

# CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN SENTILAN SENTILUN TALK SHOW

**\*Lusi Lisnaria Manalu**

**\*\*Lidiman Sahat Martua Sinaga**

## ABSTRACT

Talk shows such as *Sentilan Sentilun* are quite popular in Indonesian television. These talk show are quite interesting to study because they are not only involving many participants, but also requiring the settings in which politeness and implicature needed to be used to keep the communication flows smoothly. This paper is a pragmatic study that aims at investigating conversational implicature that hosts and the guests of *Sentilan Sentilun* talk show operate within their utterances along with the possible implications that lie behind the implicature. The data are analyzed based on cooperative principle by violating Gricean maxims, that are specifically maxim of quality, quantity and relevance. Findings show that there are 51 utterances containing conversational implicature. The findings show that there are four types of violated maxims that potentially caused conversational implicature. The dominant type is maxim of relation(56.87 %). The reason why it becomes the dominant type is because the host and the guests wanted to create humors in order to flutter someone or certain topics. The hosts and the guests conveyed an implicit meaning when giving statement or opinion or information and answering the question in their discussion based on the truth condition or facts in the talk show.

**Keywords :** *conversational implicature, types, maxim, humor, talk show, Sentilan Sentilun*

---

\*Graduate Status

\*\*Lecturer Status

## **INTRODUCTION**

There are many ways in expressing our purpose in communication. Most people use spoken or written language by using clear words so that the listener or the reader can understand the exact meaning. On the contrary, some people use unclear words or utterances for a certain purpose, so it is hard to be understood the meaning indeed because of the implied meaning of the utterances. In this case, the language action that must be noticed are the structure and the conversational circumstance, because both things can help to understand the meaning of utterances, whether for the readers or the speakers. A good language structure and an involvement situation where the language is used, will be very helpful to make a communicative conversation.

A phenomena where the meaning of the language is hardly understood is caused by the using of connotative and the meaning of the language is influenced by the contextual usage. The context that is not involved when the language used, will make it difficult in understanding the meaning of a language. This usually occurs in a conversation. In this case, besides the meaning, other thing that must be noticed is the image of the speech, so that the meaning or the effect of the speech can be achieved. Here is the role of pragmatics needed to understand the meaning of a speech. According to Yule(1996:3) there are four areas that pragmatics are concerned with, there are(1) Pragmatics is the study of the speaker meaning, (2) Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning, (3) Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said, and (4) Pragmatics is the study of the expression of

relative distance. Pragmatics is not only seeing language from the form but also the contextual circumstance.

One of the branch of pragmatics is implicature, that is implied meaning of the language. Implicature is considered as important to study more because nowadays is found so many programs, especially in TV, that is used an implied language, whether in talkshow program, comedy, or program with a concept to motivate audience. In a conversation (dialogue), frequently happened that the speaker doesn't deliver the meaning directly. Something that wants to deliver, precisely implied, spoken indirectly, or the language that is spoken is totally different with the meaning. In this case, besides the meaning, other thing that must be noticed is the image of the speech, so that the meaning or the effect of the speech can be achieved. The language usage contains of implicature can complicate the audience if the audience doesn't have much knowledge to understand the meaning. By only involving the situation will not be enough to the ordinary audience to catch the meaning of the language contain of implicature. Implicature is considered interesting to study because many conversation which the speaker doesn't apply cooperative principle, so that the understanding of an implicative language can be difficult. That's why implicature is very interesting to study, then a certain language form in a conversation can be understood.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **A. Implicature**

An implicature is something meant, implied or suggested distinct from what is said. It can be defined as the difference between what the word in utterance means according the rules of grammar and what the speaker's meaning is. Implicatures are primary examples of more being communicated than is said, but in order for them to be interpreted, it needs cooperative principle to interpreted the meaning.

### **B. Conversational Implicatures**

In conversation, people often deliver their messages or thought directly or indirectly. They may deliver their messages or thought indirectly or implicitly in certain goals. They expresses the meaning beyond the words and it has to be understood by the hearer. It relates to the knowledge of what the speaker says from what the speaker implies by the meaning of the utterances.

Conversational implicature can be meaned as additional convey the meaning. it is happened when a speaker intend to communicate more than what is asked the speaker to communicate.

### **C. Cooperative Principles**

Grice offers to use the theory of Cooperative Principle to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation between the speaker and the hearer. In addition to identifying and classifying the phenomenon of implicature, Grice developed a theory designed to explain and predict conversational implicature. He

also sought to describe how such implicatures are understood. Grice (1975: 26–30) postulated a general “Cooperative Principle,” and four “maxims” specifying how to be cooperative.

1) Maxim of Quantity

Be as informative as required. Which Grice expresses as follows :” Make your contribution as informative as is required(for the current purposes of the exchange) and do not make your contribution more informative than is required”.

2) Maxim of Quality

Make your contribution true; so do not convey what you believe false or unjustified. Maxim of quality is a matter of giving the right information. Grice suggested two sub maxims:”Do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence (Chapman, 2000:132).

3) Maxim of Relation

Be relevant, should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange. The maxim of relation requires being relevant to the context and situation in which the utterances occurs (Thomas,1995:70)

4) Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous; so avoid obscurity and ambiguity, and strive for brevity and order. According to this maxim, speakers and hearers have to be obvious in giving contribution in communication exchange. They also have to complete their performances with reasonable dispatch.

#### **D. Maxim Violation**

Maxim violation happens when the speaker simply chooses to violate the cooperative rules with no intention to generate an implicature and with no intention to deceive (Thomas,1995;4). For example, if Jane say no to invitation of John because she is busy, while in fact she has nothing to do, she violates a rule of maxim. It is typical or the characteristic for the flouting a maxim to set up a conversational implicature.

Violating maxim is a very complex of violating cooperative principle in conversational terms. By violates one or all maxim, it creates an implicature. By clearly and obviously violating maxim, it can be implied that something is beyond what it is said.

## **RESEARCH METHOD AND FINDINGS**

This research used the descriptive qualitative method. This method applied because it is intended to analyze and describe the utterances that used by each speakers. Creswell (2007:37) states that qualitative research began with assumption, a worldwide, the possible use of theoritical lens, and the study during research problems inquiring into the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social human problem. the source of data were the utterances of the host and the guests in Sentilan Sentilun talk show. The data were taken from 2 episodes of Sentilan Sentilun. The data were “Upaya Penggembosan Anti Korupsi” (February, 6th 2015) and “Gonjang Ganjing Dana Siluman” (March, 6th 2015). The data were collected by applying observation technique. This meant that the writer accessed the youtube sites, and downloaded the video of Sentilan Sentilun talk show to get the conversation, then listened the conversation and wrote all the utterances and made the transcription from the conversation and then analyzed the clauses.

After analyzing the data, each utterances from all the speakers were classified based on the types of maxim violation that potentially caused conversational implicature. They were maxim violation of quantity, maxim violation of quality, maxim violation of relation and maxim violation of manner. There were 51 utterances belong to have maxim violation. The descriptions were elaborated into the following sections.

## 1. The Violation of Maxim Quantity

Sentilun : Loh gaji mereka aja belum dibayar pak

Tony : Ya gaji.**di Amerika pernah terjadi ,jadi istilahnya itu shut down, ekonomi Amerika itu mengalami apa namanya.... tidak bias mengeluarkan dana tapi bukan gara-gara perseteruan dengan DPRD eh.. perseteruan juga sih, jadi ijin untuk menambah utang untuk menutup defisit APBN Amerika, itu dihentikan oleh kongres atau DPR di Indonesia. Jadi waktu itu pemerintah tidak bias menjalankan aktifitas *public service*, jadi misalnya kalo misalnya kita ke Washington DC kemudian ke museum itu tidak ada petugasnya. Karena petugasnya gak dibayar gajinya beku. Jadi kita jalan-jalan ke Washington DC mau masuk museum gak ada petugasnya, tutup. Atau kita kemana ke Liberty Island itu gak ada *ferry* nya kesana, tutup. Nah jadi di DKI kalo perseteruan itu terus berlanjut, itu akan menimbulkan kerugian seperti itu. Jadi dana tidak cair. Nah kalo secara nasional, itu akan mengganggu kredibilitas pemerintah. Itu akan mengganggu misalnya investor asing gak mau masuk ke Indonesia. Kemudian nanti indeks harga saham akan turun, rupiah melemah dan ini akan menimbulkan kerugian perekonomian Indonesia secara keseluruhan. Jadi jangan terlalu underestimate terhadap hal-hal semacam ini. Harus diselesaikan secara baik.**

The context is the host(Sentilun) asked the guest (Tony Prasetyantono) about the salary of the member of DPRD Jakarta which haven't been paid by the government of DKI Jakarta. From Mr.Tony's answer it can be seen that he gave more detail explanation, He explained more by giving example with what happened in America when its parlemen in Washington Dc experienced the same case as DPRD in Jakarta. If he answered directly by saying the reason why the salary of DPRD haven't been paid to the host, he surely obey the cooperative principle and implicature would not



occured. As the consequence, through his explanation he had to explain the reason of using matter in details by giving more details information what had happened in Washington Dc and related it to the case in DPRD Jakarta. That's why, he had purposely violated the rule of maxim quantity that was giving more information that was required and caused conversational implicature.

## 2. The Violation of Maxim Quality

Sentilun :beneran ndoro, soal pengangkatan kapolri itu, siapa ini yang punya kepentingan.

Thamrin : yah, saya kira kepentingan yang dipertaruhkan kali ini kepentingan yang cukup besar, sampe begitu ngotot gitu. Biar sampe pak BG itu dilantik. **Nah, yang punya kepentingan saya kira yang jelas adalah mereka yang mempunyai kepentingan kepentingan politik tapi juga barang kali ada kepentingan bisnis. Yang perlu dilindungi, sampe jangan disentuh dan sebagainya. Nah, sehingga kepentingan kepentingan itu sekarang dia itu menumpuk pada harapan pada BG ini. Jadi kalo itu disentuh ini, jadi semua itu akan goyang**

The context was the host(Sentilun) asked the guest (Thamrin Tumagalo) about who exactly has the business in the matter of Kapolri position. Mr. Thamrin answered it by giving the lack of evidence. He didn't give an exact answer who truly did have the business in that matter. It meant that he didn't know the people were. That's why he had purposely violated the maxim of quality by giving unsure answered and it caused conversational implicature.

### 3. The Violation of Maxim Relation

Sentilan : menempatkan kepentingan bangsa di atas kepentingan..... [aaaa, apayaa...]

Sentilun : golongan..

Sentilan :aaa. Itu Cuma itu kepentingan golongan tok. Untuk memimpin bangsa itu, gunakan mata batin, mata hati.. kalo perlu.

Sujiwo : **dan mata kaki...**

The context was all the speakers either the hosts or the guests talked about the nation interest. Each speakers said their opinion that relevant to the topic. But Sujiwo Tejo answered it by saying “mata kaki”. His answered was not relevant to the topic because there is no relation between the nation interest with “mata kaki”. Seemed like he wanted to continue Sentilan’s answers that used word”mata....”,indeed it had relation to the topic , but then Sujiwo used word”mata” to be spesific “mata kaki” was not relevant, as the consequence he had violated maxim relation and conversational implicature occured.

From two data above, the speakers had purposely violated the maxim relation by saying irrelevant informations or statement to the hearers.

### 4. The Violation of Maxim Manner

Sentilun : wwhehhh, ndoro....

Sentilan : **ini orang jelas ndak ini... tapi saya kenal ini. dia jelas banget..**

Sentilan : jelas itu... professor tamrin tomagola..

Sentilun : lohh...

Sentilan : ooooo... hebattt!!!!

Thamrin : **saya jelas karena saya punya 3 kartu yang jelas.**

The context was when Mr.Thamrin Tumagola came onto the stage as the second guest. Sentilan and Sentilun asked each other who Thamrin Tumagola is, they asked about he was clear or not (the status). Then Thamrin Tumagola answered it by saying “saya jelas karena saya punya 3 kartu yang jelas”. How could it be his status was clear just because he had 3 cards. What kind of cards ?it was not clear. It can be seen that Mr.Thamrin Tumagola’s statement was ambiguous because the hearer and the audiences had difficulty to interpret his statement. Everybody had different minds and points in interpreting his statement. That’s why Thamrin’s statement had purposely violated the maxim manner by giving ambiguous statement and caused conversational implicature. the data show that the speakers had purposely giving an ambiguous answers or statement to the hearer and the audiences since they can misinterpreted the speakers answers or statements. Their violation of manner caused conversational implicature.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

After analyzing and drawing all the conversational implicatures on Sentilan Sentilun talk show, the researcher draw the conclusions. It can be concluded that the hosts and guests used the conversational implicature based on the given situation or contextually. There were four types of maxim violation that caused conversational implicature on Sentilan Sentilun talk show. They were the violation of maxim quantity, quality, relation and manner. The reason of using conversational implicature are to make humors and keep secret.

## **SUGGESTIONS**

Having seen the results of the study, the researcher would like to offer the suggestions as follows :

1. It is advisable for readers to understand the cooperative principle with its maxims, especially the four types of maxim violation which potentially caused conversational implicature on Sentilan Sentilun talk show in order to avoid misunderstanding among the participants and to get the speakers's intention through his utterances on the conversation.
2. It is suggested to other researchers and the students of Applied Linguistics, who are taking pragmatics to start analysing and conducting futher research in order to get other reasons of the dominant type of maxim violation which cause conversational implicature from other topics.

## REFERENCES

- Chapman, Siobhan .2000. *Philosophy for Linguistic : An Introduction*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Cook, Guy.1989. *Discourse*.Oxford:Oxford University Press
- Creswell, John W.2007.*Qualitative Inquiry Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approches*. California: Sage Publications.
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Hutchby, Ian. 2006. *Media Talk :Conversation Analysis and The Study of Broadcasting*. Glasglow : Open University Press.
- Levinson, Steven.C.1983.*Pragmatics*.Cambridge:University Press.
- Pakpahan, Irma,B. 2012. *An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Smart FM'S Radio Talk Show*. Medan: Universitas Negeri Medan.
- Sheila Nanda, Didi Sukyadi and Sudarsono MI. 2012.*Conversational Implicature of the Presenter's in Take Me Out Indonesia*. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics.Vol. No.2( Hal 2-19)
- Thomas,Jenny.1995. *Meaning in Interaction :An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Harlow:Pearson Education.
- Timberg, Bernard.2002.*Television Talk: A History of the Tv Talk Show*.USA: The University of Texas Press.
- Yule,George.1996. *Pragmatics*. NewYork:Oxford University Press.
- [http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sentilan\\_Sentilun](http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sentilan_Sentilun)
- [http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daftar\\_acara\\_Metro\\_TV](http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daftar_acara_Metro_TV)