



Implicature of the Guests' Answers to Respond the  
Host's Threatening Questions in the TV Program

*Mata Najwa: Rapor Wakil Rakyat*

**A THESIS**

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for S-1 Degree Majoring Linguistics in  
English Department Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

Submitted by :

Grenanda Elvasanti Martono

13020111130030

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

**DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY**

**SEMARANG**

**2015**

## **PRONOUNCEMENT**

The writer honestly confirms that she arranges this thesis by herself and without taking any results from other researchers in S-1, S-2, S-3 and in diploma degree of any university. The writer also ascertains that she does not take and quote any material from other publications or someone's paper except from the references mentioned.

Semarang, 4 June 2015

Grenanda Elvasanti Martono

## **DEDICATION**

THIS THESIS IS DEDICATED TO MY BELOVED FAMILY AND  
EVERYONE WHO HAD CONTRIBUTED TO THE COMPLETION OF THIS  
THESIS.

“Nothing is able to show my gratitude for your support”

## **APPROVAL**

Approved by,

Thesis Advisor

Dr. J. Herudjati P, M.Sc.

NIP. 19530327 198103 1006

## **VALIDATION**

Approved by

Strata 1 Thesis Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

On Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Chair Person

First Member

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum

Dra. Hj. C.A. Puan Ellisafni, M.Ed

NIP. 19661004 199001 2 001

NIP. 19551003 197812 2 001

Second Member

Third Member

Prihantoro, S.S., M.A.

Ariya Jati, S.S., M.A.

NIP. 19830629 200604 1 002

NIP. 19780228 200502 1 001

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, the writer wants to express her gratitude to Allah Almighty for the grace so that this thesis “Implicature of the Guests’ Answers to Respond the Host’s Threatening Questions in the TV Program *Mata Najwa: Rapor Wakil Rakyat*” can be completed as requirement of achieving undergraduate degree. The writer also wants to express her gratitude to people who have contributed to the completion of this research.

Those great people are:

1. Dr. J. Herudjati P, M.Sc., the writer advisor who has given his helpful correction patiently and kindly in writing this thesis.
2. Dr. Rediyanto M. Noor, M.Hum., Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
3. Sukarni Suryaningsih, S.S, M.Hum., Head of English Department of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
4. Dr. Agus Subiyanto, M.A., Head of Linguistics Major of English Department of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
5. All respectful lecturers in Faculty of Humanities, especially on English Department and all staffs in Faculty of Humanities.

6. Ayah and Mama, for the unconditional love, endless support and sincere prayers that have been given to the writer.
7. The writer's sisters, Desimo and Najilla, for the prayers, support and motivations.
8. The writer's big family, Soenarto's, for the attentions to the writer.
9. Students of English Department 2011 who have given cheerfulness and unforgettable moments to the writer's academic time.
10. The warriors of Gita Bahana Arisatya who have given great and valuable experiences to the writer.
11. Everyone who has involved and becomes the part of the writer's life.

The writer realizes that this thesis is far from perfect. She will be grateful to people who will give critics and suggestions that make this thesis better. Finally, the writer hopes that this thesis will be useful for the readers especially for students majoring in linguistics.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE .....	i	
PRONOUNCEMENT .....	ii	
DEDICATION .....	iii	
APPROVAL .....	iv	
VALIDATION .....	v	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	vi	
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	viii	
ABSTRAK .....	x	
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION .....	1
	1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
	1.2 Research Problems .....	2
	1.3 Purposes of the Study .....	2
	1.4 Scope of the Study .....	3
	1.5 Organization of the Writing .....	3
CHAPTER II	REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE ....	5
	2.1 Previous Study .....	5
	2.2 Face Threatening Act .....	8
	2.3 Cooperative Principle .....	10

	2.4	Implicature .....	15
CHAPTER III		RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	18
	3.1	Type of Research .....	18
	3.2	Data Source, Population and Sample .....	19
		3.2.1 Data Source .....	19
		3.2.2 Population and Sample .....	19
	3.3	Method of Collecting Data .....	20
	3.4	Method of Analyzing Data .....	21
CHAPTER IV		DATA ANALYSIS .....	24
	4.1	Grice's Maxims .....	25
		4.1.1 Maxim of Quantity .....	25
		4.1.2 Maxim of Relation .....	38
		4.1.3 Maxim of Manner .....	46
CHAPTER V		CONCLUSION .....	54
		BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	56

## ABSTRAK

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.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

In Indonesia, politics becomes an interesting and an important topic to the citizen. There are so many Indonesian people who are not satisfied with the government's works. The Indonesian people also 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.

*Mata Najwa* is one of those tv programs that discusses a political topic in Indonesia, and the guests who are invited to the program are political figures or anyone associated with political topic in Indonesia. This tv program always discusses hot issues about politics in Indonesia. Eventhough *Mata Najwa* discusses politics, the situation of the conversation is semi formal. Because of this semi formal situation, the host and the guests use common terms to make the viewers easily get the point of the discussion. The viewers of this program come from various occupations from students to politicians.

*Mata Najwa* always gives brief information about the issues that is still happening. It is because the host, Najwa, always gives smart questions even questions that threat the guests' face. 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 belongs to Pragmatics. Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener (Yule, 1996:3). The writer uses some theories in Pragmatics field such as face threatening act theory, cooperative principle and implicature theory. The writer uses these theories since in *Mata Najwa Rapor Wakil Rakyat* Edition, the host gives some questions that threat the guests' face and makes the guests violate the cooperative principle and make implicature in responding the questions to save their face.

## **1.2 Research Problems**

1. What makes the guests violate the grice's maxims?
2. What is the implicit meaning of the guests' utterances?

## **1.3 Purposes of the Study**

1. To explain the reasons of the guests for violating the grice's maxims.
2. To explain the implicit meaning of the guests' utterances.

#### **1.4 Scope of the Study**

The writer limits this research by only focusing on pragmatics field especially face threatening act, cooperative principle and implicature. The writer uses descriptive and qualitative research. The data that are used come from a video. The writer focuses only on the questions that threat the hearer's face and the utterances that show the answers to the questions. This limitation aims to make the analysis of this research easier.

#### **1.5 Organization of the Writing**

This research is arranged in order to be systematic as follows:

**Chapter I            INTRODUCTION**

It shows the topic and the problems that will be discussed in the thesis. It contains background of the study, research problems, purposes of the study, scope of the study and organization of the writing.

**Chapter II           REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE**

It shows some theories related to the topic that will be used to analyze the data. It consists of pragmatics theory, face threatening act theory, cooperative principle theory, and implicature theory.

**Chapter III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

It shows the data of the research. It consists of types of research, data source, population, sample, method of collecting data, and method of analyzing data.

**Chapter IV DATA ANALYSIS**

It shows the deep analysis about the data and also the explanations of the data described in chapter II. It consists of findings and discussion.

**Chapter V CONCLUSION**

It shows the results of the study that come from the analysis of the data by the writer.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the writer will review some research that also discuss face threatening act and implicature. The writer will also give a brief explanation about some theories related to the topic of this study. This chapter consists of five subchapters. The subchapters are previous study, face threatening act, cooperative principle, and implicature.

#### 2.1 Previous Study

There are some research in pragmatics that use face threatening act theory and implicature theory. The first one is “Implicature Analysis on Comic Strip *Kartun Benny dan Mice* Published on Sunday Edition of Kompas Daily” by Rianti Andargini (2006), the second one is “Particularized Conversational Implicature in the TV series *NCIS: Season 2*” by Ade Kristianus Kaloeti (2012), and the last one is “Strategies For Doing Face Threatening Acts At *The CNN Democratic Presidential Debate* In Texas” by Orchid Rorosito (2009).

The research by Andargini focused on the implicature of utterances in the comic strips *Kartun Benny dan Mice* taken with a documentation method. She used a heuristic analysis to analyze her data. As the results, she found some violations of Grice’s maxims and she also found four kinds of speech acts that

helped her determine implicature from the utterances. The kinds of speech acts that she found are assertive acts, directive acts, expressive acts, and commissive acts. According to her, violation of quantity maxim is the violation that most often occurs in the comic strips. It is because Andargini thought that the comic creators apply long utterances to reply simple questions and they also use extended utterances to respond utterances which usually do not need any responses. The strength of her research is she was able to convey her purposes of the study supported by some related theories that she used. However, her research also has a weakness that is in some of her data, she found the implicature of the utterances but in fact it is not an implicature. The comic creators show the meaning of the utterances explicitly. So that, there is actually no implicature in the utterances in some of her data but she considered it as an implicature. This weakness is showed in her data as bellow:

The driver: *“wah... nggak ada kembaliannya”*

Benny: *“ditukarin dulu ya?”*

Mice: *“belanjain dulu deh..”*

Benny: *“kalo gitu... tunggu sebentar ya Mas!!”*

Then Benny and Mice get out of the taxi to exchange the money. They decide to buy and enjoy bowls of noodles. This occurrence makes the driver annoyed.

The driver: *“gawat... bisa lama nih urusannya”* (2006:38)

Andargini assumed that Benny's utterance implies that Benny orders the taxi driver to wait for him (2006:39). The writer thinks that the utterance does not contain the implicature like Andargini said, it is really clear that Benny orders the

driver to wait for him by saying “*tunggu sebentar ya Mas!!*”, so this data does not contain any implicatures.

The research by Kaloeti focused on the main character using particularized implicature in interrogating victims, suspects, and witnesses. His data are tv series taken with a “*Simak Bebas Libat Cakap*” method. He used identity method and distributional method to analyze his data. Kaloeti found the reasons why the main character in the TV series frequently uses implicature in interrogating victims, suspects, and witnesses. He also found the implicatures of the main character’s utterances. According to him, his data are artificial and not real. So that, his data need to be verified for further research. The strength of his research is that he gave a brief explanation about the context of the utterances in the tv series so that the readers easily understand the condition and what Kaloeti wanted to deliver. However, his research has a weakness that is he did not give explanations about how the victims, suspects, and witnesses manage to interpret the implicature of the main character’s utterances as he mentioned in his purposes of the study. The writer also finds the unnecessary and irrelevant information in his data analysis that is the table of power and social distance. It is unnecessary and irrelevant since Kaloeti only discusses implicature and cooperative principle which has no relation with power and social distance.

The research by Rorosito focused on the strategy for doing face threatening act by the main speakers in the presidential debate. Her data are presidential debate. She used descriptive qualitative research approach and used purpose sampling technique in collecting the data. She found the reason for using certain

substrategies in the conversation of her data. According to her, the use of on-record strategy on the debate is useful to attract hearers to be on the speaker's behalf. She also thought that the use of off-record strategy on the debate is to threaten the face of the hearers. The strength of her research is she gave a brief explanation about one of her purposes of the study that is the reason for using certain substrategies on the presidential debate. However, her research has some weaknesses that is she did not give a brief explanation about the context of the conversation. So, it makes the readers difficult to understand the situation of the text. Besides, she only explained the on-record strategy and did not explain off-record strategy as she mentioned on her results.

The difference between the writer's research and all of those research is the writer's research is not only discussing either the face threatening act or the implicature like the previous research, but it is discussing both of them. Besides, the writer will explain the context in every conversation of the data. However, the writer's research will use the data that almost the same as Kaloeti's and Rorosito's, which is an audio visual documentation.

## **2.2 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). All competent adult members of a society have 'face', consisting in two related aspects that are negative face and positive face (Brown and Levinson, 1978:61).

Yule (1996:62) said a person's negative face is the need to be independent, to have freedom of action, and not to be imposed on by others while a person's positive face is the need to be accepted, even liked, by others, to be treated as a member of the same group, and to know that his or her wants are shared by others. In this research, the writer will only focus with the face threatening act to the guests' positive face.

In order to make the explanation of face threatening act clear, the writer makes some examples.

(1) James: Hey, it's late night. Stop that awful noise right now!

Tom: All right, calm down you old man.

The situation above is in the late night, James is trying to sleep but Tom is still playing his music very loudly. Then, James proposes a face threatening act by saying that words. If James says another words as follows, he will not threat Tom's face.

(2) James: Do you think that tonight is a bit more quiet than usual? It seems like everyone has worked hard today until they do not do any activities in this time. They are also maybe having a good dream now. Do you think so?

Tom: Yeah, I think you're right. I may will wake them up with my music. I'll turn it off.

### 2.3 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:

1. Quantity
  - a. Make your contribution as informative as is required.
  - b. Do not make your contribution more informative than required.
2. Quality, try to make your contribution one that is true.
  - a. Do not say what you believe to be false.
  - b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
3. Relation, be relevant
4. Manner
  - a. Avoid obscurity of expression
  - b. Avoid ambiguity
  - c. Be brief
  - d. Be orderly

In some conditions, speakers are not being cooperative. They violate the maxims in their utterances. This violation of the maxims caused the meaning of the speakers' utterances to be not easy to understand.

The writer makes some examples in order to explain the maxims and the violation of the maxims easier to understand.

(3) Clara: There will be a party in The Tavern tonight.

Ben: Oh yeah, I know.

Clara: Will you come to the party with me?

Ben: **Perhaps.**

From the text above we can see that Ben violates the maxim of quantity that is “Make your contribution as informative as is required”. By saying **Perhaps**, Ben makes his contribution not as informative as required and it makes Clara difficult to get the point from Ben. That is a yes or no question, and Ben should answer the question by “**Yes, I will come**” or “**No, I will not come**”. It will make Clara get the point from Ben directly.

(4) Jack: Do you know where this restaurant is?

Steward: Yes, I know. It’s beside the flower shop on that corner. **I always come to that restaurant with my family every weekend. You know, they have a very super delicious lobster. I think you will like the lobster too.**

It is clear that Steward violates the maxim of quantity that is “Do not make your contribution more informative than required”. Jack just needs the location of the restaurant that he asks, and Steward should answer by giving the direction to go to the restaurant. In fact, Steward gives unnecessary information about the menu in that restaurant.

(5) Taxi driver: Take it easy, you will be safe with me. I am the number one driver in this city.

Woman: Are you sure? Then why do you keep going when it’s red?

Taxi driver: **You know ma’am, rules were made to be broken.**

The situation of the text is, a woman feels uncomfortable when she goes home by taxi. The driver drives the taxi recklessly. The driver's utterances show us that he violates the maxim of quality that is "Do not say what you believe to be false". The driver knows that rules must be obeyed. In fact, he makes his believe false by saying like that.

(6) Son: Hey, relax dad. I'm 18th now, I can drive.

Father: Really son? You look like a baby trying to ride his four-wheel bicycle.

Son: That's rude dad. I will show you that I will not make us injure even when we do not use our safety belt.

Father: Ohh trust me son. **You will go to the hell if you drive without the safety belt.**

From the text above, we can see that father violates the maxim of quality that is "Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence". Father does not really know whether his son will go to the hell if he drives without the safety belt. It will just hurt his son as he has just got the driver license and not been good at driving yet. It is clear that father's utterances based only on his opinion, not from the adequate evidence.

(7) Wife: Honey, what do you think about my dress? Is it good on me?

Husband: **It's 8 o'clock, honey.**

It is clear that husband violates the maxim of relation. He gives irrelevant answer to his wife's question. It makes his wife confused with him. He should say "**It's good on you**" or "**It's not good on you**" to make his wife easily understand his answer.

(8) Woman: Do you hate Titan?

Boy: He punched me on the head.

Woman: **I may not be with you and Titan every time, but I know that he always gets nap after lunch.**

Boy: What do you mean, mom?

Woman: Did you start the fight?

Boy: It wasn't me. It was Titan!

The situation above is a woman just found her two sons fighting with no reason. The woman knows that his oldest made the fight since he felt jealous of his little brother. She tries to make her oldest admitted that he made the fight. Unfortunately, she violates the maxim of manner that is "Avoid obscurity of expression" and this violation makes her oldest difficult to get her point.

(9) Teacher: Have you finished?

Student: **Are you a monster?**

The situation of the text is that there is a post test in a class. A teacher is watching out her students. She often asks the students if they have finished doing the test. It makes her students nervous since they think the test will be over soon. Besides, the questions in the test are very difficult for the students. Many of them find it difficult to answer the question. When the teacher asks again whether the students have finished the test or not, a student violates a maxim of manner which is "Avoid ambiguity" by saying the words. The teacher will be confused to get her student's point. The student's utterances contain an ambiguity since he says "**Are you a monster?**" to her teacher neither because she always asks the same question and makes him nervous, or because she gives very difficult questions and makes him mad.

(10) Robert: I'm sorry babe, I got an emergency call from the office and I forgot to call you to cancel our date today.

Liana: Do you ever know how did your parents meet?

Robert: No, why?

**Liana: My mother told me that her first date with daddy wasn't good. She went to the place that daddy said. She waited for three hours but daddy did not come. Then, mom decided to go to daddy's apartment but before she opened the door, she heard daddy's voice was giggling with another woman there. Mom ran to her house and just kept that secret in the rest of her life.**

Robert: What are you talking about, babe?

The situation above is Liana had a date with her boyfriend, Robert. She waited for him for a long time. Unfortunately, Robert did not come and Liana knew that he was with another woman. When Robert called her, she asked him whether he knew how they parents met or not. Then, Robert asked Liana why she asked that question. Liana did not give the reason why she asked the question, she said about her parents' date, instead. Liana's utterances show the violation of the maxim of manner that is "Be brief". If Liana be cooperative in the conversation, she might say **"It's nothing. I'm sorry to say but I know that you lied to me about the emergency call from your office and I know you were with a woman."**

(11) Woman: What were you doing today, kid?

Boy: Well, as usual mom. Nothing different.

Woman: Were you late again?

Boy: No, but I forgot to bring my science book since I was in hurry this morning.

Woman: So did you get a punishment from your teacher?

Boy: Yeah, I stood in the front of class for 15 minutes.

Woman: **You must rode your bicycle very fast so you did not late to school, right?**

Boy: Yeah.

From the text above, we can see that the woman violates the maxim of manner that is “Be orderly”. She should ask that question after his child said that he was not late today. The woman asks the child not in an orderly way.

## **2.4 Implicature**

According to Yule (1996:35) Implicature is an additional conveyed meaning contained in the speaker’s utterances. Implicatures are the main examples of more being communicated than is said. However, to make them to be interpreted, some basic cooperative principle must first be assumed to be in operation (Yule, 1996:36).

Grice in Lyons (1977:593) divides implicature into two types that are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. The difference between them is the indicator device to calculate the additional meaning in the utterances. 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).

Conventional implicatures, according to Yule (1996:45) are not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. They do not have to occur in conversation, and they do not depend on special contexts for their interpretation. Here is an example of conventional implicature:

(12) a. Mary suggested black, but I choose white.

b. p&q (+> p is in contrast to q) (Yule, 1996:45)

From the example above, we can see that there is a contrast between Mary and I showed by a word 'but'. The English conjunction 'but' is one of the words associated with specific words and result in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used (Yule, 1996:45). The example shows that 'I' suggested two colors to the hearer, that are white and black. However, we can conclude that the implicit meaning of the sentences is 'I' prefers white to black.

Conversational implicature, according to Yule (1996:40) is an additional unstated meaning that has to be assumed in order to maintain the cooperative principle. 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). Here is an example of generalized conversational implicature:

(13) I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence.

From the example above, we know that the speaker does not use a special knowledge to utter his or her utterances by using an indefinite article. We can see that the implicature in the sentences is the garden and the child are not the speaker's. The speaker should be more specific with his or her utterances by following the quantity maxim.

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. Here is an example of particularized conversational implicature taken from Yule (1996:43)

(14) Ann: Where are you going with the dog?

Sam: To the V-E-T

In the local context of these speakers, the dog is known to recognize the word 'vet', and hate to being taken there, so Sam produces a more elaborate, spelled out version of his message, implicating that he does not want the dog to know the answer to the question just asked. Another examples of particularized conversational implicatures are the sentences or utterances that violate the maxims or the cooperative principles. The writer focuses on this kind of implicature since the implicature in the data are caused by the violation of the maxims or the cooperative principles.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In this chapter, the writer will review the method used in this research. This chapter consists of four subchapters. The first subchapter explains the type of research used in dealing with the data. The second subchapter explains the data source, population and sample. The third subchapter explains the method of collecting data, and the last subchapter explains the method of analyzing data.

#### **3.1 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.

## **3.2 Data Source, Population, and Sample**

### **3.2.1 Data Source**

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*. The writer uses the guest's utterances that show the response to the face threatening's utterances in the tv program as the secondary data. The utterances are transcribed by the writer after the writer watches the video.

### **3.2.2 Population and Sample**

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 the video, there are five segments and 202 utterances in total.

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. According to Hadi (1980:91), purposive sampling is a selection of a group of subjects based on certain characteristics that are considered to have a close

relation with the characteristics of the previous population. Therefore, in determining the sample, the writer uses purposive sampling technique to make sure that certain element is put in the sample.

### **3.3 Method of Collecting Data**

In this research, the writer uses method of non participant observation (*simak bebas libat cakap*) in collecting the data. The writer uses that method since the writer does not involve in the conversation that are used as the data of the research. 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.

The data are collected in accordance with the following steps:

1. The writer downloaded the video of *Mata Najwa* at [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com) episode *Rapor Wakil Rakyat*.
2. The writer made transcripts of the whole conversation in *Mata Najwa, Rapor Wakil Rakyat* edition.
3. The writer identified the conversation which only contained face threatening act performed by the host and also the guests' utterances that contain the response to the host's threatening questions in *Mata Najwa, Rapor Wakil Rakyat* edition.
4. The writer made transcripts of the chosen conversation or utterances to be analyzed.

### 3.4 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). The writer uses this method since the indicator device of this research is both of the speaker and the listener in a conversation. Distributional method is a method of analyzing data that the indicator device is the language itself (Sudaryanto, 1993:15). Here is a sample data that is analyzed with Identity method and Distributional method.

(15) Najwa: Apa yang bisa anda lakukan?

Priyo: Emm... mestinya semua fraksi - fraksi, harusnya, itu kan sudah milik publik dan memang keinginan masyarakat seperti itu ya diberitahukan saja. Keliatannya kami berlima sudah habis, bersama dengan badan kehormatan, sudah hampir habis akal untuk konteks yang satu ini. Tapi yang lain - lain juga banyak prestasi, tapi untuk mengenai masalah absensi ini kami sudah hampir kehilangan cara lagi bagaimana.

The writer analyzes the data (15) with Identity Method by describing each participant of the conversation and the context of the conversation. The writer also describes the role of each participant of the conversation based on the tv program. The writer finds out that Priyo as the guest of the tv program was a vice of the house representative and Najwa was the host of the tv program. The role of each

participant is very clear that is the host asks some questions related to the topic and the guest answers the questions. The writer also finds the context of the conversation based on the topic of the tv program. The context was the host talking about the issue of attendance list that is not reported publicly by some factions in the house of representative. Since Priyo was a vice of the house representative, the host asked him about the things that he can do to handle that issue. Distributional method is used in analyzing the data. First, the writer determines whether the question of the host threatens the guest's face or not. By asking such a question to the vice of the house representative, the host was doing face threatening act. The host wanted to know what the guest can do to handle the issue. In order to save his face, the guest was being incooperative. In short, the guest violated the maxim of relevance and made an implicit meaning in his utterances. In identifying the implicature, the writer firstly identifies the explicature meaning in the guest's utterances.

The data are analyzed in accordance with the following steps:

1. The writer watched the video of *Mata Najwa, Rapor Wakil Rakyat* edition and made the transcripts of the conversation.
2. The writer described the context between the host and the guest in *Mata Najwa, Rapor Wakil Rakyat* edition.
3. The writer described the utterances of the host that threat the guests's face in *Mata Najwa, Rapor Wakil Rakyat* edition.

4. The writer identified whether the guests violated the maxim or not when they answered the host's questions in *Mata Najwa, Rapor Wakil Rakyat* edition.
5. The writer identified the explicature of the guest's utterances linked to the context of the conversation before identified the implicit meaning. The writer also identified the reason for the use of conversational implicature by the guests in *Mata Najwa, Rapor Wakil Rakyat* edition.

## CHAPTER IV

### DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the writer will give brief explanation and analysis of the guests' answers in responding the question that threatens their face in *Mata Najwa*. By using related theories, the writer will also describe the implied meaning uttered by the guests and their reason for doing it. The guests of the tv program are the political figures in Indonesia that have a great power in the discussion.

The writer analyzes one episode of *Mata Najwa* that contains five segments. From the analysis, the writer found eleven conversations that contain five violations of Grice's maxims. Those violations are five violations of quantity maxim, three violations of relation maxim, and three violations of manner maxim. Besides, the writer also found the conversational implicature in each conversation between the host and the guest that contains violations of Grice's maxims.

## 4.1 Grice's Maxims

### 4.1.1 Maxim of Quantity

#### 4.1.1.1 Make your contribution as informative as is required

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.)

#### Context which happened before the conversation begins

The speakers of the tv program, *Mata Najwa*, talk about the target achievement by the members of the House of Representative. The members never reach the target that is made by themselves. One of the guests, Vera, says that they lack of the experts to help them so that the members never reach the target. However, the host is not satisfied with the reason of Vera and she keeps asking the same question. Then, another guest, Hidayat, explains that the House of Representative has the power to make the regulations, but the government also helps them. He also says that the government's role sometimes makes them fast,

and sometimes makes them slow. Then, the host asks Hidayat about the government's role, whether they often make them fast or they often make them slow.

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. From Hidayat's answer, we can see the violation of quantity maxim. In order to make a cooperative conversation, he should answer the question by just telling the host that the government's role often makes them fast or the government's role often makes them slow because the host only wants to know whether the government's role often makes them fast or slow. However, Hidayat gives an inappropriate answer.

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 thinks 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.

#### 4.1.1.2 Do not make your contribution more informative than required

In a conversation, the speakers should not give more information that is unnecessary than is needed.

(17) Najwa : *Mbak Rieke saya tertarik tuh, jadi ada praktek selama ini kalopun tidak datang jadi sekjennya atau sekertarisnya yang ngejar-ngejar tanda tangan dong mbak? Gitu? Mas Teguh betul tidak praktek yang seperti itu?*

Teguh : *Seperti yang dibidang fraksi, saya kebetulan sekertaris fraksi di PAN, e...saya memang tidak pernah mengalami situasi yang seperti e...Rieke kemukakan ya.*

Najwa : *Anda mendengar itu tapi?*

Teguh : *Ya, dan bagi saya misalkan, saya nggak berbeda dengan mbak Rieke melihat ya misalkan fingerprint itu. Artinya gini, perspektif saya sebenarnya lebih kepada memudahkan, jadi kalo misalkan sekarang era teknologi, misalkan tidak usah pake e..tanda tangan cukup misalkan dengan jempol, ya lebih baik, begitu kan.*

(In my perspective, I want to make an easy way. In this technology era, we don't need a signature. It's better with only a fingerprint.)

Context which happened before the conversation begins

The attendance list of the members of House of Representative becomes an interesting issue. There is an opinion saying that attendance list becomes the only one indicator to represent the performance of the House of Representative's members. The speakers of *Mata Najwa* discuss whether it is right that the attendance list becomes the only one indicator to represent the performance of the House of Representative's members. One of the guest, Rieke, said that the attendance list is not important and it can not represent the performance of the House of Representative's members. She also said that it is because there is a practice where some parties' secretaries ask their members to sign the attendance list although they do not come to the meeting. After hearing Rieke's statement, the host, Najwa, interested in this issue. Then, she asks the other guests, Teguh, about the practice.

Teguh is a secretary of a faction in the House of Representative. By asking whether the practice is really happen or not, Najwa threatens Teguh's face since she considers him as the people who run that practice. This question also threatens the faction that the guest belongs. The host really threatens the guest's face by giving another question after the guest answers the first question, that is whether the guest ever heard about the practice or not. Then, the question "*anda mendengar ini tapi?*" threatens not only the guest and his faction, but also the House of Representative's reputation. It makes the guest, Teguh, difficult to answer the question. There is a violation of the quantity maxim in Teguh's answer. The guest should answer the question by just telling the host that he ever

heard the practice in order to make a good conversation. However, the guest gives unnecessary and irrelevant information.

From the guest's answer, the writer sees some implicit meanings. The writer identifies the implicit meaning 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, Teguh. The explicature of the guest's utterances is that he gives irrelevant and unnecessary additional information that is he prefers the members of House of Representative use fingerprint to signature in filling the attendance list. The context is that Rieke, one of the guests, said that there is a practice where some parties' secretaries ask their members to sign the attendance list although they do not come to the meeting. After Rieke gives her statement, the host asks another guest who is a secretary of a faction whether the practice really happens or not. When the guest answers the question, the host asks another question that is whether he has ever heard that the practice really happens or not. After identifying the explicature of the guest's utterances linked to the context of the conversation, the writer identifies that the implicature of the guest's answer may be that he thinks that the attendance list filled by a signature has a big risk of the inappropriate practice. Another implicatures may be that the guest thinks that if the members of House of Representative fill the attendance list with a fingerprint, it will make the inappropriate practice will not happen again in the House of Representative since the inappropriate practice only happens because the signature can be manipulated by the members of House of Representative. It is showed by Rieke's statement that there is a practice where some parties'

secretaries ask their members to sign the attendance list although they do not come to the meeting. From the violation of quantity maxim done by the guest, the writer sees that the guest is trying to change the topic of the conversation. He says that the practice really happens and his statement makes the reputation of the House of Representative becomes bad in the public. By giving an unnecessary and irrelevant information right after giving his statement, he hopes that the host and the audiences will no longer focus on his statement that the practice really happens. It is the guest's reason for making implicatures in his utterances.

(18) Najwa : *Sekarang alat-alat pendukung kelengkapan dewan apa saja mbak?*

Vera : *Jadi begini, kita cuma punya dua staff ahli, tenaga ahli. Dua tenaga ahli.*

Najwa : *Yang untuk pribadi? Dua tenaga ahli pribadi, kemudian di komisi ada staff ahli tidak?*

Vera : *Ada staff ahli dan itu masing-masing hanya satu di bidang sub-bidangnya.*

Najwa : *Oke, kalau kemudian membahas undang-undang itu ada ahli yang datang untuk diminta bantuan kan?*

Vera : *Betul, tapi kan kami ini, kami ini kan jabatan publik, kami ini kan jabatan politik, bukan seperti e..bukan seperti kayak pemerintah, eksekutif. **Jangan disamakan dengan tadi eksekutif. Kami juga punya tugas lain diluar dari itu.***

(Don't assume that we are the same with the executive position. We have another job.)

### Context which happened before the conversation begins

In the House of Representative, there are three functions that must be done by the members. Every function has its target achievement. In the discussion, the speakers focus on legislative function. The members of House of Representative never reach the target that is made by themselves. It makes the legislative performance of the members get a low grade. One of the guests, Vera, gives her opinion about the reason for this problem. She says that the members of the House of Representative are also human who has their own business. She also says that the House of Representative in Indonesia lacks of experts to help the members to finish the regulation planning. Because of this lack of experts, the legislative performance of the House of Representative is not good and gets a low grade.

Vera is a member of the House of Representative. She is being asked by the host, Najwa about the experts who come to help her and the members of House of Representative to finish the regulation planning. The host's question threatens the guest since the host gives the rebuttal questions to her. It makes her being cornered. In Vera's answer, there is a violation of the quantity maxim. It is clear that Vera is not being cooperative in the conversation. She should answer the question by just telling the host that there are some experts brought in to help the members of House of Representative to finish the regulation planning, so that the conversation becomes cooperative. However, she gives unnecessary information.

The writer identifies the explicature of the guest's utterances and sees the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa,

and the guest, Vera in order to identify an implicit meaning in the guest's utterances. The explicature of the guest's utterances is that the guest does not want the host or the public assumes that the members of House of Representative are the same with the government who has an executive position. Her utterances also shows that she gives irrelevant additional information with the host's question. The context is that one of the guests, Vera, tells the host and the audiences about the reason why the members of House of Representative never reach the target that is made by themselves. She says that they lack of the experts to help them finish the regulation planning. Then, the host asks some questions to the guest about the experts that brought in to help them. From the explicature of the guest's utterances and the context of the conversation, the writer identifies the implicit meaning in the guest's utterances may that the works or responsibilities of the members of House of Representative are bigger than the government's. The government's are easier and even they have more experts to help them in working than the members of House of Representative. That is why the guest said that government is an executive position and different from the members of House of Representative. The writer sees that the guest, Vera, is trying to defend herself by giving unnecessary information. She defends herself since she is being cornered by the host's question that is although the experts had been brought in to help, the target still had not been reached. Besides, the writer also sees that the guest shows her dissatisfaction at the government because she has a lot of duties and she has to do the things that are not her responsibility. Those are the reasons of the guest for violating the quantity maxim and making an implicature in her utterances.

(19) Najwa : *Ada tidak mekanisme anda mengatur pertanggungjawaban sehingga rakyat bisa lihat di website?*

Vera : *Ada. Kita dari fraksi demokrat ada SOPnya bahwa betul kita menggunakan anggaran dengan baik. **Saya tidak tau dengan yang lain tapi kalau kami fraksi demokrat sangat ketat dalam pengawasan tersebut.***

(I don't know with the other factions, but our faction, Demokrat, is really strict with the financial monitoring.)

Context which happened before the conversation begins

The members of House of Representative in Indonesia get a great number of salaries, even their salary is the world's fourth biggest salary. Even so, the members of House of Representative say that they often get deficit. According to them, they are often asked for money by the residents in the area where they work for the things that are not actually become their responsibility. One of the guests, Vera, who comes from DKI Jakarta constituency says that her constituency is like the hell. She is often asked by residents to fund the cost of their giving birth or the cost of their parents' grave. However, the host thinks that the salary of members of the House of Representative is enough and certainly they rarely get deficit because they also get recess money. Then, the host asks the guest about the mechanism of accountability for the recess money.

Vera is being asked by the host, Najwa, about the mechanism of accountability for the recess money that she got so that the Indonesian citizen can see it through a website. This question threatens the guest since the host looks like doubting the guest to be held responsible for the recess money she got. Besides,

the answer of the guest will show her own performance and her party's performance, so that the question threatens her face and makes her difficult to answer it. From the guest's answer, it is clear that the guest violates the quantity maxim. In order to make a good conversation, the guest should answer the question by just telling the host that there is a mechanism of accountability for the recess money that she got so that the Indonesian citizen can see it through a website. However, the guest gives unnecessary information.

An implicit meaning in the guest's utterances is identified by the writer 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, Vera. The explicature of the guest's utterances is she gives irrelevant information with the guest's question that she does not know whether another faction have a strict rule in monitoring the use of the recess money or not while her faction has it. The context is that one of the guests, Vera, says that she often gets deficit since she is often asked for money by the residents for the things that are not actually her responsibility. However, the host thinks that the salary of members of the House of Representative is enough and certainly they rarely get deficit because they also get recess money, so that the host asks the guest about the mechanism of accountability for the recess money. From the explicature of the guest's utterances and the context of the conversation, the writer identifies that the implicit meaning of the guest's utterances may be that the responsibility of other parties for the recess money is debatable. There are maybe some parties that do not use the recess money appropriately so their responsibility is debatable. From the guest's answer,

the writer sees that the guest is trying to convince the host and the audiences that her party really holds responsibility for the recess money that is given to them by saying her party has SOP as the evidence. This is the reason why the guest, Vera, violates the quantity maxim and makes an implicature in her utterances.

(20) Najwa : *Oke kalau saya tanya anda, anda pernah mempublish itu di website? Seperti yang dilakukan Ahok? Ada? Websitenya apa mbak? Sekalian dapil Jakarta bisa dicek nih.*

Vera : *Saya ada. Boleh dilihat, boleh dilihat. **Bukan,bukan masalah mempublish, kegiatan saya hampir setiap hari blusukan.***

(It's not the matter of publication, I almost *blusukan* everyday.)

#### Context which happened before the conversation begins

The speakers of *Mata Najwa* talk about the mechanism of accountability for the recess money that the Democracy party got. One of the members, Vera, says that they have SOP as the evidence that they really hold responsibility for the using of the recess money. However, the host still wants to know more about the SOP and be convinced by them that they really have the SOP. Then, the host asks the guest whether she publishes the SOP in a website so that the Jakarta constituency can see it or not.

Vera is a member of the Democracy party. She becomes an informant of her party to give information about the SOP of her party. Najwa asks Vera about the SOP and it threatens her since the host gives the rebuttal questions to her. It makes

Vera cornered. Najwa's question also shows a hesitancy towards the party because she asks Vera whether she publishes the SOP or not. The question becomes more threatening since she mentions a political figure in Indonesia who always publishes his activity and his mechanism of responsibility to the public to be compared with the guest's performance. We can see the violation of the quantity maxim in the guest's utterances. We also can see that the guest is not cooperative in the conversation. In order to make the conversation being cooperative, she should answer the question by just telling the host that she publishes the SOP so that the Jakarta constituency can see it. However, the guest gives unnecessary information.

In order to identify the implicature meaning in the guest's utterances, the writer identifies the explicature of the guest's utterances and sees the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa, and the guest, Vera. The explicature of the guest's utterances is she gives a rebuttal that is according to her, the publication is not a matter. She also gives unnecessary information that is she always does a *blusukan*. The context is that Najwa asks Vera about the mechanism of accountability for the recess money that the Democracy party got. After Vera answers the question, Najwa still asks her about the SOP whether she publishes it or not. After identifying the explicature of the guest's utterances linked to the context of the conversation, the writer identifies that the implicature of the guest's utterances may that her party does not have to announce the accountability of something related to money to public in order to show their responsibility. Having a SOP is good enough to be an evidence of

responsibility. The writer sees that the guest, Vera, tries to change the topic. By giving another unnecessary information, she hopes that the host and the audiences are interested in talking about her activity, *blusukan*. This is the reason why the guest, Vera, gives a contribution more informative than is required.

#### 4.1.2 Maxim of Relation

##### 4.1.2.1 Be relevant

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 ni 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.)

Context which happened before the conversation begins

Relating to topic about the salary of the members of House of Representative that is the world's fourth biggest salary, the host of *Mata Najwa* announces that the members of House of Representative get allowances so that they should not find another commission or projects in the outside. However, one of the members, Siswo, says that the salary is not as big as she has assumed and he says that he often gets deficit since he is often asked for money by the residents for the things that are not actually his responsibility. Then, the host asks another member, Rieke, whether the allowances need to be removed or even need to be added.

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 be 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.

(22) Najwa : *Oke, ada mekanisme pertanggungjawaban tidak mbak Vera*

Vera : *Oh iya kita ada mekanisme pertanggungjawaban.*

Najwa : *Anda umumkan dimana agar bisa dicek uang itu untuk apa?*

Vera : ***Kita harus melaporkan kepada fraksi dan kesekjenan kalau tidak, tidak akan dicairkan lagi.***

(We have to report to the faction and the general secretary. If we don't, we won't get the money.)

#### Context which happened before the conversation begins

The speakers of the tv program, *Mata Najwa*, talk about the salary of members of House of Representative that is ranked fourth in the world's largest House of Representative payroll. However, some of the members of House of Representative say that they often get deficit because there are so many residents ask them to give money for their needs which are not their responsibility. Then, the host, Najwa, mentions the recess money received by the members of House of Representative amounting to one billion, which certainly does not make them get

the deficit. One of the guests, Vera, says that the amount of the recess money does not reach one billion and they get it only once every three months. Then Najwa asks Vera whether she has a mechanism of accountability for the recess money or not. Najwa also asks Vera where she announced the accountability mechanism so that people can see for what the money was.

As a member of a party, Vera's face is threatened because Najwa asks her about where she announced the accountability mechanism of recess money in her party so that people can see for what the money was. The host's question is a repetition question even it is more detail. Najwa gives the question after Vera answers the first question that is her party has the mechanism of accountability for the recess money. However, she repeats her question and even makes it more detail. It makes Vera cornered by the question since Najwa looks like doubting her party. Najwa's doubt is reinforced by the fact that many members of House of Representative do a corruption. It is clear that the host's question threatens the guest's face. We can see the violation of the relation maxim in the guest's answer. Because of this violation, the conversation between the host and the guest becomes uncooperative. The guest should answer the question by just telling the host where she announced the mechanism of accountability for the recess money, so that the conversation becomes cooperative. However, the guest gives irrelevant answer.

The writer identifies the explicature of the guest's utterances and sees the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa, and the guest, Vera in order to identify the implicit meaning contained in Vera's

answer. The explicature of the guest's utterances is she does not answer the host's question where she announced the mechanism of accountability for the recess money instead she gives irrelevant information that her party should report the mechanism of accountability for the recess money to the faction or the general secretary in order to get the money. The context is that Najwa mentions the recess money received by the members of House Representative who say that they often get deficit when their salary is big. Najwa also asks Vera whether her party has the mechanism of accountability for the recess money. Although Vera said that her party has the accountability mechanism, Najwa keeps repeating the question and even asks where she announced the accountability mechanism so that people can see for what the money was. After identifying the explicature of the guest's utterances linked to the context of the conversation, the writer finds the implicature contained in the guest's utterances may that the faction and general secretary are very strict in a financial control in the House of Representative so that the guest's party will not do a corruption because her party always gives a clear accountability for the recess money. From the violation of the relation maxim, the writer finds that the reason why the guest violates it and makes an implicature in her utterances is because she wants the host and the audiences will no longer focus on the question about where she announced the mechanism of accountability for the recess money.

(23) Najwa : *Dan dana blusukan itu kan didapat dari uang reses, uang itu ada mekanisme pertanggungjawabannya?*

Vera : *Justru itu. Karena saya merasa saya punya tanggungjawab saya diberikan oleh rakyat uang itu saya kembalikan kepada rakyat.*

(That's the point. Since I got the money from the people, I have to give it back to them.)

Context which happened before the conversation begins

The members of House of Representative in Indonesia get recess money with a very large number. The host of *Mata Najwa*, Najwa, asks about the mechanism of accountability for the money to one of the guests, Vera. After answering the question, Vera gives an unnecessary information that since she became a member of House of Representative, she always did *blusukan*. However, Najwa makes Vera's statement as a gap to repeat her question about the mechanism of accountability for the recess money. Then she says that Vera gets the *blusukan* fee from recess money and she repeats her question about the mechanism.

Vera is being asked by the host about the mechanism of accountability for the recess money that is used as *blusukan* fee. This question threatens Vera's face since the question is a repetition and a form of doubt. Since the previous question has not been answered correctly by Vera, then Najwa repeats the question again because she doubted Vera. In Indonesia, there are many issues about the members of House of Representative doing corruption and the repetition of the question clearly shows that Najwa doubts the mechanism of accountability for the recess money. Najwa also indirectly considers that Vera's party does a corruption. The host's question not only threatens the guest's face, but also the party that the guest

belongs. The conversation between Najwa and Vera is uncooperative since Vera violates the relation maxim. Vera should answer the question by just telling the host that she has the mechanism of accountability for the recess money that is used as *blusukan* fee. However, the guest gives irrelevant answer.

In order to identify the implicit meaning of the guest's utterances, the writer identifies the explicature of the guest's utterances and sees the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa, and the guest, Vera. The explicature of the guest's utterances is she does not answer whether she has the mechanism of accountability of the recess money or not instead she gives irrelevant information that she always gives the money back to the people because she got the money from them. The context is that Najwa mentions the recess money received by the members of House of Representative. She also asks Vera about the recess money that is used as her *blusukan* fee. Then, from the explicature of the guest's utterances and the context of the conversation, the writer identifies that the implicit meaning of the guest's utterances may be that recess money is earned from Indonesian people through the payment of taxes and this money should be allocated to Indonesian people's needs, not for the personal benefits of members of House of Representative. The writer finds the reason of the guest for violating the relation maxim and making an implicature is because she wants to show the public that she does not do a corruption since she gives the money given by the people to the people.

### 4.1.3 Maxim of Manner

#### 4.1.3.1 Avoid obscurity of expression

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.)

#### Context which happened before the conversation begins

The members' attendance list in the House of Representative should be a public information in Indonesia. However, the attendance list becomes very difficult to get because there are some factions in the House of Representative that sealed on the attendance list. They hide the attendance list from the public whereas it becomes a benchmark to assess the performance of the members of House of Representative by the people. Then, the host, Najwa, asks one of the guests, Rieke, about her opinion that different from public opinion that is the attendance list is actually not important.

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.

(25) Najwa : *Mbak Vera kalau tidak salah anda yang merasa seperti itu salah satunya kan? Tidak penting itu kehadiran?*

Vera : *Saya kira e..saya agak sedikit e..berbeda. Karena kalo absen itu bukan salah satu indikator keberhasilan anggota DPR itu dalam tampil sebagai wakil rakyat.*

(I have a different opinion because an attendance list can't be one of success indicator of the members of House of Representative.)

Context which happened before the conversation begins

The speakers of *Mata Najwa* talk about about the member of the House of Representative's attendance list. There are two opinions in the discussion, they are an opinion that attendance list is important and an opinion that attendance list is not important. Najwa asks a panelist, Panji, why they have to pay more attention to the attendance list. Panji analogizes a student who asked his teacher why he was not in school and the student answered that his absence does not mean anything. It is clearly not true because the student should be present at the school so that he became proficient. According to Panji, this also applies to members of

House of Representative. They must be present at each meeting in the House of Representative so that they understand the problems that exist in Indonesia and they will be able to get over the problems. Then, Najwa asks to one of the guests, Vera, about her own opinion that attendance list is not important.

As a member of the House of Representative who says that attendance list is not important, Vera's face is threatened by Najwa because of her question. Najwa's question threatens Vera's face since Najwa directly shows her objection to Vera's opinion by asking the question right after Panji's explanation of how important the attendance list is. We can see the violation of the manner maxim contained in Vera's utterances. This violation shows that Vera does not cooperate with Najwa in the conversation. Vera should be cooperative in answering the question by just telling the host the reason why the attendance is not important for her. However, the guest's answer leads the host in confusion and makes her difficult to get the guest's point.

The writer identifies the explicature of the guest's utterances and sees the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa, and the guest, Vera, so that the writer can identify the implicit meaning contained in the guest's answer. The explicature of the guest's utterances is she does not answer that the attendance list is important instead she gives an answer that makes the audiences perform a wrong response that is she thinks that attendance list can not be an indicator success for the members of House of Representative. The context is that Najwa asks an opinion to one of panelist, Panji, about the important of attendance list. Then, Najwa asks Vera about her own opinion that attendance

list is not important. From the explicature of the guest's utterances and the context of the conversation, the writer identifies that the implicature contained in the guest's utterances may be that members of House of Representative should be considered as successful people's representatives when they are able to resolve the any problems that occur in Indonesia and really able to consider the people's aspirations. From the guest's answer, the writer sees that she wants to change the people's mindset about the indicator device for assess the members of House of Representative's performance. Besides, the writer also sees that the guest does not prepare answers to the host's question that is identified by the word 'e...' so that she gives an answer with an obscurity expression which makes the listeners difficult to get her point. Those are the reasons why the guest violates the manner maxim and makes an implicature in her utterances.

#### **4.1.3.2 Be brief**

In a conversation, the speakers should avoid giving contribution that makes the sentence become unnecessary long.

(26) Najwa : *Apa yang bisa anda lakukan?*

Priyo : *Emm... mestinya semua fraksi – fraksi, harusnya, itu kan sudah milik publik dan memang keinginan masyarakat seperti itu ya diberitahukan saja. Kelihatannya kami berlima sudah habis, bersama dengan badan kehormatan, sudah hampir habis akal untuk konteks yang satu ini. Tapi yang lain-lain juga banyak prestasi, tapi untuk mengenai*

*masalah absensi ini kami sudah hampir kehilangan cara lagi bagaimana.*

(The factions should announce their attendance list because it is the people's want. We and the Honorary Council have run out of ways for this context, but for another contexts there are so many achievements. Only the attendance list's problem that makes us confused.)

Context which happened before the conversation begins

In Indonesia, there are several ways to assess the performance of the members of House of Representative done by Indonesian people. One of them is to look at the attendance list of the members of House of Representative. By looking at the attendance list, people can see which members of House of Representative are actively attending meetings and providing solutions to the problems in Indonesia. Therefore, the attendance list of the members of House of Representative should be public information. However, some factions in the House of Representative do not show their attendance list and seem like hiding it from the public. It makes Indonesian people difficult to assess the performance of the members of House of Representative, so that the speakers of *Mata Najwa* talk about this issue. Then, the host, Najwa, asks one of the guests, Priyo, what he can do as a vice chairman of the House of representative.

Priyo is a vice chairman of the House of representative. He has a high position in the House of Representative so that he is expected to make the performance of the members becomes better. By asking what he can do, Najwa threatens his face because Najwa assumes that Priyo has not been able to handle

the behaviour of his members that hide the attendance list that should be a public information. Indirectly, Priyo is regarded as a vice chairman who is not assertive since he lets this problem occur. From the guest's answer, we can see the violation of the manner maxim that is be brief. In order to make a good conversation, the guest should answer the question by just telling the host what he can do as a vice chairman of the House of Representative in dealing with the attendance list problem that is not published by some factions in the House of Representative. However, the guest's answer is very long, not brief and not to the point. In other words, the prolixity in his utterance is quite obvious and it makes listeners difficult to get his point.

The writer sees an implicit meaning of the guest's utterances. In order to identify it, the writer identifies the explicature of the guest's utterances and sees the context which happened before the conversation begins between the host, Najwa, and the guest, Priyo. The explicature of the guest's answer is he does not answer the things that he can do to solve the problem instead he give an unnecessary long answer that is the factions should announce the attendance list and the attendance list's problem makes him confused. The context is that Najwa explains the problem of how hard the *Mata Najwa* team to obtain an attendance list of the members of the House of Representative which should be a public information. It is because there are some factions in the House of Representative who refuse to provide the attendance list to be informed to the public. Najwa asks Priyo what he can do as a vice chairman of the House of Representative. Logically, if the vice chairman of the House of Representative can act decisively

to ask the factions in the House of Representative to inform the public about the attendance list, then the public will not find it difficult to assess the performance of the members of the House of Representative. after identifying the explicature of the guest's utterances linked to the context of the conversation, the writer identifies the implicature of the guest's utterances may that many factions in the House of Representative hide the attendance list because their members rarely attend the meeting so that they do not want the public knows this fact, but their attitude in hiding the attendance list makes people consider the members of the House of Representative's performance is bad. The guest's answer shows that the guest, Priyo, is trying to show to public that he had acted as best as possible by bringing the name of Honorary Council in blaming the factions that do not want to publish their attendance list. Besides, the writer also sees that Priyo does not want to cause an internal problem in the House of Representative because of his statement that is he blames the factions for not publishing their attendance list by saying a good thing about them. Those are the reasons why the guest violates the manner maxim and makes an implicature in his utterances.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

In this chapter, the writer will show the conclusion based on the analysis which contains conversational implicature identified in the utterances produced by the guests in the tv program *Mata Najwa, Rapor Wakil Rakyat* Edition. The utterances are the answers to the host's questions.

After analyzing the data, the writer concludes:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. The guests' reasons for violating the maxims in their utterances are so various. The writer will explain the guests' reasons as follows:
  1. They have no courage to show the congruity in the House of Representative because it may trigger an internal problem so that they violate the maxim and make implicatures in their utterances to deliver their meaning indirectly to the public.

2. Most of them want to change the topic in order to make the host and the audiences will no longer focus in the threatening questions that are addressed to them.
3. They want to defend themselves from the threatening questions and want to show their disappointment to either the government or their own colleague in the House of Representative.
4. Most of them want to convince the public that they are working properly and they never do an inappropriate thing.
5. Some of them wants to change the public's mindset about the assessment of the members of the House of Representative's performance.

Eventhough the guests' reasons are so various, 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.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 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](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H5_3Do4317E)>
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press