

**Implicature of the Guests' Answers to Respond the Host's
Threatening Questions in the TV Program *Mata Najwa: Rapor
Wakil Rakyat***

Grenanda Elvasanti M. and J. Herudjati P.

Linguistic Section, English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro
University

Jl. Prof Soedarto, SH. Tembalang. Semarang 50275

Abstract: *Dalam menjawab pertanyaan yang mengancam muka, bintang tamu dalam sebuah acara seringkali menyampaikan maksud mereka secara tidak langsung melalui tuturannya untuk tujuan tertentu. Oleh karena itu, penulis tertarik untuk menganalisa bagaimana para bintang tamu menyampaikan maksud mereka secara tidak langsung. Penulis menganggap bahwa acara televisi Mata Najwa memiliki karakteristik yang telah disebutkan, sehingga acara tersebut dijadikan data penelitian. Penulis berfokus pada tuturan bintang tamu dalam menjawab pertanyaan dari tuan rumah, dan alasan para penutur menggunakan tuturan implisit. Penulis menggunakan teori implicature dan cooperative principle dalam menganalisa permasalahan tersebut. Penulis membatasi ruang lingkup analisa pada data tuturan bintang tamu yang mengandung implikatur pada saat diberi pertanyaan yang mengancam muka mereka, oleh tuan rumah. Data tersebut diambil dari acara TV Mata Najwa Edisi Rapor Wakil Rakyat. Penulis menggunakan metode Simak Bebas Libat Cakap dari Sudaryanto. Dalam menganalisis data, penulis menggunakan metode padan dan metode agih. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa tuturan implisit yang digunakan oleh bintang tamu di Mata Najwa saat menjawab pertanyaan yang mengancam muka mereka, dari tuan rumah bermakna penolakan dan ketakutan. Tujuan penggunaan implikatur tersebut adalah untuk menjaga dan melindungi muka mereka.*

Keywords: *tindakan mengancam muka, implikatur, maksim grice, Mata Najwa, program tv*

Introduction

In Indonesia, politics becomes an interesting and an important topic to the citizen. The Indonesian people really want to know every single information about what the government will do to develop Indonesia. That is why in Indonesia, there

are so many tv programs that discuss politics and also invite the political figures as the guests such as *Mata Najwa*. This tv program always gives brief information about the issues that is still happening. The host's questions make the guests find it difficult to answer the questions. Sometimes they make their answers difficult to understand by the hearers. Even some of them change the topic to avoid answering the questions. From the phenomena above, the writer sees violations of maxims and implicatures in the guests' answers. Then, the writer is interested in determining the implicature of the guests' answers to respond the host's questions that threat their face.

This research has two purposes that are to explain the reasons of the guests for violating the Grice's maxims and to explain the implicit meaning of the guests' utterances.

Review of the Related Literature

Face Threatening Act

Face Threatening Act is an act done by someone that threatens another individual's face wants in the form of utterances. Brown and Levinson (1978:60) said that some acts intrinsically threaten face. Acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/ or of the speaker is called face threatening act (Brown and Levinson, 1978:65).

Cooperative Principle

Cooperative Principle, according to Grice in Yule (1996:37) is a principle which requires us to make our conversational contribution such as is required by the accepted purpose of the talk exchange in which we are engaged. Grice (in Yule, 1996:37) also said that when we utter a speech we should notice with four maxims, that are Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner.

Implicature

According to Yule (1996:35) Implicature is an additional conveyed meaning contained in the speaker's utterances. Grice in Lyons (1977:593) divides

implicature into two types that are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. When the conventional implicature needs something additional to what is truth conditional in the normal meaning of words to calculate the additional meaning in the utterances, the conversational implicature needs general condition to calculate the additional meaning in the utterances (Lyons, 1977:593).

Conversational implicature consists of generalized conversational implicatures and particularized conversational implicatures (Yule, 1996:40-46). When no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called a generalized conversational implicature (Yule, 1996:41). According to Yule (1996:42), our conversations take place in very specific contexts in which locally recognized inferences are assumed. Such inferences are required to work out the conveyed meanings which result from particularized conversational implicatures.

Research Method

Type of Research

This research is descriptive and qualitative research. The writer uses this kind of research because the writer wants to describe the data in the form of words in this research and determine the guests' answers to the questions in the data. According to Hadi (1980:3), descriptive research only describes the object or situation of event and takes general conclusion from that situation. Meanwhile, Satori and Komariah (2012:22) stated that qualitative research is focusing on the quality or the main things of the product or the service.

Data and Population

According to Suryabrata (2014:39), primary data are gained when the researcher collects informations directly from the sources, while secondary data are composed as documents. The data source of this research is a tv program *Mata Najwa: Rapor Wakil Rakyat*. Arikunto (2010:173) stated that population is the

whole research object. According to that statement, the population of this research is all of the utterances taken from the video *Mata Najwa* especially *Rapor Wakil Rakyat* edition. In analyzing the data, the writer focuses on the utterances that contain face threatening act uttered by the host, and the utterances of the guests that contain the response to the host's utterances. However, the writer only uses the guests' utterances to respond the host's threatening utterances as the data of this research.

Method of Collecting Data

In this research, the writer uses method of non participant observation (*simak bebas libat cakap*) in collecting the data. According to Sudaryanto (1993:134), SBLC is a method where the researcher does not involve in the dialog or the conversation. He is only the observer of the dialog or the conversation.

Method of Analyzing Data

In analyzing the data, the writer uses Identity method and Distributional method proposed by Sudaryanto. Identity method is a method of analyzing data that the indicator device is outside factor of the language (Sudaryanto, 1993:13). Distributional method is a method of analyzing data that the indicator device is the language itself (Sudaryanto, 1993:15).

Findings and Discussion

Grice's Maxims

Maxim of Quantity

In a conversation, the speakers should give their contribution that is not less informative.

(16) Hidayat : *Kekuasaan membuat undang-undang memang ada di DPR, tetapi bersama dengan pemerintah. Nah, bersama dengan pemerintah, ini juga bagian-bagian yang bisa melancarkan juga kadang-kadang bisa memperlambat.*

Najwa : *Seringkali yang mana pak?*

Hidayat : *Seringkali ya antara ini dan itu. Gitu ya fifty-fifty.*

(They often make us fast and they often make us slow, fifty fifty.)

Hidayat is a chairman of PKS. He states that government's role sometimes makes them fast and sometimes makes them slow in making a regulation. Then, the host asks about the government's role, whether they often make them fast or they often make them slow. As a chairman of a party, Hidayat's positive face is threatened by the host's question because he should give information about the government's performance which is the government has a higher social class than him.

The writer sees implicatures of the guest's utterances. In order to identify it, the writer firstly identifies the explicature of the guest's utterances. The explicature of the guest's utterances is that he does not answer whether the government's role makes them fast or makes them slow. In other words, he does not give the wanted answer of the host. After identifying the explicature meaning, the writer sees the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa, and the guest, Hidayat. The context is that one of the guests, Vera, explains the reason why the members of House of Representative never reach the target in making a regulation. However, Najwa is not satisfied with the reason and keeps asking the same question. Then, Hidayat explains that the government has a role to help them in making a regulation which sometimes makes them fast and sometimes makes them slow. After hearing Hidayat's statement, Najwa asks him about the government's role. From the explicature of the guest's utterances and the context of the conversation, the writer identifies that the implicature of Hidayat's utterances may he does not brave to tell that the government's role more often makes the members of House of Representative slow in making a regulation because it will make the government's reputation becomes bad. Another implicature of his utterances may he also does not brave to tell that the government's role more often makes the members of House of Representative fast in making a regulation because it will make the members of

the House of Representative's reputation becomes bad since his utterances automatically will make the public think that the members of House of Representative need help in order to increase their performance. From Hidayat's answer, the writer identifies that the reason why he violates the quantity maxim and makes implicatures in his utterances is because he avoids doing a face threatening act to the government and the members of the House of Representative.

Maxim of Relation

In a conversation, the speakers should give their contribution that is relevant.

(21) Najwa : *Saya mau ke mbak Rieke. Mbak Rieke dari semua tadi yang seharusnya tidak perlu dihapus atau malah kurang ini perlu ada tambahan?*

Rieke : *Saya harus ucapkan terima kasih dan saya juga mohon maaf jika selama lima tahun ini banyak kinerja yang masih terus harus kami perbaiki, tetapi mohon sekali lagi jangan generalisasi kami. Masih ada orang-orang yang sungguh-sungguh bekerja untuk rakyat dan kami dan menurut kami kalau tadi dikatakan anda ini wakil kami tapi anda mengatakan sudah berjuang keras tetapi tidak bisa lalu untuk apa menjadi wakil kami. Untuk sebuah demokrasi yang matang membutuhkan dua hal prinsip yaitu politik yang komunikatif yang kedua adalah active citizenship warga negara yang aktif.*

(I have to say thank you and I also have to apologize if during the past five years there are a lot of our performance that should be improved, but please don't generalize us. There are some people who sincerely work for the people. A mature democracy needs two things that are the communicative politics and active citizenship.)

Rieke is a member of the House of Representative. The host asks her about the allowances received by the members of the House of Representative, whether it needs to be removed or even needs to be added. The discussion of the salary of the members of House of Representative has always been a hot issue because the great salary received by them is not compatible with their performance, so that the

host's question threatens the guest's face. The host's question indirectly makes the audiences can assess her attitude regarding to money, so that the guest should be aware with her answer in order to make a good self image. In the guest's answer, there is a violation of the relation maxim so that the conversation is not cooperative. The guest should answer the question by just telling the host that she wants some of the allowances need to be removed or she wants some additional allowances, so that the conversation becomes cooperative. However, the guest gives irrelevant answer.

The writer identifies the implicit meaning in the guest's utterances by identifying the explicature of the guest's utterances and seeing the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa, and the guest, Rieke. The explicature of the guest's utterances is she does not answer whether she wants some of the allowances need to be removed or she wants some additional allowances. In other words, she does not give the wanted answer of the host instead she gives irrelevant information. She asks a favor to Indonesian citizen to not generalize all of the members of House of Representative and she gives information relating to the mature democracy. The context is that Najwa announces the salary and the allowances received by the members of House of Representative in Indonesia that are ranked fourth in the world's largest House of Representative payroll. She also says that the members of the House of Representative do not need to find another commission or another project. However, Siswo says that the members of House of Representative often get deficit since they are often asked for money by the residents for the things that are not actually their responsibility. The host asks Rieke whether the allowances need to be removed or even need to be added. From the explicature of the guest's utterances and the context of the conversation, the writer identifies that the implicature of the guest's utterances may that Indonesian citizens have not been actively participating in the development of Indonesia especially for the politics. However, they always blame the members of House of Representative if there is a political chaos in Indonesia. It is showed when the guest gives irrelevant

information about the mature democracy that also needs active citizenship. The writer finds two reasons why the guest violates the relation maxim and makes an implicature in her utterances. The first because she wants to change the topic, so that the host and the audiences will no longer focus in the allowances for the members of House of Representative. The second is because she wants to convince the public that she is a member of House of Representative who always works hard to make Indonesia becomes a better country.

Maxim of Manner

In a conversation, the speakers should avoid giving contribution which makes the listeners perform a wrong response.

(24) Najwa : *Saya ingat yang protes salah satunya itu mbak Rieke, anda merasa tidak penting sesungguhnya absensi mbak Rieke?*

Rieke : *Menurut saya tidak bisa dilihat dari apakah orang menandatangani absen dengan dua kali, atau bisa titip absen sebenarnya.*

(I think we can't see whether the attendance list is signed twice or it can be signed by another members.)

Rieke is a member of the House of Representative. She is being asked by the host about her own opinion that really different from public opinion that is the attendance list is not important for her. The host's question threatens the guest's face since the host directly shows her objection to the Rieke's opinion by asking her why the attendance list is not important. There is a violation of the manner maxim in Rieke's answer. She should answer the question by just telling the host the reason why the attendance list is not important for her in order to make a good conversation. However, the guest's answer leads the host in confusion and makes her difficult to get the guest's point.

The writer identifies the implicit meaning of the guest's utterances by identifying the explicature of the guest's utterances and seeing the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa, and the guest, Rieke. The explicature of the guest's utterances is she does not answer that she thinks the

attendance list is not important instead she gives irrelevant answer which makes the audiences perform a wrong response. Her answer is that the attendance list can be signed twice and can be signed by another members. The context is that Najwa explains that there are many factions that sealed on their attendance list, whereas it becomes a benchmark to assess the performance of the members of House of Representative by the people. One of the guests, Rieke, argues that her opinion differs from public opinion that is she thinks that the attendance list is not important so that Najwa asks Rieke about the opinion. After identifying the explicature of the guest's utterances linked to the context of the conversation, the writer identifies that the implicature contained in the guest's utterances may that all this time the members of House of Representative who do not come to the meeting still get their attendance list full because there is a fraudulent practice in the House of Representative. In other words, the attendance list can be manipulated by the members of the House of Representative. The reason why she violates the manner maxim and makes an implicature in her utterances because she wants to show the fraudulent practice in her workplace to the public, but she has no courage to show it in a very clear way because she may get a warning from her superior. She may also do not want to be labelled as an employee who shows a disgrace of her own workplace.

Conclusion

The guests' answers to the host's questions that threaten their face violate some maxims, that are maxim of quantity, maxim of relation and maxim of manner. From the data, the writer finds that the most common violation in the guests' utterances is violation of quantity maxim. Generally, the guests violate the maxims when the host asked them some questions that threaten their face. Because of that violation, the guests make conversational implicature in their utterances. The writer sees that most of the guests violate the maxim and make implicatures in their utterances since they want to change the topic because they think that the host's questions are really threatening their face so that they could not provide arbitrary answers to those questions.

References

- Andargini, R. 2006. "Implicature Analysis on Comic Strip 'Kartun Benny dan Mice' Published on Sunday Edition of Kompas Daily". Semarang: Diponegoro University
- Arikunto, S. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C. (1978). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hadi, Soetrisno. 1980. *Metodologi Research* (Jilid 1). Yogyakarta: ANDI
- Kaloeti, A.K. 2012. "Particularized Conversational implicature in the TV series 'NCIS: Season 2'". Semarang: Diponegoro University
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics* (Volume 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Rorosito, O. 2009. "Strategies For Doing Face Threatening Acts At 'The CNN Democratic Presidential Debate' In Texas". Semarang: Diponegoro University
- Satori, Djamian & Komariah, Aan. 2012. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press
- Suryabrata, Sumadi. 2014. *Metodologi Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers
- Youtube, 2014.< https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H5_3Do4317E>
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press