

Expressions of Social Criticism in “Sentilan Sentilun” Talk Show

Ni Luh Putu DA Astika and Mytha Candria

Linguistic Section, English Department, Faculty of Humanities,

Diponegoro University

Jl. Prof Soedarto, SH. Tembalang. Semarang 50275

Abstract: Skripsi berjudul “Expressions of Social Criticisms in ‘Sentilan Sentilun’ Talk Show” ini bertujuan menjelaskan pelanggaran maksim apa saja yang ditemukan dalam sebuah acara televisi berjudul “Sentilan Sentilun”, jenis implikatur yang digunakan untuk menyampaikan kritik sosial, dan kritik sosial yang disampaikan oleh para penutur dalam acara tersebut. Teori yang digunakan adalah teori implikatur dan prinsip kerjasama Grice (dalam Levinson, 1983). Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif karena data yang digunakan berupa kata dan hasilnya berupa data tertulis. Metode kuantitatif juga digunakan dalam penelitian ini untuk menghitung ujaran-ujaran yang mengandung kritik sosial dan membuat persentase dari pelanggaran maksim. Data yang menjadi objek penelitian ini adalah acara televisi “Sentilan Sentilun” dari episode 7 Juli 2014 sampai episode 27 Oktober 2014. Teknik yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data adalah teknik simak bebas libat cakap, unduh, dan teknik catat. Dalam menganalisa data, saya menggunakan metode padan pragmatik dan metode reflektif-introspektif. Penelitian ini menghasilkan kesimpulan bahwa ada 4 pelanggaran maksim yang ditemukan dalam acara televisi “Sentilan Sentilun”, yaitu pelanggaran terhadap maksim kuantitas, maksim kualitas, maksim relevansi, dan maksim pelaksanaan. Implikatur dalam acara ini merupakan *particularized conversational implicatures* dan pendengar membutuhkan pengetahuan yang sama dengan penutur untuk memahami kritik sosial yang disampaikan. Kritik sosial yang ditemukan dalam penelitian ini merupakan kritik terhadap pemerintah Indonesia terkait beberapa kasus yang terjadi di Indonesia, yaitu korupsi, penyuapan, dan kemiskinan.

Keywords: kritik sosial, implikatur, Sentilan Sentilun

Introduction

Social criticism is one common way to communicate. It is easily found in many communication media. In Indonesia, I often find social criticism in many occasions,

such as in speech, poems, caricatures, songs, films, etc. Therefore, I am interested in researching social criticism, since Indonesian people like to criticize, and they have various interesting ways in expressing social criticisms. Social criticism becomes my interest since it shows how critical people are to their environment. This proves that people cautiously observe and care about what is happening in the country.

I chose “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show because it is a political humor show and is rich in social critiques. Current political topics can trigger people to give their social criticisms. Current political topics can trigger people to give their social criticisms.

This study has three purposes. Firstly, it aims to show maxim violations that occur in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show. Secondly, it aims to discuss the types of implicatures. Thirdly, it aims to explain how the speakers in the talk show express their social criticisms and explain the possible interpretation(s) of the social criticisms.

Theoretical Framework

a. Pragmatics

According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is the study of “meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)” (p. 3). Pragmatics is also the study of language that is seen in relation to language users (Mey, 1993). As language users, the speakers have guidelines to be efficient and effective in using language to converse so as to further co-operative ends, and Grice identifies these guidelines as ‘maxims of conversation’ (as cited in Levinson, 1983). The maxims of conversation are also known as Grice’s cooperative principles.

b. Pragmatic Meaning

There is a term called “‘code-model’ of communication”, where “communication is seen as an encoding-decoding process” (Schmitt, 2010, p. 70). This means that in

order to have successful communication, the sender has to pair messages and signals in the same way with the receiver (Shmitt, 2010).

c. Grice's Cooperative Principles

The famous principles in pragmatics are called Grice's cooperative principles. Yule (1996) says that "the assumption of cooperation is so pervasive that it can be stated as a cooperative principle of conversation and elaborated in four sub-principles, called maxims" (p. 37). According to Grice, there are four maxims (as cited in Levinson, 1983, p. 101-102):

The maxim of quality:

Try to make your contribution one that is true:

1. Do not say what you believe to be false
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

The maxim of quantity:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required

The maxim of relevance:

Make your contributions relevant.

The maxim of manner:

Be perspicuous:

1. Avoid obscurity
2. Avoid ambiguity
3. Be brief

Be orderly

d. Implicature

There are two types of implicature, i.e. conversational implicatures and conventional implicatures (Yule, 1996). Both Levinson (1983) and Yule (1996) use the term "conversational implicatures" to refer to implicatures that occur in

conversation. Different to conversational implicatures, ‘conventional implicatures’ are not based on Grice’s cooperative principle but are associated with specific words, such as *but*, *even*, or *yet* (Yule, 1996).

Conversational implicature is divided into three kinds, i.e. generalized conversational implicatures, scalar implicatures, and particularized conversational implicatures (Yule, 1996). ‘Generalized conversational implicatures’ arise from utterances, in which the listeners do not require special background knowledge in order to make the necessary inferences (Yule, 1996). Yule (1996) also states that some other generalized conversational implicatures are usually conveyed “on the basis of a scale of values and are consequently known as scalar implicatures” (p. 41). Meanwhile, ‘particularized conversational implicatures’ arise from utterances which have “very specific context in which locally recognized inferences are assumed” (Yule, 1996, p. 42).

Research Method

Type of Research

The study is descriptive as the data used in the study are in the forms of words and not in numbers: “*deskripsi merupakan gambaran ciri-ciri data secara akurat sesuai dengan sifat ilmiah itu sendiri*” (Djajasudarma, 2006, p. 16). This study is qualitative because the result of the study is word. I also use quantitative method, in which I count the utterances that contain social criticism and make the percentages of maxim violations found in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show.

Data and Population

In the study, the linguistic context consists of phonemes, morphemes, lexemes words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and meaning, while, the non-linguistic context is the background knowledge of the speakers and the listeners. The population of the study is all utterances in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show.

Methods and Techniques of Collecting Data

The method of collecting data used in the study is non-participant observation, meaning that I do not involve in the situation being observed. The utterances are observed by watching and listening to the talk show. Then I download some episodes of the talk show from YouTube and take note of utterances containing social criticism.

Methods and Techniques of Analyzing Data

The method that I use to analyze the utterances is pragmatic *padan* method and reflective-introspective method. The pragmatic *padan* method uses the speaker's partner as the determiner (Sudaryanto, 1993). In the study, I observe the audiences of "Sentilan Sentilun" talk show to determine what statements or utterances that implicitly express social criticisms. Reflective-introspective method is used to explain social criticisms that the speakers in "Sentilan Sentilun" talk show want to deliver.

Findings and Discussion

In "Sentilan Sentilun" talk show broadcasted on July 7, 2014, until October 27, 2014, there are 24 utterances that contain social criticisms. All implicatures found in "Sentilan Sentilun" talk show are particularized conversational implicatures, where the listeners need to have special background knowledge in order to get the speakers' implicit meanings. The findings are presented as follows:

The Percentages of Maxim Violations in "Sentilan Sentilun" Talk Show

No.	Maxim Violations	Frequency (F)	Percentages (%)
1.	Violation of Quantity Maxim	7	29.17
2.	Violation of Quality Maxim	3	12.5
3.	Violation of Relevance Maxim	2	8.33
4.	Violation of Manner Maxim	12	50
Total		24	100

From the table that the violation mostly occurred in the talk show is the violation of manner maxim, the violation of quantity maxim, the violation of quality maxim and the violation of relevance maxim.

The Violation of Quantity Maxim

Ndoro : Tapi pernah kita juga diatur dalam penjara. Pernah ya?

Pak Budi : Nah, itu dia.

Sentilun : Malu-maluin, Ndoro.

Markonah : Lho? Di dalam penjara, Ndoro?

Ndoro : Wah, ada. Pak Budi bisa njelasin. Saya pura-pura nggak tahu.

Markonah : Masa *to*?

Sentilun : **Itu termasuk salah satu keajaiban di negeri ini.**

Markonah : Oo... keajaiban dunia jangan-jangan.

Sentilun : Lho iya. Pengurus bola mengendalikan organisasi dari dalam bui

The preceding conversation was taken from “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show entitled “Pilpres VS Piala Dunia”, broadcasted on July 7, 2014. The context is that Ndoro Sentilan talked about Indonesian soccer club which was once led by a prisoner. In the conversation, Sentilun violated maxim of quantity in 8th line when he gave his opinion about what Ndoro Sentilan were talking about.

From Sentilun’s statement, Sentilun gave more information than was necessary, in that he did not just affirm Ndoro’s statement about Indonesian soccer association *PSSI* that was led by a prisoner, but also he supplied the listeners with additional information. “*Itu*” in Sentilun’s utterance referred to the moment when Indonesian soccer association *PSSI* was led by a prisoner. The possible inference of Sentilun’s implicature is that Sentilun criticized the former head of *PSSI* (Indonesian soccer association), Nurdin Halid, who was involved in corruption.

The Violation of Quality Maxim

Sentilun : Ndoro, kalau kita cermati ya, sekarang ini tidak saja banyak lembaga survey, tapi juga banyak sekali tu lembaga konsultan politik.

Ndoro : Maksudnya apa itu?

Sentilun : Semua *dikonsultaseni*. Soal penampilan capres, konsultasi.

Ndoro : Kaya gimana, kaya gimana?

Sentilun : Penampilan, jambulnya aja diatur, Ndoro. Itu ada konsultannya. Cara bicaranya.

Chacha : Cara jalan mungkin, cara jalan?

Sentilun : Cara jalan, *thumuk thumuk*.

Chacha : Ada konsultannya?

Sentilun : Ada. Ini konsultannya. **Konsultasi cara jalan capres, moonwalker**.

Chacha : Munduur. Munduur.

In the episode entitled “Bukan Sekedar Presiden Quick Count” broadcasted on July 14, 2014, Ndoro Sentilan, Sentilun and Chacha Frederica were talking about political consultants, i.e. consultants to whom Indonesian president candidates consulted a number of issues related to their candidacy. In the line 12, Sentilun violated maxim of quality, where he said untrue information about the way president candidates walked, “**Konsultasi cara jalan capres, moonwalker**” (“**The consultation of the way president candidates walked, a moonwalker**”).

Observing Sentilun’s utterance, I found that what Sentilun meant by using the word “moonwalker” to describe the way Indonesian president candidates walked concerns the quality of the president candidates. In this case, Sentilun said that the quality of president candidates is bad because they often lie.

The Violation of Relevance Maxim

Ndoro : Jadi gini, lho, relawan itu beda sama kamu, lho.

Sentilun : Bedanya gimana?

Ndoro : Kamu itu *ndak* rela, ngeluh. Nggak dapet gaji, ngeluh. Dapet gaji, ngeluh.

Sentilun : Ha, kalo pembantu kaya saya ini, ngeluh ya wajar, Ndoro.

Ndoro : Kenapa?

Sentilun : **Ya, asalkan jangan terus-terusan prihatin**. Jangan. Makanya saya berharap betul, pemimpin yang baru ini jangan kerjanya cuma prihatin-prihatin mulu.

The previous conversation was taken from the episode entitled “Pemimpin Baru Indonesia Baru” broadcasted on August 4, 2014. Ndoro Sentilan and Sentilun were talking about volunteers that participated in the 2014 presidential election. Sentilun’s response in line 7 was not relevant to Ndoro’s question, thus, he violated the maxim of relevance. In order to understand Sentilun’s criticism, the listeners needed to have

background knowledge regarding what made Sentilun said that complaining was better than just expressing sympathy. SBY was known to always respond to problems faced by Indonesian people by saying “*saya prihatin*”. The criticism that Sentilun wanted to communicate is that as a president, SBY could only express sympathy, but he did not do anything to solve the problems that happened in Indonesia.

The Violation of Manner Maxim

Ndoro : Kira-kira apa, ya, yang menarik, ya, kalo nilai-nilai kepahlawanan itu, Mas, ya, dibikin film seperti superhero. Mungkin Mas Hanung tertarik bikin superhero; judulnya bukan Superman, tapi, misalnya Super Sentilun. Itu gimana?

Sentilun : Lah, nanti slogannya lain, Ndoro.

Ndoro : Apa dong?

Sentilun : Sentilun, Pahlawan yang Tidak Terkalahkan. **Ha iya, kalo kalah langsung nggugat ke MK.**

In the episode “Ekspresi Kemerdekaan” on August 18, 2014, Ndoro Sentilan and Sentilun were discussing the right to express opinions. Ndoro Sentilan said that it would be interesting to produce such a superhero film as “Super Sentilun”. Sentilun responded by saying that the slogan of the film would be “Sentilun, the Undefeated Hero”. He added that if he was defeated, he would sue to The Constitutional Court.

Sentilun violated maxim of manner as well as maxim of relevance in the conversation. Sentilun’s last statement was obscure since it was difficult to understand why Sentilun said that if he had been defeated, he would have sued to The Constitutional Court. Thus, he violated the manner maxim. Meanwhile, Sentilun violated the relevance maxim because his last statement had no connection with the previous statement and the topic being discussed.

As Indonesians, the listeners understand the moment that happened in Indonesia when one of 2014 president candidates lost in the presidential election, and he sued the General Elections Commission (*Komisi Pemilihan Umum* or *KPU*) to The Constitutional Court (*Mahkamah Konstitusi* or *MK*). The man was Prabowo. Looking

at Sentilun's last statement, he dispraised Prabowo's attitude that he did not accept the result of the presidential election.

Conclusion

There are two conclusions that I can draw after analyzing "Sentilan Sentilun" talk show. Firstly, I found 24 utterances in the "Sentilan Sentilun" talk show that contain social criticism. Among these utterances, the violations concern 4 maxim violations, i.e. violation quantity maxim, quality maxim, relevance maxim, and manner maxim. Among those maxims, the most violated maxim is the manner maxim (50%), the quantity maxim (29.17%), the quality maxim (12.5%) and the relevance maxim (8.33%).

Secondly, the implicatures found in the "Sentilan Sentilun" talk show are all conversational implicatures because they occurred in conversations and were based on Grice's cooperative principles or maxims. Furthermore, all the implicatures are particularized conversational implicatures since the conversation occurred in specific contexts in which the topics related to Indonesian politics. The listeners also needed special background knowledge in order to get the speakers' implicit meaning of social criticisms. The social criticisms found in "Sentilan Sentilun" talk show are criticisms toward the Indonesian government. They concerned some cases that happened in Indonesia, e.g. corruption in the government, bribery in the election and poverty.

References

- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: Second Edition*. London: Hodder Education.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pagmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.