iya kan? Gak ada beliau ngadu-ngadu ke hukum dan sebagainya. Jadi ini saya kira lumayan lah kita, Indonesia lumayan. Banyak negara tetangga kita menilai kebebasan kita sangat luar biasa. Di negara sebelah, anda harus tau ya, di Singapura rupanya ya, itu semua stasiun televisi, semua televisi itu milik pemerintah. Semua koran milik pemerintah. Jadi kalau gak salah di Malaysia juga hampir semua koran besar dimiliki pemerintah dan sebagainya.* (Personally, I have often been slandered, so I do not really respond to it, personally. But if we look at Mr. Joko Widodo himself, there was an intellectual who said that he was stupid, foolish, and so forth. Yet Mr. Jokowi was just fine, he did not respond either. Right? He never brought the matter to the law or anything like that. So, I think this is quite good, for us—Indonesia is quite good. Many of our neighboring countries assess our freedom as truly remarkable. In the neighboring country, you must know, in Singapore it appears that all television stations, all television channels, are owned by the government. All newspapers are owned by the government. So, if I am not mistaken, in Malaysia as well, almost all the major newspapers are owned by the government and so forth.)

In the data [PS.27], there occurs a violation of the principle of cooperation in the maxim of manner and the maxim of quantity. NS asked about the article concerning criticism of the president and public authorities in the new Criminal Code (Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2023) and whether that article would be used when PS becomes president. A violation of the maxim of manner occurred because PS did not respond directly and sequentially to the two points of the question. Instead, PS described the figure of President Jokowi. The maxim of quantity was violated because PS's response did not clarify his stance on whether to maintain or abolish the rubber article. The first response that PS gave was that he had often been slandered, so he did not really respond to it. PS provided more of a

comparison with President Jokowi, who did not respond, and with the countries of Singapore and Malaysia, which are not as free as Indonesia in terms of freedom of speech.

Based on its function, PS's speech act constitutes an assertive utterance, namely informing about himself who does not pay attention to slander by comparing himself with President Jokowi and by comparing freedom of speech in Indonesia with that of Singapore and Malaysia. Based on the speech components, the context of this utterance is NS's desire to know how PS would act as president in relation to the rubber article that ensnares those who criticize the president or criticize public authorities. The ends that NS intended to achieve through his utterance were not fully fulfilled by PS's response. This is due to PS modifying the ends by making comparisons, as previously explained.

Conclusion

Based on the percentage, Anies Baswedan demonstrated the highest level of adherence to the cooperative principle, namely 29 occurrences (72.50%), whereas Prabowo Subianto exhibited the highest number of violations of the cooperative principle, namely 15 occurrences (38.46%). However, this does not automatically indicate the communication quality of each presidential candidate, as violations of the cooperative principle do not always serve a negative purpose. The pragmatic functions identified in the utterances of the three candidates were assertive, directive, and expressive, while NS's utterances were generally interrogative. These types of utterances were employed to inform, report, suggest, and promise. Since the context was a talk show rather than a campaign, the most frequently occurring utterances were used to inform rather than to promise.

The violations of the cooperative principle identified consisted of breaches of the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. The factors influencing the occurrence of these violations included sustaining communication, modesty, providing additional information, concealing messages, withholding, contradiction, concealing predictions, covering up intentions, and preserving reputation.

These findings contribute to the advancement of political discourse research by providing empirical evidence of how presidential candidates strategically employ conversational violations to manage their public image and control narrative flow during televised debates. The research offers practical insights for political communication practitioners, showing how violation patterns can reveal underlying strategic intentions, and provides voters with tools to better decode political messaging. Furthermore, this study extends the application of Grice's cooperative principle to Indonesian political contexts, demonstrating its relevance for analyzing cross-cultural political communication strategies and their effectiveness in electoral settings.

References

- Ahlsen, E. (1993). Conversational principles and aphasic communication. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 57—70. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(93\)90070-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90070-6)
- Arvianto, F. (2019). An Analysis of the Cooperative Principle in the Comedy Show Extravaganza. *Jubindo: Journal of Indonesian Language and Literature Education*, 4(1), 54–60.. <https://doi.org/10.32938/jbi.v4i1.151>
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University. Press.
- Citra, Y., & Fatmawati. (2021). Reasons for Violations of Grice's Cooperative Principle in the *Mata Najwa* Program on Trans 7. *Onoma Journal: Education, Language, and Literature*, 7(2), 437–448. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v7i2.1278>
- Dalman, R.C. (2022). Conveying meaning in legal language e - Why the language of legislation needs to be more explicit than ordinary language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 198, 43—54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.05.009>
- Dewi, A.N.C. & Rahman, Y. (2021). Pelanggaran Maksim Percakapan pada Prinsip Kerjasama Grice dalam Film *Ballon* Tahun 2018 Karya Michael Herbig. *E-Journal Identitaet*, 10(02), 1—11. <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/identitaet/article/view/41029>
- Efendi, A. L., Fadilla, A., Khoirunnisa, A. C., Bakry, G. N., & Aristi, N. (2023). Analisis jaringan komunikasi #Pilpres2024 pada platform Twitter. *WACANA: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Komunikasi*, 22(2), 219–232. <https://doi.org/10.32509/wacana.v22i2.2976>
- Fatmawati, R. N. (2022). Reasons for Violations of the Maxim of Manner/Implementation in Grice's Cooperative Principle in the Culture of Riau Society. *Sintaks: Journal of Indonesian Language and Literature*, 2(2), 130–136. <https://doi.org/10.57251/sin.v2i2.486>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation". *Speech Acts [Syntax and Semantics 3]*, Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (eds), 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Hasanah, H. (2021). Maxim Violations in Creating Humor: A Comparative Study between Madurese Humor and Javanese Humor. *Sawerigading*, 27(2), 205–218. <https://sawerigading.kemdikbud.go.id/index.php/sawerigading/article/view/927/430>

- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania.
- KPK. (2023). *User Manual Sistem Informasi LHKPN (E-LHKPN)*. <https://elhkpnp.kpk.go.id//download/User%20Manual%20e-lhkpnp%20eksternal%20-%20v1.4.pdf>
- Leech, G.N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman.
- Lemhanas. (2022). *2024 Election: Time for Democracy of Ideas, Not Democracy of Cult Worship*. <https://www.lemhanas.go.id/index.php/publikasi/press-release/1670-pemilu-2024-waktunya-demokrasi-gagasan-bukan-demokrasi-pengkultusan>, accessed December 11, 2023.
- Compliance and Violation of the Cooperative Principle in *Premen Pensiun The Movie*. *Jurnal Sastra Indonesia*, 10(1), 16–22. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jsi/article/view/39957>
- LHKPN. (2023). *Announcement of State Officials' Wealth Report: Anies Rasyid Baswedan*. Jakarta: Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia. <https://elhkpnp.kpk.go.id/portal/user/PreviewAnnoun/104251470>
- Malayu, S.M., Muliadi, Y.A., Mayasari, L. (2013). Aimai in Japanese Implicature: A Pragmatic Study. *Migration Letters*, 20(5), 713–727. <https://doi.org/10.59670/ml.v20i5.4060>
- Moghaddam, M.M. (2019). Towards a Cognitively-Mediated Conceptualisation of the Cooperative Principle: An Introduction to the Maxim of Diplomacy. In Alessandro Capone, Marco Carapezza & Franco Lo Piparo (eds.), *Further Advances in Pragmatics and Philosophy: Part 2 Theories and Applications*. Springer Verlag. 469-490. <https://philpapers.org/rec/MORTAC-19>
- Nadar, F. (2013). *Pragmatics and Pragmatic Research*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Osman, Z. & Yusoff, N. (2010). *Rhetoric in Scientific Writing: Evaluation Based on Grice's Cooperative Principle*. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics (IJLEAL)*, 9(1), 69–83. <https://doi.org/10.15282/ijleal.v9i1.1196>
- Prasasti, P.A., Rahmat, A.A., Arginingrum, P.S., Arwansyah, Y.B., & Utomo, A.P.Y. (2022). *Analysis of the Cooperative Principle in Stand-Up Comedy Season 2*. *Khatulistiwa: Journal of Education and Social Humanities*, 2(2), 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.55606/khatulistiwa.v2i2.491>
- Rani, S. (2020). Dinamika Komunikasi Politik Pada Pemilihan Presiden Di Indonesia. *Alhadharah: Jurnal Ilmu Dakwah*, 18(2), 72-85. <https://doi.org/10.18592/ALHADHARAH.V18I2.3379>
- Rukmorini, R. (2023). Bertahan hingga Malam demi Mendengar Gagasan Tiga Bakal Capres, diakses 11 Desember 2023. <https://www.kompas.id/baca/nusantara/2023/09/20/malam-menunggu-paparan-gagasan-para-bacapres>
- Saleh, F., Yusuf, R., Wahyuni, I., Hermansyah, S., & Risdayanti, R. (2023). *The Cooperative Principle in the Bugis Short Comedy Film "Ambo Nai Anak Jalanan": A Pragmatic Study*. *Idiomatik: Journal of Indonesian Language and Literature Education*, 6(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.46918/idiomatik.v6i1.1868>
- Searle. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in The Theory of Speech Act*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 1946 on Criminal Law Regulations*, amended by (1) Law No. 73 of 1958 on the Enactment of Law No. 1 of 1946 of the Republic of Indonesia Regarding Criminal Law Regulations for the Entire Territory of the Republic of Indonesia and Amending the Criminal Code; (2) Law No. 4 of 1976 on Amendments and Additions to Several Articles in the Criminal Code Related to the Expansion of the Application of Criminal Legislation, Aviation Crimes, and Crimes Against Aviation Facilities/Infrastructure; and (3) Law No. 27 of 1999 on Amendments to the Codes of Law Relating to Crimes Against State Security.
- Wijana, I.D.P. (1996). *Fundamentals of Pragmatics*. Yogyakarta: Andi Yogyakarta.
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatics*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.