Pragmatic Analysis of Flouting Grice's Maxims in Indonesian and US Presidential Debates

Maria Imachulatha Abi[1], Agus Syahid[2], Syamsurrijal[3], Lela Rahmawati[4], Hilda Hastuti[5]

[1,2,3,4,5] English Literature, Universitas Bumigora, Mataram, Indonesia

Author's Active Phone Number: 081239569176

Article Info	ABSTRACT
	This study examines the flouting of Grice's cooperative maxims specifically Quantity, Relevance, Quality, and Manner in the 2024 presidential debates of Indonesia and the United States. The objective is to identify the types of maxim flouting committed by candidates and to compare pragmatic communication strategies across these two distinct political cultures. A qualitative descriptive approach was employed, using transcripts from YouTube videos of the presidential debates in Indonesia and the U.S. Data collection involved observation, transcription, and documentation, while data analysis focused on classifying and presenting instances of maxim flouting. The analysis centers on how candidates strategically flout these maxims to achieve rhetorical goals within formal debate settings. The findings reveled a total of 20 instances of maxim flouting, with the Maxim of Quantity and the Relevance being the most frequently flouted. This flouting serves to control the narrative, divert difficult questions, and strengthen political image. Donald Trump flouted the most maxims (7 instances), followed by Prabowo Subianto (5), Kamala Harris and Ganjar Pranowo (4 each), while Anies Baswedan did not flout any maxims. The communication style of U.S. candidates tends to be more expansive and confrontational, whereas Indonesian candidates were more structured and concise.
Corresponding Author: Maria Imachulatha Abi *Universitas Bumigora* 2104020010@universitasbumigora.ac.id	

1. INTRODUCTION Pragmatics, in communication, is crucial in explaining how messages are received and understood within specific contexts. Pragmatics focuses on how language is used in interaction and how context influences the interpretation of meaning. Unlike semantics, which is concerned with the meaning of words in isolation, pragmatics explores how meaning is constructed through the use of language in communication, taking into account social and cultural factors (Yule, 1996). This theory is particularly relevant in understanding political discourse, where speakers often rely on contextual clues, indirect expressions, and cultural nuances to convey their messages.

One relevant theory of pragmatics is the theory of conversational maxims, specifically the four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner (Grice, 1975). These principles guide the cooperation between speakers and listeners to achieve mutual understanding and maintain effective

communication. In political communication, especially in presidential debates, these maxims can often be deliberately flouted for strategic purposes, such as persuasion, evasion, or manipulation.

In the context of political communication, language use becomes increasingly complex, functioning not only as a tool for message delivery but also as an instrument to influence and persuade the public. For instance, the flouting of Grice's principle in the program "Mata Najwa Adu Kuat Constitutional Issues" can be observed in the following conversation: NS (Najwa Sihab) asks, "Nasdem offered congratulations and was even the first party to congratulate Prabowo-Gibran for acknowledging his defeat, but on the other hand, they are challenging the KPU's decision and requesting a reelection. How can this be explained?" HT (Hermawi Taslim) gives a lengthy response explaining the legal mechanisms for challenging the KPU's decision (Mauliyati et al., 2024).

According to Grice's principle of the maxim of quantity, speakers are expected to provide enough information without overloading the listener. HT's answer, being too long and convoluted in this case, caused NS to repeat the question, which demonstrates a flouting of the maxim of quantity, as the response did not meet the informational needs of the question, which called for a brief and clear explanation (Mauliyati et al., 2024).

Flouting of Grice's cooperative principles in presidential debates is not uncommon and can even serve as an intentional communication strategy. Presidential candidates in both Indonesia and the United States sometimes flout these maxims to achieve specific political objectives or convey more complex implicit meanings. This phenomenon is interesting to explore, especially considering that presidential debates are pivotal moments that can influence voter perceptions and preferences. The communication principles previously mentioned face unique challenges when applied in the political arena. When speakers flout the four cooperative principles, it leads to a misalignment in meaning interpretation by the listener, often referred to as Gricean maxim flouting.

Previous study has studied a variety of objects. Hamza & Nordin (2024) the study of a investigating pragmatic deviation from Grice's Cooperative Principle and conversational maxims in a political interview with Donald Trump on CNN News Channel. Meanwhile, Isbandi (2021) focused on news programs as the object of study. Khan et al., (2025) analysing the use of grice's theory in drama. While Averina (2023) focused on movie. Until now, no study has been found that specifically compares the application of Grice's principles of cooperation in the context of presidential debates between Indonesia and the United States, making this pragmatic analysis in this context of novel value.

Presidential debates are political discussion forums that attract public attention in both Indonesia and the United States. These debates involve an exchange of arguments and ideas among presidential candidates from both countries, with each candidate attempting to convince the public through their vision, mission, and proposed programs. They are typically structured and moderated to ensure the debate progresses in an orderly manner. This study examined the flouting of Grice's maxims quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, in the presidential debates between candidates from Indonesia and the United States.

2. METHODS

This study focuses on pragmatics, particularly Grice's maxims. The author analyzes dialogue segments from the Indonesian presidential debate held on February 4, 2024, on the Official iNews (2024), as well as the U.S. presidential debate between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris on September 11, 2024, broadcast on the CNN YouTube channel (2024). The analysis centers on the flouting of Grice's maxims, utilizing a total of 10 data points for an in-depth examination of both debates.

This study employs a qualitative descriptive method to analyze the flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principles in presidential debates in Indonesia and the United States. The study method aimed to provide an in-depth understanding of the rhetorical strategies used by political candidates during debates, particularly how they intentionally flout these maxims to influence public perception

and achieve specific communication objectives. According to Sugiyono (2017), a qualitative approach is suitable for this study as it enables detailed exploration of verbal interactions and communication patterns in the context of political debates.

The primary data sources for this study are the YouTube videos of two presidential debates: the U.S. Presidential Debate held on September 11, 2024, broadcasted on the CNN YouTube channel (CNN, 2024), and the Indonesian Presidential Debate held on February 4, 2024, available on the Official iNews channel (Official iNews, 2024). These data sources were chosen for their relevance to the research objectives, as they offer dynamic verbal interactions between the candidates, providing a rich context for analyzing communication strategies used in formal political discourse.

Data collection in this study followed the theory of Miles et al (2014), specifically using observation and documentation methods. The debate videos are thoroughly watched, focusing on the question-and-answer (Q&A) segments where candidates interact with moderators or each other. Notations are made on sections where the flouting of Grice's maxims occurs, including the Maxim of Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner. The relevant segments are transcribed to ensure accuracy, and the transcriptions are carefully documented for further analysis. This documentation helps in organizing the data for systematic coding and classification.

Data analysis followed a systematic approach, also derived from Miles et al (2014), which includes data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusions. (1) Data Reduction: In the initial phase, the transcriptions were carefully coded to identify instances where the candidates flout Grice's Cooperative Principles. Each debate segment was analyzed for violations of the maxims related to Quantity, Quality, Relevance, or Manner. (2) Data Display: After coding, the data were then categorized based on the specific maxim being flouted. Each of these maxims was carefully examined to uncover the rhetorical strategy behind each instance of maxim flouting. (3) Drawing Conclusions: The final stage involved interpreting the classified data to understand the communicative intentions behind the candidates' actions. This step is aimed at uncovering the strategic use of language during the debates and understanding how candidates use these flouting to manipulate narratives, control the conversation, or avoid difficult questions. This methodology ensured that the study findings are presented in a structured and clear manner, providing insight into how Grice's Cooperative Principles are intentionally flouted to achieve specific political communication goals.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The objective of this study is to identify the types of maxim flouting found in the question-and-answer segments of the 2024 presidential candidate debates. Below are the findings based on the types of maxim flouting observed in the data.

Table 1. Flouting of Grice's Cooperative Maxims by Presidential Candidates in the 2024 Debates

No	Candidate	Maxim Quantity	Maxim Quality	Maxim Relevance	Maxim Manner	Total Flouting
1.	Prabowo Subianto	3	0	2	0	5
2.	Ganjar Pranowo	2	0	1	1	4
3.	Anies Baswedan	0	0	0	0	0
4.	Donald Trump	3	1	3	0	7
5.	Kamala Harris	2		2	0	4
	Total					20

Data (1)

Ganjar states, "*Kalau ngasih makannya kepada anak-anak untuk mencegah stunting, saya sama sekali tidak setuju, Bapak. Karena Bapak terlambat, Pak. Stunting itu ditangani sejak bayi dalam kandungan, Pak.*"

The data above was taken at minutes 1:34:57 -1:39:18 when Mr. Prabowo asked about the issue of satunting Here, Ganjar flouts the Maxim of **Quantity** in his response, "***Karena Bapak terlambat, Pak. Stunting itu ditangani sejak bayi dalam kandungan, Pak,***" by providing excessive information that is not directly relevant to the question. This over-explanation diverts attention from the main issue whether food should be provided for stunting prevention, by adding unnecessary details. According to Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle, the Maxim of Quantity suggests providing just enough information, not more than necessary. In political discourse, such flouting is often used to shift focus from sensitive topics or strengthen an argument. Oladeji & Olukemi (2024) note that flouting the Maxim of Quantity in political speeches can obscure the core message, as speakers introduce surplus information to influence audience interpretation. In Ganjar's case, his extended response weakened the clarity and effectiveness of his answer, highlighting the impact of flouting on communication in debates.

Data (2)
In the debate session on the issue of stunting. According to (WHO), stunting is defined as impaired growth and development in children due to poor nutrition, recurrent infections, and inadequate psychosocial stimulation. Children are considered stunted if their height for their age is more than two standard deviations below the median of the WHO Child Growth Standards.

"*Jangan sampai confuse antara stunting dan pemberian makan, Pak. Jadi, makannya jangan banyak-banyak nanti kekenyangan, jangan sampai nanti terjadi obesitas,*"

In the debate on stunting, Ganjar flouts three of Grice's Cooperative Principles. First, he flouts the Maxim of **Quantity** with the phrase "***makannya jangan banyak-banyak nanti kekenyangan***," which adds irrelevant information about food quantity instead of focusing on stunting prevention. Second, he flouts the Maxim of **Relevance** with "***jangan sampai nanti terjadi obesitas***," shifting the topic from malnutrition (stunting) to overnutrition (obesity), which is unrelated to the question. Third, he flouts the Maxim of **Manner** with "***jangan sampai confuse antara stunting dan pemberian makan***," which is vague and unclear. These floutings disrupt effective communication by adding unnecessary and ambiguous information. Grice (1975) emphasized the importance of the four maxims Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner, for clear communication. Mauliyati et al. (2024) also highlighted that flouting these maxims in public discussions can weaken clarity and focus. In Ganjar's case, his indirect response diverted attention from the main issue, reducing the message's clarity. This emphasizes the importance of applying cooperative principles in political debates.

Data (3)
In Data 3, within the context of a political debate, Prabowo delivered the statement,

"*Fokus saya membantu gizi ibu hamil, pendidikan, angka kematian ibu, kesetaraan di politik...*"

This statement flouted the Maxim of **Quantity** as it failed to provide sufficient information to answer the specific question about women's protection and policy changes. Rather than offering a direct explanation related to this issue, Prabowo introduced multiple unrelated topics such as education and political equality, which weakened the completeness of his response. Additionally, the phrase "***angka kematian ibu, kesetaraan di politik***" flouted the Maxim of **Relevance**. While these topics are broadly relevant to women's welfare, they do not directly address the core of the question, thus making the response less relevant and diverting attention from the main issue. Although there was an attempt to broaden the perspective, the inclusion of these topics muddied the central message and failed to meet the expectations of a clear and efficient exchange. Grice (1975), through the Cooperative Principle, emphasized that effective communication requires adherence to four maxims, particularly the Maxim of Quantity, which requires providing adequate information, and the Maxim of Relevance, which

insists that responses remain on topic. Violations of these maxims occur when speakers provide insufficient or off-topic information, thereby impeding the clarity and focus of the conversation. This analysis is supported by the study of Sidabutar et al. (2023), titled Flouting and Violation of Grice's Maxim in Podcast Dedy Corbuzier Scene Widi Viera–Cinta Laura, which found that flouting the Maxims of Quantity and Relevance is common when speakers offer extraneous information or shift topics to unrelated matters in order to enhance their image or avoid deeper questioning. In this case, Prabowo's inclusion of unrelated policy areas risks diverting the audience's attention from the core issue of women's protection. Therefore, both Grice's theory and the supporting literature reinforce that this utterance violated both the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Relevance due to its lack of focus and insufficient information.

Data (4)
In the debate session on free internet,
> "*Mungkin tidak lengkap Bapak dengar ucapan saya. Saya katakan yang penting makan gratis dibanding internet gratis...*"

Prabowo flouted the Maxim of **Quantity** by failing to provide an informative and direct answer. Instead of explaining strategies to address the digital divide through free internet access, he shifted the focus to free meals, a topic irrelevant to the original question. The phrase "***Saya katakan yang penting makan gratis dibanding internet gratis***" clearly flouted the Maxim of **Relevance** as well. While free meals may be an important topic in broader welfare discussions, it did not address the specific inquiry about digital inclusion. As a result, Prabowo's response lacked both relevance and sufficient detail, failing to meet the demands of the discussion. According to Grice (1975) Cooperative Principle, the Maxim of Quantity requires a speaker to provide adequate and concise information, while the Maxim of Relevance insists on staying on topic. Prabowo's shift toward discussing free meals, rather than internet-related policies, violated both maxims, thereby diminishing the clarity and communicative efficiency of his response. This finding is supported by Isbandi (2021) in Flouting Maxim of Grice's Cooperative Principle in Conversation at Coronacast ABC News, which identifies that violations of the Maxims of Quantity and Relevance often occur in multi-topic conversations where speakers introduce unnecessary or off-topic information. Isbandi noted that in public discussions, such as podcasts or debates, these violations can lead to confusion and reduce the clarity of the message. In Prabowo's case, his mention of free meals diverted attention from the main topic of free internet, thus weakening the effectiveness of his response.

Data (5)
In Data 5, Prabowo stated,
> "*Kalau saya jadi presiden, saya akan bawa internet gratis ke seluruh desa di Indonesia...*"

This statement flouted the Maxim of **Quantity** due to its lack of detail. While he expressed his intention to provide free internet, Prabowo failed to explain how the plan would be implemented or the steps required to achieve it. The statement "***Saya akan bawa internet gratis ke seluruh desa di Indonesia...***" is a general commitment without specific elaboration, making the response insufficient for the audience's informational needs. Grice (1975) emphasized that every participant in a conversation must provide the appropriate amount of information. The Maxim of Quantity discourages offering too little information, as it hinders understanding. In Prabowo's case, his vague and overly general statement did not meet the audience's expectations for concrete, actionable plans, violating the maxim. This is reinforced by Isbandi (2021), who found that violations of the Maxim of Quantity occur when speakers provide generic statements without adequate detail, particularly in public settings like debates, where speakers may give incomplete responses to avoid scrutiny or maintain their image. In Prabowo's case, the lack of elaboration on how free internet would be provided across Indonesian villages constitutes a violation of the Maxim of Quantity, thereby reducing the effectiveness of his communication.

Data(6)

In Data 6, Harris stated,

"*I was raised in the middle class and am the only person on this stage with a plan to lift up the middle class and working people in America. I believe in... I know that housing is too expensive for too many people, and we know that young families need support.*"

This utterance flouted the Maxim of **Quantity** by providing excessive and unnecessary information. The phrase "**I know that housing is too expensive for too many people, and we know that young families need support**" deviates from the main point of the question, which specifically asked about economic policy. Harris added details about housing inequality and family support, which were not required in the context of an answer that should have remained focused on the economy. Additionally, the statement "**I know that housing is too expensive for too many people**" flouted the Maxim of **Relevance**, since although housing is indeed a relevant issue in broader social policy, shifting the attention to this matter without directly addressing the core of economic policy disrupts the focus of the conversation. This phrase becomes irrelevant to the question, which aims to explore strategies for economic improvement, and thus diverts the response away from its main objective. Grice (1975), in his Cooperative Principle, emphasized that effective conversation requires participants to adhere to four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner. The Maxim of Quantity expects speakers to provide information that is neither too much nor too little. When speakers offer excessive information, it may cause confusion among listeners. In Harris's case, the information presented exceeded the communicative need and thus risked shifting the focus from a more specific topic. The Maxim of Relevance was also flouted, as her remarks regarding housing and family support extended beyond the narrower focus on the economy, resulting in a blurred main message. This analysis is supported by Hamza & Nordin (2024), who discuss how political speakers often deviate from Grice's maxims to divert attention from the main topic or to enhance their personal image. In their analysis, they observe that such deviations are used strategically in political discourse to influence public perception and control the conversation.

Data (7)

In Data 7, during the debate on economic issues and the cost of living, Trump stated,

"*First of all, I have no sales tax. (...) I also have millions of people coming into our country: criminals, people from jails and prisons, and activists taking jobs from African-Americans, Hispanics, and women.*"

This utterance flouted the Maxim of **Quantity** by including excessive information that was not needed in the specific context. Trump introduced several unrelated topics, such as criminality, immigration, and employment disruption, which were not relevant to the core question about the economy and cost of living. The phrase "**I also have millions of people coming into our country**" clearly flouting the Maxim of **Quantity**, as it fails to directly and adequately respond to the question regarding economic issues. Moreover, the statement "**activists taking jobs from African-Americans, Hispanics, and women**" flouted the Maxim of **Relevance**, as it shifts the topic from economics to a social issue that was not being addressed in the original question. This diversion results in a response that lacks focus and diminishes communicative efficiency. Grice (1975) Cooperative Principle outlines that in effective communication, each participant must comply with four maxims, including the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Relevance. The former requires sufficient but not excessive information, while the latter demands that responses remain relevant to the topic at hand. Violations of these maxims, particularly when excessive or irrelevant information is introduced, can hinder the clarity of communication and confuse the listener. As discussed by Hamza & Nordin (2024), political figures like Trump often deviate from Grice's Cooperative Principle, specifically the maxims of quantity and relevance—to serve various rhetorical functions, such as distorting facts, diverting attention, or portraying themselves as the most competent choice. Their study on Trump's CNN interview in 2016 reveals how he frequently violated Gricean maxims,

including providing excessive or insufficient information and deliberately shifting topics to manipulate audience perception.

Data (8)

In Data 8, presented ~~in Table 8~~ of the political debate, Harris stated,

> *"Well, let's talk about what Donald Trump left us. He left us with the worst unemployment since the Great Depression. He left us with the worst public health crisis (...) and the worst attack on our democracy since the Civil War (...) Project 2025."*

This statement is considered to have flouted the Maxim of **Quantity**, as Harris provided excessive information beyond what was required to answer the specific question, which was more narrowly focused on the economy and cost-of-living issues. Instead of delivering a targeted response on economic policy, Harris expanded the scope of her answer to include various unrelated topics such as public health, democratic stability, and Project 2025, which were not directly related to the economic issue at hand. The phrases "**He left us with the worst public health crisis**" and "**Project 2025**" exemplify how the speaker provided more information than necessary for the conversational context, thereby shifting the audience's attention from the original economic issue to broader national concerns. The inclusion of "**Project 2025**" in particular also flouted the Maxim of **Relevance**, since it introduced a new and unsolicited topic that diverted attention away from the economic question posed by the moderator. Although the project may have political implications, it was not directly tied to economic policy or cost-of-living reforms, and therefore its mention disrupted the cohesion of the response. By linking multiple major national concerns public health, democracy, and future policy threats Harris's statement moved further away from the core issue, weakening the clarity and precision expected in debate communication. According to Grice (1975), Cooperative Principle, effective conversation is grounded in adherence to four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner. The Maxim of Quantity emphasizes the need to provide the right amount of information not more, not less, so as to maintain relevance and avoid overwhelming the listener. When speakers exceed this threshold, as Harris did in this case, they risk diffusing the message and confusing the audience. The Maxim of Relevance, likewise, demands that all parts of a speaker's contribution stay aligned with the conversational topic. The introduction of Project 2025, without a clear and immediate link to the issue of economic recovery or inflation, is an example of how relevance may be compromised in political discourse. This finding is further supported by Prirahayu et al. (2020) in The Flouting of Maxims in the First Presidential Debate Between Joe Biden and Donald Trump 2020, which highlights how political speakers often flout both the Maxim of Quantity and Relevance to strategically expand their arguments. Prirahayu et al. (2020)) found that during debates, politicians may introduce tangential issues whether for self-promotion, to strengthen criticism, or to avoid answering sensitive or technical questions. Harris's elaboration on public health and Project 2025 appears to serve as a rhetorical device to intensify her critique of the Trump administration, rather than to directly address the economic question at hand. Thus, her response constitutes a clear example of flouting both the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Relevance, as it provided too much information and introduced off-topic content that distracted from the primary discussion.

Data (9)

In Data 9, Trump stated,

> *"My policies focus on empowering the American worker. I cut taxes for businesses and families, and I will do so again. We need to bring jobs back to America by incentivizing companies to stay here, not move overseas. We also need to protect American workers from unfair foreign competition and stop illegal immigration from taking American jobs."*

This utterance flouted the Maxim of **Quantity** by providing a broad and extended response that went beyond what was required to answer the specific question regarding economic measures for the working class. While the earlier part of his statement addressed tax policy and job incentives, the

inclusion of issues such as "**illegal immigration**" and "**unfair foreign competition**" expanded the response unnecessarily into topics not explicitly related to the core economic issue. The statement "**We also need to protect American workers from unfair foreign competition and stop illegal immigration from taking American jobs**" clearly marks the moment where the conversation deviated. This flouted the Maxim of **Relevance**, as the question was focused on economic improvements for working-class Americans, not on border control or foreign policy. Trump's shift toward protectionist and anti-immigration rhetoric introduced emotionally charged content that, while potentially persuasive to certain voters, distracted from the intended topic of economic policy. According to Grice (1975), effective communication is governed by adherence to the Cooperative Principle, which includes the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner. Flouting the Maxim of Quantity occurs when speakers provide more information than necessary, while the Maxim of Relevance is flouted when responses diverge from the question's intended subject. In this case, Trump's response was not only exceeded the necessary scope but also introduced unrelated content that diluted the specificity of the answer. Moreover, Rakhmasari (2023) in an analysis of flouting maxims in the second American Presidential Debate supports this view by highlighting how political figures often flout the Maxims of Quantity and Relevance in debates to redirect attention, expand the issue, or reinforce personal branding. Rakhmasari (2023) notes that inserting ideological or emotional appeals into unrelated topics is a common political strategy. Trump's response exemplifies this pattern, as he strategically shifted from tax and job policy to immigration control, thereby strengthening his nationalist rhetoric while ignoring the specific economic policy angle of the question. Grice's theoretical foundation and Rakhmasari (2023) support the conclusion that Trump's response flouted both the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Relevance by providing excessive, tangential, and ideologically motivated information.

Data (10)
In Data 10, Trump responded to a question concerning immigration policy by stating,

> "*I would have handled immigration very differently. We need to stop the invasion at our southern border. These people are criminals, and they are taking jobs from American citizens. We need to close the border immediately and deport these individuals.*"

This statement is considered to have flouted the Maxim of **Quality**, as the claim "**These people are criminals**" constitutes a factual generalization that misrepresents the reality of undocumented immigration. Not all undocumented immigrants are criminals, and asserting such a broad and negative claim violates the principle that speakers should not state what they believe to be false or cannot substantiate. Additionally, the response also flouted the Maxim of **Quantity**, as Trump provided emotionally charged and extreme solutions such as total border closure and mass deportation which extended well beyond what was needed to respond to a question that specifically asked about administrative delays in handling immigration issues. These proposals were not only excessive but also not directly responsive to the question's narrower focus. Moreover, the utterance also flouted the Maxim of **Relevance**, as Trump's remarks shifted the discussion from administrative and policy-based responses toward generalized and provocative claims about crime and national security. Rather than explaining how his administration would avoid delays or improve immigration systems, he redirected the focus toward painting immigrants as a criminal threat, thereby distracting from the policy-centered inquiry. Grice (1975) emphasized that for a conversation to be effective, the Maxim of Quality obliges speakers to tell the truth; the Maxim of Quantity requires that they provide the appropriate amount of information; and the Maxim of Relevance insists that their contributions stay on-topic. Trump's statement violates all three. By making a misleading and unproven claim (Quality), offering more information than was contextually appropriate (Quantity), and diverting attention from the issue at hand (Relevance), he undermined the clarity and purpose of the exchange. The potential motivation behind this flouting may be strategic. Trump's rhetoric appears intended to strengthen his image as a strong defender of national security and to resonate

emotionally with voters concerned about immigration. By simplifying the complex issue of immigration into a narrative of invasion and criminality, Trump likely sought to appeal to voter fears and present himself as a decisive leader. However, this tactic distorts the issue and weakens the informational value of the response. This interpretation aligns with findings from Rakhmasari (2023) in an analysis of flouting maxims in the American Presidential Debate, which explains that speakers often flout multiple maxims simultaneously during debates particularly when seeking to provoke emotional reactions or distract from specific policy discussion. Hossain found that exaggeration, generalization, and fear-based narratives were common strategies for manipulating audience focus. Trump's claim about criminality and drastic border actions is consistent with this trend. Therefore, both Grice's framework and Rakhmasari's (2023) findings confirm that this statement flouted the Maxims of Quality, Quantity, and Relevance, as it provided misleading, excessive, and off-topic information that detracted from meaningful political discourse.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of 10 data points from political debates between presidential candidates in Indonesia and the United States, significant differences were found in the application of cooperative communication principles among the candidates. Indonesian candidates, particularly Ganjar and Prabowo, showed deviations from the maxims a total of 9 times. Ganjar exhibited 4 deviations: 2 related to the Maxim of Quantity, 1 related to the Maxim of Relevance, and 1 related to the Maxim of Manner. Prabowo showed 5 deviations: 3 related to the Maxim of Quantity and 2 related to the Maxim of Relevance. These deviations reflect a communication strategy in Indonesia where candidates often provide more detailed responses, sometimes including information that is not directly relevant to the question. This approach may serve to strengthen their positions or avoid directly addressing sensitive topics.

In contrast, U.S. candidates Donald Trump and Harris demonstrated a total of 11 deviations across the debates. Trump deviated 7 times: 3 related to the Maxim of Quantity, 1 related to the Maxim of Quality, and 3 related to the Maxim of Relevance. His responses often included excessive information, unsubstantiated claims, and shifts in topics, indicating that his communication strategy involved emotional rhetoric and personal attacks on political opponents. Harris, on the other hand, deviated 4 times: 2 related to the Maxim of Quantity and 2 related to the Maxim of Relevance. While she remained more focused on economic issues, her responses also included unnecessary details and shifted the discussion off-topic, often moving to political criticisms.

These differences in how candidates applied the cooperative communication principles can be attributed to the distinct political and cultural contexts of Indonesia and the United States. In Indonesia, debates seem to favor broader and more comprehensive answers, which may reflect a communication style that values providing extensive information. In contrast, U.S. debates often focus on emotional rhetoric, with candidates aiming to capture public attention through provocative statements and criticisms of their opponents. While Grice's cooperative principles are designed to guide effective communication, the analysis revealed that their application varied significantly between the presidential candidates of Indonesia and the United States, influenced by cultural and political factors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

possible without the help and support of those who offered valuable advice and guidance. I am deeply grateful for all the input and assistance provided.

REFERENCES

Averina, F. E. (2023). A Pragmatic Analysis of Flouting Maxims in Classroom Verbal Interaction as Seen in Freedom Writers Movie. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, *6*(1), 16–30. https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v6i1.38

CNN. (2024). *Watch the full Second Presidential Debate Hosted by ABC 11th September 2024*. CNN. https://www.youtube.com/live/T89NYFjEAiM?si=qm36EFt1OzyFEDdT

Grice, H. . (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Logic and conversation* (Issue January, pp. 41–58). University College London. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ls/studypacks/Grice-Logic.pdf

Hamza, M. H., & Nordin, N. R. M. (2024). Pragmatic Deviation of Grice's Cooperative Principle in Trump's Political Interview With the CNN News Channel. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *14*(3), 883–892. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1403.31

Isbandi. (2021). *Flouting maxim of grice's cooperative principle in conversation at coronacast ABC news: Pragmatics apptoach* [Putera Batam University]. http://repository.upbatam.ac.id/1203/1/bab I.pdf

Khan, A., Shahid, M. A., Iqbal, P., & Mahnoor. (2025). Analysis of Gricean Maxims In "The Oyster And The Pearl": A Pragmatic Study. *Journals of Applied Linguistics and Tesol*, *8*(1), 1130–1150. https://jalt.com.pk/index.php/jalt/article/view/443/351

Mauliyati, D., Suwadi, S., & Rokhmawan, T. (2024). Analysis of Violations of Grice ' s Principles of Cooperation in the Mata Najwa Adu Kuat Program on Constitutional Affairs. *Alinea Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pengajaran*, *4*(2), 259–281. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.58218/alinea.v4i2.955

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook. In *SAGE* (3rd ed.). SAGE. https://doi.org/10.7748/ns.30.25.33.s40

Official iNews. (2024). *[FULL] Debat Kelima Capres Pemilu 2024, Minggu, 4 Februari 2024*. Official INews. https://youtu.be/gKNqF9jOhZ4?si=6uEFTvAM7iaP2yuw

Oladeji, & Olukemi., F. (2024). A pragmatics Study Of Conversational Maxim In Joe Biden's Inaugural Speech. *JOLLS: International Journal of Arts, Languages, Linguistics and Literary Studies*, *13*(June), 87–95. http://www.jolls.com.ng/v2/

Organization, W. H. (2015). *Stunting in a nutshell*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/news/item/19-11-2015-stunting-in-a-nutshell#:~:text=Stunting is the impaired growth,infection%2C and inadequate psychosocial stimulation.

Prirahayu, A. O., Khalawi, H., & Rahayu, D. (2020). The flouting of maxims in the first presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump 2020: The eclectic approach. *English Education Department*, *1*(3), 1–10. https://repository.stkippacitan.ac.id/

Rakhmasari, D. L. (2023). AN An Analysis of Flouting Maxims in the Second American Presidential

Debate. *English Education and Literature Journal (E-Jou)*, *3*(01), 34–45. https://doi.org/10.53863/ejou.v3i01.624

Sidabutar, N. I., Manurung, L. W., & Simarmata, R. O. (2023). Flouting an d Violation Grice ' s Theory of Cooperative Principle Maxim in Podcast Dedy Corbuzier Scene Widi Viera-Cinta Laura. *Jurnal Bima: Pusat Publikasi Ilmu Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *1*(4), 42–69. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61132/bima.v1i4

Sugiyono. (2017). Metode penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R&D. In *Penerbit Alfabeta*. https://elibrary.stikesghsby.ac.id/index.php?p=fstream&fid=140&bid=1879

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. In H.G. Widdowson (Ed.), *Oxford University Press.* H.G. Widdowson: Linguistics George Yule: Pragmatics Oxford University Press.