

An Analysis of Conversational implicatures During the Debate between 2012 Candidates of DKI Jakarta Governor

Dony Wijaya Kusumah
English Language and Literature
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
donykusumah1992@USA.com

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to investigate the conversational implicatures during the debate between 2012 candidates of Jakarta Governor and to identify which maxims the candidates failed to observe, also to identify what implicatures that are attained from the violated maxims. Data were taken from DKI Jakarta governor candidates debate aired on Metro TV on August 18, 2012. Data relevant to implicatures were marked and numbered. The data were analyzed by classifying conversations with maxim violations. The results show that the governor candidates commit flouting towards Grice's (1975) maxims. The maxim the candidates violated the most was relevance maxim. Furthermore, the flouting occurs due to several factors comprising lack of knowledge, insufficient evidence, and avoidance answering questions in purpose. However, even though some violations were done, some of the candidates were able to use sentences or utterances in compliance with the cooperative principles since only half of the data that are violated.

Keywords: *Conversational Implicatures, Debate, Grice's Maxims, Maxims Flouting*

INTRODUCTION

Conversation is essentially a spoken language event between two or more participants which generally occurs in a relaxed atmosphere. Conversation is a container that allows the realization of the principles of cooperation (maxims) and decorum in speaking events. In order to do so, an understanding towards conversational implicatures is needed, so that what is said and implied can be understood well by the hearer.

There are many definitions about implicatures from many language experts. Implicature can be defined as a proposition implied by utterances of a sentence in a context, even though the proposition itself is not a part of the utterance previously stated (Mujiyono, 1996). In the same vein Brown and Yule (1996) defined implicatures as what it might be meant, suggested, or is intended by the speakers which are different from what is actually being said. That argument rests on a different meaning from what actually the speaker wants to deliver with literal meaning of the speech.

Conversational implicatures are used to describe the meaning behind

what is actually written or said or something that is implied. Conversational implicatures are part of pragmatics studies in which an implicit meaning of a conversation is different from the literal meaning of a conversation. In order to analyze the kind of implicatures during the process of communication, Grice's (1975) cooperative principles (maxims) are used as tools to assess the implicit meaning behind the speaker's utterance.

Paradoxically enough, more often than not, people fail to observe the maxims whether deliberately or accidentally. There are five major ways of failing to observe a maxim, namely: flouting (to lead the addressee to look for a covert, implied meaning), violating (prevents or at least discourages the hearer from seeking for implicatures), infringing (occurs when a speaker fails to observe the maxim, although s/he has no intention of generating an implicature and no intention of deceiving), opting out (unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires.), and suspending (no expectation on the part of any

participant that one or several maxims should be observed).

Research on conversational implicatures has investigated a number of areas such as language acquisition, comedy, reality show and also debate. Among others are Pessy (2003) and Tuti Tresnawati (2005). Pessy (2003) studied child acquisition of pragmatics by an Indonesian boy who focuses on speech acts and implicature. His findings reveal that the boy had obtained four of the five types of speech acts, namely: representative, expressive, directive, and commissive. Moreover, implicature is derived from phrases the boy used when he wants something.

On the other hand, Tuti (2005), through her analysis in “Bajaj Bajuri”, found that the discourse of this comedy contains many conversational implicatures as a result of the violations of Grice's (1975) cooperative principles and Leech's (1999) principles of politeness. Funny effect that supports the success of the humor can be realized because of the phenomenon of implicature as its main element.

This phenomenon has inspired the researcher of this study to conduct research on conversational implicatures during a debate between 2012 candidates of DKI Jakarta Governor. A debate between DKI Jakarta Governor is chosen because Jakarta is considered as the capital city of Indonesia. Thus, it is taken to be the battle ground for all political parties. Besides, during this election the candidates come from outside of Jakarta which makes it interesting. The data analysis will focus on the candidates' answers towards panelist's questions in order to find what maxims fail to be observed and to show what the candidates should have been said to avoid some violations to Grice (1975)'s cooperative principles.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Grice (1975)'s Cooperative Principlless

In order to communicate, it is important to follow some rules so that the communication runs smoothly. Grice (1975) in Parera (2004), a philosopher who developed cooperative principles underlying the use of language, says “make your

conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged,” which means that interlocutors have to keep a conversation to the point and clear.

In a conversation, the participants follow the cooperative principles and the maxims in order to deliver their information. Even though sometimes they do not realize what we actually say. This makes the listener assume many conclusions during the process of inference. For an example, when one says “boys will always be boys”, this kind of sentence does not have the communicative value because the sentence is only a clear statement. However, when the sentence occurs in a conversation, the information that is given by the speaker must have more meanings than what is actually being expressed. This information is then called "implicatures" (Lysons, 1977).

According to Grice (1975) in Jannedy (1994), there are rules that control the communication which are called maxims. There are four maxims : 1) maxim of quality 2) maxim of

quantity 3) maxim of relevant and 4) maxim of manner.

Maxim of Quality

There are two important rules that need to be considered in order to have this maxim applied during a conversation:

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

For example:

Dony : I thought you can fix my watch!!

Syifa : Well, I thought I could.

In this conversation, it is clear that Syifa does not obey the second rule.

Maxim of Quantity

In order to achieve this maxim, it is important to make contribution as informative as required for the current purpose of the exchange.

For example:

Dony : Which one do you prefer, tea or milk?

Syifa : I like tea, but only with less sugar.

During this conversation, Syifa gave too much information more than it is required.

Maxim of Relevance

This maxim is sometimes called "a super maxim" knowing that almost all conversations rely on this maxim. The information that is given must be relevant to the context that is being discussed.

For example:

Dony : Hey, is Caesar coming to this party?

Syifa : Well, I saw her getting on an angkot.

During this conversation, Dony concludes that Caesar is coming to the party because Syifa sees her getting on an angkot. However, if Caesar's destination is not to come to the party, then the information that Syifa gave is not relevant.

Maxim of Manner

This maxim of manner is as important as other maxims. The use of this maxim is to help the listeners so that they will not be confused of the information that is given. The information should avoid ambiguity

and obscurity of expression. It has to be brief and be orderly, too. For example:

Dony: Just open!

Syifa: A moment please, still feeling cold

During this conversation, Dony creates an ambiguity by saying the word "open". Dony does not say what should be opened by Syifa. Moreover, the word "still feeling cold" uttered by Syifa also violates manner maxim. Syifa's utterance could be interpreted to anything.

Departing from the information above, it is clear that there are norms whenever someone is about to convey an idea. However, in daily conversations, it is not uncommon to see people violate these Grice (1975)'s maxims. Even Grice (1975) himself says that a conversation will not be fun if we always stick to the rule. The conversation will become much alive when one or more of those maxims is being violated. Moreover, sometimes the violations are done intentionally in order to save someone's face. For example:

Dony : Hey! What do you think of my new sweater?

Syifa : Have u seen Netta??

This conversation shows that Syifa is actually disobeying maxim of relevant. Syifa does not think that Dony's new sweater suits him which makes Syifa change the entire subject of the conversation.

Conversational Implicatures

Grice (1975) in Thomas (1995), says there are two types of implicatures which are conventional implicatures and conversational implicatures. A conventional implicature is an implicature that occurs as a result of reasoning logic. This kind of implicature usually can be found when the word "even" is used in a sentence. A good example is evident in the sentence: "even the president comes to Cameron Diaz's wedding!" by looking at the sentence it can be assumed that a president usually does not go to a celebrity wedding. While conversational implicatures, according to Levinson (1997), is a concept that is important in the process of communication. He found that this concept 1) explains the facts of the language use that cannot be reached by linguistics theory, 2) gives an overview

about the additional meanings that a sentence might have, 3) simplifies the structure and description of the semantic contents

Implicatures Scale

Certain information is always delivered by choosing a word which declares a scale value. Implicatures scale is a scale that shows the value of the goods of the service which is as follows:

- a. Quantity : Some, few, little, many, all
- b. Frequency : Sometimes, often, always
- c. Temperatures : Cold, warm Hot
- d. Certainty : Perhaps, maybe, surely

Preference given scale or statement against a phenomenon is a negative value or a denial of the high or low value. In other words, if in a conversation the speaker uses or utters one of these scales, it implies the denial or the counter of the negative value

Hedges

The maxims of a conversation are unspoken assumptions in a

conversation. Usually, we assume that people will provide numbers of accurate, correct, relevant information and try to put clarity to it. However, there are several types of utterance used by speaker to mark that such utterances are harmful when they don't fully follow the principles. This type of utterance is called hedges (Mujiyono, 1996).

Speaker often shows that they care about cooperation principle when they use hedges. In quality maxim, a good interaction can be measured by range of expressions used which shows that everything being said may not be fully accurate

METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive qualitative study, for it involves descriptive data in the form of written and spoken data (Sudarma, 1993). The descriptive nature of the study is visible from the main goal of this study which is to reveal what cooperative principles failed to observe by the governor candidates. In order to solve the problem of this research, there are two steps taken namely data collection and data analysis.

Data Collection

Data were taken from DKI Jakarta governor candidates debate aired on Metro TV on August 4, 2012. Data relevant to implicatures were marked and number. This method is called comprehension method as proposed by Sudaryanto (1993). The procedures of this study were undertaken by the process of recording the candidates' debate show, Transcribing the results of these candidates debate, identifying the conversation according to Grice (1975)'s theory of cooperative principles and classifying the violated conversational maxims.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed by classifying conversations which failed to observe. Describing some additional meanings derived or called implicature comes after the process of identification is done. These conversational implicatures were obtained by interpreting the non-observant conversations according to Grice (1975)'s maxims. Interpretation can be done by connecting the data with linguistic context and social

context which includes the elements of situation, culture and ideology

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

.During the process of analysis, there are some interesting findings regarding the violations of Grice's (1975) cooperative principles done by DKI Jakarta governor candidates. There are 44 utterances in total during this debate (including a presenter, two panelists, and three debaters). The utterances coming from the debaters are only 24. However the amount of violations (flouting maxim) done by the governor candidates when answering to panelists questions are 12 utterances. The relatively small number of violations i.e 12 utterances signifies the candidate were fairly aware of the cooperative principles.

Here is the table of frequency that includes the entire data of the flouting maxims:

Maxims	Total
Quality Maxim	3
Quantity Maxim	1
Relevance Maxim	5
Manner Maxim	3

One the examples of the violation is as follows:

[The root of problems in the first question is about Jakarta's complex problems. Here is the question asked by the panelist:

"...So, what will you do, both the first and the second candidate, to overcome these problems? I wish that your responses will neither be normative nor rhetoric. Instead, we wish that your responses are specific towards those problems. Thank you".

[Here is how Basuki Purnama answered to the question]

"...I have set the goal to start the hardwork, starting from the first day, If God allows us to govern Jakarta. Honorable ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate what has been said, but I know Jakarta, I know the problems and I also know the solutions..."

From the data above, Basuki Purnama did not provide any specific answer related to the question. Basuki only provided a confirmation, a rhetorical answers as it is mentioned "...I know Jakarta, I know the problems and I also know the solutions...". By saying such an utterance, Basuki only tried to keep his positive image in front

of the audience knowing that he and his partner wanted to be elected as the next couple to rule Jakarta instead of answering the question. However, this caused a violation towards the quality maxim.

What can be inferred from Basuki's response is Basuki seems to avoid answering the questions. This may suggest that Basuki is lack of knowledge of specific strategies to overcome Jakarta's complex problems, which made him not confident enough to provide the necessary answers.

Departing from the data above it is shown that the flouting of relevance maxim is the one that occurs the most during the debate between the 2012 Candidate of Jakarta Governor. Such a phenomenon takes place because not only do the candidates have to focus on the questions being asked, but they need to be acknowledged by the audience in order to be elected as the next Jakarta Governor.

The cooperative principles in a conversation comprise four types of maxim which speakers need to be aware of and recognized, in this case within a television debate program.

Generally, the speakers involved in a conversation cooperate with one another to achieve a goal thus the collaboration between each factor is a very important factor.

Generally, the statements from the candidates in the debate program are true, relevant and attempted at being clear. When a candidate states, "I know Jakarta, I know its problems", the television audience will assume that the candidate really knows the problem or, at least, possesses some facts about the thing discussed and does not try to deceive its speaking partner.

The findings in this research comprise the flouting of four maxim types. The data were taken from one of the television program, a public debate in Jakarta's governor election. Referring to the findings, it is revealed that the candidates committed flouting on conversational maxims when they provide responses towards panelists' questions. Such flouting depicts that the candidates committed violations due to their personal purposes.

In a debate session, the candidates seem to provide responses that are unclear, irrelevant, groundless and

unnecessary. The floutings of maxim are intriguing to be scrutinized since hidden meaning/intentions of the speaker can be uncovered.

In addition to that, information communicated by the governor candidates is also done through by the choice of a word showing a value scale. During the process of analysis, it is shown that quantity scale occurs the most. Such a phenomenon happens because a debater tends to show their power by showing the scope of their capability in doing things. This can be concluded by looking at the most used words in his utterances which is "all, a lot of and many". Even though a debater realizes that when he says "all" it does not really cover the whole thing, he tends to keep using it to hide his denial or the counter towards the negative value. This result matches Saragih (2008) theory about quantity scale which is if in a conversation the speaker uses or utters one of these scales, it implies the counter of the negative value.

Besides the conversational maxim, there are also hedges in this research. The hedges are used by the governor candidate to show that they

care about the cooperativeness principle and it will be very harmful if the hedges are not used in their utterances. Based on the analysis on hedges, it is found that hedges are:

- (1) used to show the speaker's awareness towards some rules in doing a communication
- (2) related to all the maxims
- (3) used by all the governors or vice governors to respect all member during the debate

From this hedges, it can be concluded that even though governors/vice governors do not have a background knowledge towards pragmatics, they are fully aware of the rules of communication and generally respect them.

Departing from all the data analysis above, starting from the analysis towards maxim, relevance maxim is the most violated one. This phenomenon occurs because a debater, almost in every utterance that s/he conveys, intends to deliver his/her intentions/interests to the audience. In this context, a debate forum, a debater is forced to say anything that makes him/herself good in order to intrigue the audience to vote for him/her during

the election. This is also proven by Tuti (2005) with her analysis in a comedy "Bajaj Bajuri" that relevance maxim is violated intentionally in order to deliver a particular purpose, which is to entertain the audience.

Moreover, the relevance maxim can also be used as a tool to avoid a direct question which a debater does not know the answer to. Instead of answering to the question relevantly, when a debater find himself in a position of confusion, he intends to answer the question with something that can make them more desirable by the audience. In other words, it can be said that this is one of the best tools to hide one's weakness during a debate.

In conclusion, the implicatures attained can be classified as the 'specialized conversation implicatures because this debate is broadcast in one of the television stations with a special context through comprehending meanings by interferencing. The hearer should firstly assume that the speakers are being cooperative and are intended to deliver information.

This research is complementary and completing. It is complementary because this research uses Grice's

(1975) cooperative principles in analyzing the implicatures in Jakarta's governor debate. Then it is completing because this research puts the existing political issue in the Jakarta's governor election into focus.

CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing the data, it can be concluded that, (1) the governor and vice governor candidates commit flouting towards conversational maxim namely quality maxim, relevance maxim, quantity maxim, and *manner* maxim in communicating their response towards panelists' questions. The relevance maxim happened to be the most violated maxim due to the purpose of DKI Jakarta governor candidates to be acknowledged by the audiences or to avoid specific questions.

(2) The flouting occurs mainly due to several factors comprising lack of comprehension on what is being asked, lack of knowledge on the field being asked by the panelists, insufficient evidence on the existing problems in Jakarta and psychological aspects such as nervousness and lack

of confidence resulting in the flouting of conversational maxim.

Furthermore, (3) the candidates are not aware that they commit the flouting of conversational maxim when they give their responses. The responses communicated are irrelevant to the panelist's question, unclear, groundless and unnecessarily excessive. Moreover, the candidates also commit flouting of more than one type of conversational maxim.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Gillian dan George Yule. (1996). *Analisis Wacana* (edisi terjemahan oleh I. Soetikno). Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation, Syntax and Semantics, vol.3* edited by P. Cole and J. Morgan, Academic Press
- Jannedy, Stefanie. (1994). *Language Files: Sixth Edition*. Ohio: Ohio State University Press Columbus.
- Levinson, C. Stephen. (1997). *Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. (1977). *Language, Meaning and Context*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mujiyono, W. (1996). *Implikatur Percakapan Anak Usia Sekolah Dasar*. Malang: IKIP Malang.
- Parera, J.D. (2004). *Teori Semantik: Edisi Kedua*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Pessy. (2003). *A Study of Speech Acts and Implicature Acquisition and The Acquisition of A Four-Years Old Indonesian Boy*. Skripsi S1. Jakarta: Universitas Kristen Petra.
- Saragih, Amrin. (2006). *Bahasa dalam Konteks Sosial*. Medan: Program Pasca sarjana Unimed.
- Saragih, Amrin. (2008). *Pragmatik*. Medan: Program Pascasarjana USU.
- Sudarma, T. Fatimah. (1993). *Metode Linguistik: Rancangan Metode dan Kajian*. Bandung: Eresco.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Thomas, Jenny. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London/New York: Longman.
- Tresnawati, Tuti. (2005). *Implikatur Percakapan Sebagai Unsur Utama Pengungkapan Humor Dalam Wacana Komedi Situasi Bajaj Bajuri*. Skripsi S1. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang.