

## CHAPTER FOUR

### CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to draw a conclusion based on the analysis in the previous chapter. Overall, Fadli Zon uses the non-observance of the Gricean maxim to defend his superior and colleague Setya Novanto in the Freeport case. It can be seen in how Zon uses the non-observance of the Gricean maxim to defend Novanto in the nine data that I have analyzed.

The first is by not giving any detailed information required by the question used by Fadli Zon in data 1. He uses violating a maxim as the most suitable type of non-observance of the Gricean maxims as to make the case and the fact blurry in which the audience can be misled. In this case, Zon misleads the audience by saying, “It could be from anywhere” when asked by Najwa about the exact commission of the House that is involved in the meeting.

By saying it, the audience could think about the other possibility of the participants met by the PTFI representative. Not the 7<sup>th</sup> commission, who in fact is the one that has the right to meet first with PTFI according to the rules if they want to discuss the contract extension. I find that by violating a maxim, Zon could make the case vague and cause the audience confused. Therefore, the audience will not know the details of the case and thus they are misled by Zon's utterances.

The second is by claiming that Novanto is innocent in the case. In data 2, Fadli Zon uses flouting the maxim of quantity and manner as the most suitable one. In this case, Najwa asks him to clarify whether Setya Novanto himself that attends the meeting. Yet, Zon responds to it by not giving a specific answer to the question, instead, he claims Novanto's innocence by stating that the meeting is just a usual meeting. By using flouting the maxim of quantity and manner, I find that Zon can give more information and long winded answer to direct the audience into another conclusion.

In data 3, Zon tries to defend Novanto by stating that there is a conspiracy behind Novanto that wants to trap him to become the one who is at fault in the case. In the conversation, Zon jumps right to another case without even answering what Najwa asks. This is sufficient as Zon does not have to answer the question and make easier for him to lead the audience into another topic.

In data 4, Zon again uses flouting the maxim of manner as well as flouting the maxim of quantity to claim that again the meeting is just a usual thing to happen. In this case, Najwa asks if it is normal for certain leader of PTFI to meet the Speaker of

the House. However, Zon responds to it by giving long winded answers saying that the representative of the House can meet anyone for the sake of giving aspirations. By flouting the maxim of manner and quantity, I find that it is easier for Zon to direct the audience to another conclusion in which he wants the audience to think that Novanto is not against the procedure of meeting the PTFI.

In data 5, Zon uses another way to defend Novanto by blaming his opposition, namely, Sudirman Said. This time, Zon chooses to flout the maxim of relation. In the case, Zon does not answer the question if there is nothing improper in the meeting. He instead jumps into another topic by answering the question irrelevantly and blaming Sudirman Said as his opponent. He claims that there is a conspiracy behind Novanto that in fact is masterminded by Sudirman Said. By answering the question of the interviewer with an irrelevant answer, it is easier for Zon to blame right away Novanto and his opponent's in the case.

In data 6, Zon again uses flouting the maxim of quantity. Zon adds more information than what the question asks about if he knows Riza Chalid. Yet, after answering that he knows Riza Chalid, he adds more information by stating the meeting being recorded on 8 June. Again, this is enough for Zon to lead the audience back to the conspiracy of why the meeting has to be recorded.

In data 7, Zon states that the case is not serious. In this case, Zon chooses to flout the maxim of relation. Zon responds by giving an irrelevant answer when asked about the details of Setya Novanto and Riza Chalid's involvement in the meeting, he instead states that the conversation in the recording is just a joke between the

participants of the meeting. I find it very effective as it makes him easy to jump right into another case and claim again that Novanto again is innocence.

In data 8, Zon once more claims Novanto's innocence by claiming that Novanto is trapped in the case. In this case, Zon opts again to flout the maxim of relation. I find that by flouting the maxim of relation it is effective for Zon not to answer the question and jump into another case. Zon in this case does not answer the question if the conversation is just a joke. Instead, he enquires why the meeting has to be recorded. This is related to Zon's intention to make the audience think that Setya Novanto is the victim of the case.

In the last data, Fadli Zon refuses to respond to the questions. In this case, Zon chooses to opt out of a maxim. Zon is cornered when asked about the existence of the chats in the recording. In this respect, he uses his final defence by refusing to answer the question. This is caused by his unwillingness for the discussion to go further in details. I find it as his last effort to defend Novanto because there is no other way to defend Setya Novanto.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that Fadli Zon uses the non-observance of the Gricean maxim to defend Setya Novanto. Fadli Zon mostly uses flouting the maxim of quantity and relation to support his defence for Novanto. In his utterances, he uses each of the flouts the maxim of quantity four times and relation three times because they are the most effective ways to defend Setya Novanto. In flouting the maxim of quantity, he can direct the audience to other cases or conclusions by giving more information than the questions require. On the other

hand, in choosing to flout the maxim of relation, it is just easy for him to jump right to another case and discussion without even answering the questions.

Moreover, Fadli Zon flouts the maxim of manner twice. This is used by him since he can lead the people to another conclusion. In defending Novanto, Zon also uses violating and opting out a maxim each time.

This is effective as by violating a maxim, Zon can mislead the audience about the fact. Furthermore, by choosing to opt out maxim Zon can put himself not in trouble by refusing to answer the question.

From all the data that I have analysed, Fadli Zon does not use the other types of non-observance of the Gricean maxims like infringing a maxim and suspending a maxim. He does not use infringing a maxim because Zon is obviously a competent person that is not in such condition like being drunk or nervous in the interview. He does not use suspending a maxim as he and the interviewer, Najwa Shihab, does not have to suspend anything, for example, suspending a name of a person or an institution as it is clear for the audience to know everything about the case.

Words: 1,278

