



EXPRESSIONS OF SOCIAL CRITICISM IN “SENTILAN SENTILUN” TALK SHOW

A THESIS

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

Submitted by:
Ni Luh Putu Dewi Asih Astika
13020111130027

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG
2015**

PRONOUNCEMENT

I honestly confirm that I compile this thesis by myself and without taking any results from other researchers in S-1, S-2, S-3, and in diploma degree of any university. I also ascertain that I do not quote any material from other publications or someone's paper except from the references mentioned.

Semarang, September 2015

Ni Luh Putu Dewi Asih Astika

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

When the going gets tough, the tough get going.

-Joseph P. Kennedy-

You may never know what results come of your action, but if you do nothing there will be no result.

-Mahatma Gandhi-

This thesis is dedicated to my beloved family who kept encouraging and supporting me and to my friends and everyone who helped me accomplish this thesis.

APPROVAL

Approved by,
Thesis Advisor

Mytha Candria, S.S, M.A
NIP. 19770118200912 2 001

VALIDATION

Approved by
S-1 Thesis Examination Committee
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University
on September 25, 2015

Chair Person

Dr. J. Herudjati P, M.Sc
NIP. 195303271981031006

First Member

Prihantoro, S.S, M.A
NIP. 198306292006041002

Second Member

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum
NIP. 196610041990012001

Third Member

Hadiyanto, S.S, M.Hum
NIP. 197407252008011013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise be to God the Almighty, who has given strength and true spirit, so this thesis entitled “Expressions of Social Criticism in ‘Sentilan Sentilun’ Talk Show” came to a completion. I take this opportunity to express gratitude to all people who have contributed to the completion of this research report. My special gratitude is dedicated to my advisor Mytha Candria, S.S, M.A, who has given her continuous guidance, helpful correction, moral support, advice, and suggestion, so that this thesis came into completion.

My sincere gratitude also goes to the following:

1. Dr. Redyanto Noor, M.Hum, as the Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University;
2. Sukarni Suryaningsih S.S, M.Hum, as the Head of English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University;
3. All lectures of English Department who have guided and shared their knowledge;
4. All academic staff in the Faculty of Humanities who gave their contributions;
5. My parents and family for giving their supports and encouragement; and
6. All friends in class A and linguistics class.

I realize that this thesis is still far from perfection. Therefore, I would be glad to receive any constructive criticisms and advices to make this thesis better.

Finally, I hope that this thesis will be useful to the readers who wish to learn something about implicatures.

Semarang, September 25, 2015

Ni Luh Putu Dewi Asih Astika

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE.....	i
PRONOUNCEMENT.....	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION.....	iii
APPROVAL.....	iv
VALIDATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
ABSTRACT.....	x
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Research Question.....	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study.....	2
1.4. Previous Studies.....	3
1.5. Organization of the Writing.....	6
CHAPTER 2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	8
2.1. Pragmatics.....	8
2.2. Pragmatic Meaning.....	8
2.3. Grice’s Cooperative Principles.....	10
2.3. Implicature	13
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHOD.....	18
3.1. Types of Research.....	18
3.2. Data, Population, Samples and Data Sources.....	19
3.3. Methods of Collecting Data.....	19
3.4. Methods of Analyzing Data.....	20
CHAPTER 4 DISCUSSION.....	22
4.1. Maxim Violations Found in “Sentilan Sentilun” Talk Show	22
4.2. The Violation of Quantity Maxim	23

4.3. The Violation of Quality Maxim	28
4.4. The Violation of Relevance Maxim	33
4.5. The Violation of Manner Maxim	36
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION	42
REFERENCES	44
APPENDIX	

ABSTRAK

Skripsi berjudul “Expressions of Social Criticisms in ‘Sentilan Sentilun’ Talk Show” ini bertujuan menjelaskan pelanggaran maksim apa saja yang ditemukan dalam sebuah acara televisi berjudul “Sentilan Sentilun”, jenis implikatur yang digunakan untuk menyampaikan kritik sosial, dan kritik sosial yang disampaikan oleh para penutur dalam acara tersebut. Teori yang digunakan adalah teori implikatur dan prinsip kerjasama Grice (dalam Levinson, 1983).

Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif karena data yang digunakan berupa kata dan hasilnya berupa data tertulis. Metode kuantitatif juga digunakan dalam penelitian ini untuk menghitung ujaran-ujaran yang mengandung kritik sosial dan membuat persentase dari pelanggaran maksim. Data yang menjadi objek penelitian ini adalah acara televisi “Sentilan Sentilun” dari episode 7 Juli 2014 sampai episode 27 Oktober 2014. Teknik yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data adalah teknik simak bebas libat cakap, unduh, dan teknik catat. Sementara itu, teknik pengambilan *sample* menggunakan *purposive* dan *random sampling technique*. *Purposive sampling technique* digunakan untuk mengambil ujaran yang merupakan data dalam penelitian ini yaitu ujaran yang mengandung kritik sosial, sedangkan *random sampling technique* digunakan untuk mengambil ujaran yang akan dianalisis. Dalam menganalisa data, saya menggunakan metode padan pragmatik dan metode reflektif-introspektif.

Penelitian ini menghasilkan kesimpulan bahwa ada 4 pelanggaran maksim yang ditemukan dalam acara televisi “Sentilan Sentilun”, yaitu pelanggaran terhadap maksim kuantitas, maksim kualitas, maksim relevansi, dan maksim pelaksanaan. Ujaran yang mengandung implikatur kritik sosial dalam acara ini berjumlah 24 ujaran dan pendengar membutuhkan pengetahuan yang sama dengan penutur untuk memahami kritik sosial yang disampaikan. Oleh karena itu, implikatur dalam acara ini merupakan *particularized conversational implicatures*. Kritik sosial yang ditemukan dalam penelitian ini merupakan kritik terhadap pemerintah Indonesia terkait beberapa kasus yang terjadi di Indonesia, yaitu korupsi, penyuapan, dan kemiskinan.

Kata kunci: Kritik sosial, implikatur, Sentilan Sentilun

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains background of the study (1.1.), research questions (1.2.), purpose of the study (1.3.), previous studies (1.4.) and organization of the writing (1.5.).

1.1. Background of the Study

I chose social criticism as the topic of my study because of three reasons. First of all, social criticism is one common way to communicate. It is easily found in many communication media. In Indonesia, I often find social criticism in many occasions, such as in speech, poems, caricatures, songs, films, etc. Therefore, I am interested in researching social criticism, since Indonesian people like to criticize, and they have various interesting ways in expressing social criticisms. Secondly, social criticism becomes my interest since it shows how critical people are to their environment. This proves that people cautiously observe and care about what is happening in the country. Finally, the existence of social criticism shows that people have their rights to give social criticism, regardless their social status, race or religion.

In terms of the data used in the study, I chose “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show because it is a political humor show and is rich in social critiques. Current political topics can trigger people to give their social criticisms. The title of the talk show, *Sentilan Sentilun*, is an indication that the speakers in the talk show are

always asked to give their social criticisms related to Indonesian politics. The title of the talk show refers to the two hosts of the talk show, namely Ngoro Sentilan, the main host, and Sentilun, the co-host. “*Ngoro*” is a Javanese honorific title used to call an aristocrat or a boss. In the talk show, Ngoro Sentilan is performed by a famous Indonesian actor Slamet Rahardjo. Meanwhile, Sentilun is a male maid that is performed by Butet Kertaradjasa, a well-known Indonesian artist. However, the title also has another meaning. The word “*sentilan*” in Indonesian language also means scolding or criticizing. Therefore, “Sentilan Sentilun” can be interpreted as “criticism given by the maid Sentilun”. In this show, Sentilun and the guests are to express their social criticisms related to current situation in Indonesia.

1.2. Research Questions

There are three research questions of the study:

1. What maxims are violated in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show?
2. What are the types of implicatures used to express social criticisms?
3. What are the social criticisms expressed in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show?

1.3. Purpose of the Study

In conducting the study, I aim to show maxim violations that occur in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show, and I also discuss the types of implicatures. Besides, I would like to explain how the speakers in the talk show express their social criticisms and explain the possible interpretation(s) of the social criticisms.

1.4. Previous Studies

I found five previous studies (Aini, 2012; Dewi, 2010; Druzhinina, 2009; Petersson, 2011; and Riekkinen, 2009) related to social criticism. Aini (2012) writes a study of maxim violation in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show. She uses Grice’s cooperative principles in analyzing the data. She argues that there are four maxim violations in the talk show, i.e. the violation of quantity maxim, violation of quality maxim, violation of relevance maxim, and violation of manner maxim. These violations occur because the speakers wanted to create political humors. The political humors contain various implicit meanings, i.e. criticizing, hinting, expressing hopes, or joking.

Dewi (2010) studies the social criticism that is expressed by Thomas Hardy through his poem “At Country Fair”. Dewi (2010) uses literary and authorial sociological approach in examining the criticism. The result of the study is that the social criticism is aimed at the English government and society in the Victorian era, and this was found by examining the intrinsic elements of the poetry, i.e. imagery, diction, and figurative language. Dewi (2010) says that Hardy’s criticism concerns the degeneration of the system conducted by the English government in the Victorian era, in which England is in the industrial revolution. She states that Hardy uses the words “dwarf” and “giant” as symbols of two classes in the Victorian era, in which “dwarf” refers to the government and “giant” refers to the English people. The two words reflect how the government of the Victorian era utilizes English people without paying attention to their welfare.

Another study, conducted by Druzhinina (2009), is concerned with the expression of social criticism in a film. The film is an animated fantasy movie, “Corpse Bride”, directed by Timothy Burton. In the study, she discusses issues of human society in general and Victorian culture in particular. Druzhinina (2009) explains that Burton uses not only the setting, characterization, structure, imagery, and verbal language, but also nonverbal forms of language to criticize society. Since Burton is a movie director, the nonverbal language meant is in the form of animation including drawings and music to illustrate Burton’s message. Druzhinina (2009) writes that through the film, Burton criticizes the cruelty and artificiality of the Victorian society. Burton, through visual and auditory metaphors, in which mechanical dolls stand for people and clocks stand for their hearts, says that society is a device that manipulates living creatures as if they were parts of a machine. Besides, through the theme of the wedding ritual, Burton portrays the marriage in the film in terms of bargain, capture, and victimizing. Burton also criticizes gender inequality in the Victorian era.

Petersson (2011) writes in her essay that Suzanne Collins’s *The Hunger Games* trilogy could be interpreted as a critique to the present-day US society. She uses the characteristics of dystopian novels and of the *Bildungsroman* to highlight aspects of social criticism in *The Hunger Games* trilogy. In analyzing the data, Petersson (2011) compares the society in the trilogy to the present-day US society. This results in the conclusion that there are parallels and connection between those two societies that expose the more negative sides of present-day society in the US. One criticism in the trilogy is about the capital in US society

that has not only the control of people, but also the power of money. *The Hunger Games* trilogy also shows that media is the most powerful weapon in the US society.

Riekkinen (2009) describes the differences between native English speakers and ELF-speakers in their use of lexical hedges as a politeness strategy when they give criticism. Riekkinen (2009) uses discourse analytic approach to analyze the lexical hedges used by those two groups of speakers. She concludes that both groups use lexical hedges when they give criticism although the ELF-speakers use lexical hedges less than the native speakers. They also hedge in a less varied way. The possible reason of why ELF-speakers use less lexical hedges is related to the sociological variables. The ELF-speakers have a small social distance to others as they all are operating with foreign language. However, the fact that ELF-speakers use lexical hedges less than those of the native speakers does not result in any communicational problems.

Those previous studies are similar to my study in which we focus on social criticism as our topic, yet we have different theory used. Dewi (2010) and Petersson (2011) use literary approach as they study criticism in literature. Although Druzhinina (2009) explains social criticisms in a film, she also uses literary devices to examine the criticisms. Meanwhile, Riekkinen (2009) and Aini (2012) use linguistic theory to discuss social criticism, in which Riekkinen (2009) uses discourse analytic approach, while Aini (2012) uses Grice's cooperative principles and contextual approach in analyzing the data. The last writer seems to have similar theory and data used to my study where we study social criticism in

“Sentilan Sentilun” talk show by using Grice’s cooperative principle. However, Dewi (2012) focuses on the maxim violation, while I focus on the social criticism found in the talk show. I also discuss the types of implicatures and the interpretation of the social criticism expressed by the speakers.

1.5. Organization of the Writing

CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains background of the study (1.1.), research questions (1.2.), purpose of the study (1.3.), previous studies (1.4.) and organization of the writing (1.5).

CHAPTER 2 : THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter deals with the theory used to analyze the data. It concerns pragmatics (2.1.), pragmatic meaning (2.2.), Grice’s cooperative principles (2.3.), and implicature (2.4.).

CHAPTER 3 : RESEARCH METHOD

The third chapter is divided into four subchapters, i.e. types of research (3.1.); data, population, samples and data sources (3.2.); methods of collecting data (3.3.); and methods of analyzing data (3.4.).

CHAPTER 4 : DISCUSSION

This chapter is the analyzing of the data. All of the explanation in the study is related to the research questions that are wanted to identify.

CHAPTER 5 : CONCLUSION

The chapter consists of a conclusion of the discussion and suggestion for the next researchers who are interested in conducting the same research.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter deals with the theory used to analyze the data. It consists of pragmatics (2.1.), Grice's cooperative principles (2.2.), and implicature (2.3.).

2.1. Pragmatics

According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is the study of “meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)” (p. 3). It deals with how an utterance can have different meaning with what is said verbally. Pragmatics relates to how speakers use language for their own purposes. Therefore, pragmatics is also the study of language that is seen in relation to language users (Mey, 1993). As language users, the speakers have guidelines to be efficient and effective in using language to converse so as to further cooperative ends, and Grice identifies these guidelines as ‘maxims of conversation’ (as cited in Levinson, 1983). The maxims of conversation are also known as Grice's cooperative principles, which will be discussed in the following sub-chapter (2.2.).

2.2. Pragmatic Meaning

Schmitt (2010) says “pragmatics is concerned not with language as a system or product per se, but rather with the interrelationship between language form, (communicated) messages and language users” (p.70). According to this view,

there is a term called “‘code-model’ of communication”, where “communication is seen as an encoding-decoding process” (Schmitt, 2010, p. 70). This means that in order to have successful communication, the sender has to pair messages and signals in the same way with the receiver (Shmitt, 2010). Messages are “meanings internal to senders and receivers” while signals are “what is physically transmitted (that is, sound, smoke signals, writing) between the sender and the receiver” (Schmitt, 2010, p. 70). Schmitt (2010), however, says that human communication does not only rely on the evidence from the signals, but also the evidence from other sources, that is perception and general world knowledge.

Schmitt (2010) says that the process of grasping speaker’s meaning in context involves several aspects:

1. The assignment of reference
2. Figuring out what is communicated directly
3. Figuring out what is communicated indirectly, or implicitly

In assigning reference, a listener needs to understand that a word has a referent and he/she needs general world knowledge to identify the specific referent that a speaker intended. As is stated by Yule (1996):

Reference, then, is not simply a relationship between the meaning of a word or phrase and an object or person in the world. It is a social act, in which the speaker assumes that the word or phrase chosen to identify an object or person will be interpreted as the speaker intended” (Yule, 1996, p. 22).

Shmitt (2010) states “the process of assigning reference also involves the interpretation of ‘deictic expressions’” (p. 72). There are three types of deictic

expressions: person deictics (e.g. *I, you, it*), place deictics (e.g. *there*), and time deictics (e.g. the tensed forms of the verbs) (Shmitt, 2010).

2.3. Grice's Cooperative Principles

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

The maxim of quality:

Try to make your contribution one that is true:

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

The maxim of quantity:

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

The maxim of relevance:

Make your contributions relevant.

The maxim of manner:

Be perspicuous:

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

These maxims indicate what language users have to do when they communicate, so that they can communicate in an efficient, rational, cooperative way. They also have to give information sincerely, relevantly and clearly (Levinson, 1983). As an example, consider the following conversation:

- (1) Ita : *Kamu kemarin ikut latihan nggak?*
Tya : *Nggak.*

In the example (1), Ita asked Tya whether she came to the rehearsal or not. Tya replied that she did not attend the rehearsal. The example (1) shows that both Ita and Tya obeyed the maxim of quality. As mentioned by Grice, someone should make true contribution in which he speaks the truth and sincere condition. In the example, Ita as the one who gave the question asked sincerely and indeed lacked of information and required the requested information. Levinson (1983) said that “when one asserts something one implicates that one believes it, when one asks a question one implicates that one sincerely desires an answer” (p. 105-106). Tya made an inference from Ita’s utterance and tried to be co-operative. In order to make her contribution true, Tya also need to answer the question by saying what she believed to be true.

Both persons in the example (1) also obeyed maxim of quantity. Ita asked information which she needed and, similarly, Tya gave information as was required. From Tya’s response, we notice that she said what Ita needed to know and did not give additional information which was not needed. Therefore, Ita and Tya had made contribution as informative as was needed.

Grice’s explanation about maxim of relevance is that you should be relevant. As showed in the example (1), Ita’s utterance was assumed to be a question that needed an answer. Tya was being co-operative by giving an answer in which the content was also relevant to the information being asked.

The example (1) also shows that Tya obeyed maxim of manner. The information given by Tya was conveyed briefly. Tya did not give a complicated

answer, but she answered directly by giving the information being asked. She also did not give an obscure and ambiguous answer.

In order not to be misinterpreted, there are additional phrases that have to be uttered to maintain the maxims. These initial phrases are called ‘hedges’. Yule (1996) states that hedges are “certain kinds of expression that speakers use to mark that they may be in danger of *not* fully adhering to the principles” (p. 37-38). The initial phrases are as follows:

Quality maxim : as far as I know, I may be mistaken, I’m not sure if this is right, I guess

Quantity maxim : as you probably know, to cut a long story short, I won’t bore you with all the details

Relevance maxim : I don’t know if this is important, this may sound like a dumb question, not to change the subject

Manner maxim : this may be a bit confused, I’m not sure if this makes sense, I don’t know if this is clear at all

These guidelines given by Grice, however, are not usually used in communication. People naturally do not speak by fully obeying the cooperative principles. Yet, that is not what Grice actually means by giving cooperative principles. Levinson (1983) states that “when talk does not proceed according to their specifications, hearers assume that, contrary to appearances, the principles are nevertheless being adhered to at some deeper level” (p. 102). Consider the following example:

- (2) A: Where’s Bill?
B: There’s a yellow VW outside Sue’s house” (Levinson, 1983, p. 102)

The example (2) shows that B fails to be cooperative with A. B fails to answer A's question; B seems to violate at least two maxims, which are maxim of quantity and maxim of relevance. B violates maxim of quantity because B does not give contribution as informative as is required and violates maxim of relevance because B's response concerns the change of topic. Yet, as we interpret B's utterance, we notice that despite the apparent failure of co-operation, B is being co-operative at some deeper level. Levinson (1983) says that we can assume that B is being co-operative by seeing possible connection between the location of Bill and the location of the yellow VW. Thus, we can make an inference that if Bill has a yellow VW, he may be in Sue's house.

The example above shows how people are being co-operative although they seem at first to violate the maxims. In such a case, the hearers or listeners need to make inferences to preserve the assumption of co-operation. It means that there is an additional meaning of speaker's utterances. Grice dubs this kind of inference as *implicature*, or more properly a *conversational implicature* (as cited in Levinson, 1983). The implicature is discussed in the following sub-chapter (2.3.).

2.4. Implicature

Yule (1996) defines implicature as "an additional conveyed meaning" (p. 35). This means one's utterance implicates something more than what is said. Thus, speakers are also being more communicative than is said. However, some people do not purposely violate one or more maxims. They have tried to be co-operative. In the example (2), in order to understand that B is being co-operative, A has to drive an inference that is similar to what is on B's mind. However,

people can also purposely violate one or more maxims whereby they can implicitly give an opinion or criticism.

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

Conversational implicatures are based on Grice’s cooperative principles (Yule, 1996). There are some properties that are used to test whether an implicature belongs to conversational implicatures. Grice suggests that the properties of conversational implicatures are:

- (i) cancellability (or defeasibility)
- (ii) non-detachability (or inference based on meaning rather than form)
- (iii) calculability
- (iv) non-conventionality (as cited in Levinson, 1983, p. 119)

Meanwhile, Yule (1996) says “conversational implicatures can be calculated, suspended, cancelled, and reinforced” (p. 44-45). He gives an example of an utterance, in which the implicature is a conversational implicature. A speaker says “You have won five dollars” (Yule, 1996, p. 44). This implies that someone won only five dollars. In fact, the speaker can always deny the intended meaning that he wants to communicate. This can be seen in the following statements that show the properties of conversational implicatures:

- (a) “You’ve won at least five dollars!”
- (b) “You’ve won five dollars, in fact, you’ve won ten!”
- (c) “You’ve won five dollars, that’s four more than one!” (Yule, 1996, p. 44)

The first statement shows that a conversational implicature can be suspended. In the early statement, the speaker said that someone only won five dollars. However, by adding the words “at least”, the speaker suspended his early intended meaning and implied that the person had better to get five dollars than to get nothing. This showed that the speaker understood the person’s achievement.

In the second statement, the speaker could also cancel his implicature by giving additional information. This resulted in the assumption that the speaker was disappointed with the person he talked to. He said that the person could actually win ten that is more than five dollars, instead of only five dollars. There must be background knowledge of the speaker and listener that made the speaker said that the person should get more than five dollars. It might be because the inability of the person to get more money.

In the last statement, the speaker also gave additional information to reinforce the implicature. He said that five dollars is four more than one. This showed that the speaker affirmed that he was disappointed with the person’s achievement. This statement is actually more offensive than the previous one.

In summary, conversational implicature can easily be calculated since it appears in conversation, in which the context of the situation and the speaker’s expression can easily be observed.

There are three kinds of conversational implicature, i.e. generalized conversational implicatures, scalar implicatures, and particularized conversational implicatures (Yule, 1996). ‘Generalized conversational implicatures’ arise from utterances, in which the listeners do not require special background knowledge in

order to make the necessary inferences (Yule, 1996). The example of generalized conversational implicatures is:

(3) “I walked into a house.” (Levinson, 1983, p. 126)

The statement in the example (3) implicates that the house was not my house and it was not related to the speaker. Therefore, the implicature occurs without any particular context or special background knowledge.

Yule (1996) also states that some other generalized conversational implicatures are usually conveyed “on the basis of a scale of values and are consequently known as scalar implicatures” (p. 41). The speakers use the word that expresses one value from a scale of values, such as most, many, some, few, always or often (Yule, 1996). Hence, scalar implicatures can also be noticed by observing the maxim of quantity and maxim of quality (Yule, 1996). Yule (1996) also states that “when any form in a scale is asserted, the negative of all forms higher on the scale is implicated” (p. 41), for example, when someone says “some apples”, he creates an implicature (+> not many).

Meanwhile, ‘particularized conversational implicatures’ arise from utterances which have “very specific context in which locally recognized inferences are assumed” (Yule, 1996, p. 42). In other words, the listeners shall have special background knowledge of the context of utterances in order to be able to understand speakers’ implicit meaning. Particularized conversational implicatures usually arise from observing maxim of relevance “since utterances are relevant only with respect to the particular topic” (Levinson, 1983, p. 127).

The example of particularized implicatures is in the example (2), in which A has to draw on some assumed knowledge in order to make B's response relevant. A has to have background knowledge of VW as a type of cars. Besides, A should also understand that Bill owns a yellow VW. If B says that there is a yellow VW outside Sue's house, B must imply that there is no one but Bill in the Sue's house. Hence, Bill is in the Sue's house.

Different to conversational implicatures, 'conventional implicatures' are not based on Grice's cooperative principle but are associated with specific words, such as *but*, *even*, or *yet* (Yule, 1996). Yule (1996) says that conventional implicatures "don't have to occur in conversation, and they don't depend on special contexts for their interpretation" (p. 45). It is also stated that:

However, not all implicatures have to be conversational, that is to say, dependent on the context of a particular language use (or 'conversation'). There are certain expressions which, taken by themselves, implicate certain states of the world that cannot be attributed to our use of language, but rather, are manifested by such use (Mey, 1993, p. 103).

The example of conventional implicatures is "The car looks good but expensive". Yule (1996) says "the interpretation of any utterance of the type *p* but *q* will be based on the conjunction *p* & *q* plus an implicature of 'contrast' between the information in *p* and the information in *q*" (p. 45). In the example, the word "expensive" also refers to the car as previously said in the utterance. Therefore, the utterance implies a contrast condition of the car. The listeners can understand that the speaker wants to buy a new car but he does not have enough money to buy it.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter contains research methods. It is divided into four subchapters, i.e. types of research (3.1.); data, population, samples and data sources (3.2.); methods of collecting data (3.3.); and methods of analyzing data (3.4.).

3.1. Types of Research

The study is descriptive as the data used in the study are in the forms of words and not in numbers: “*deskripsi merupakan gambaran ciri-ciri data secara akurat sesuai dengan sifat ilmiah itu sendiri*” (Djajasudarma, 2006, p. 16). In this case, I describe maxim violations found in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show and explain the utterances that contain social criticism. This study is also conducted to explain the possible interpretation(s) of the social criticisms.

Based on data analysis, this study is qualitative because the result of the study is word. Djajasudarma (2006) says that “*metode kualitatif merupakan prosedur yang menghasilkan data deskriptif berupa data tertulis atau lisan di masyarakat bahasa*” (p. 10-11). I use utterances of the hosts and guests in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show broadcasted from July 7, 2014 to October 27, 2014 as the data.

I also use quantitative method, in which I count the utterances that contain social criticism and make the percentages of maxim violations found in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show. As is stated by Djajasudarma (2006), qualitative research in

linguistics is always supported by a quantitative method in the aspect of data calculation.

3.2. Data, Population, Samples and Data Sources

Data are unit analysis that includes its context, both linguistic context and non-linguistic context. In linguistics, the unit analysis can be phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, phrases, clauses, sentences, and utterances. In the study, the linguistic context consists of phonemes, morphemes, lexemes words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and meaning, while, the non-linguistic context is the background knowledge of the speakers and the listeners. In this case, the background knowledge that is required is related to Indonesian political issues.

Population is the whole data that are used in a study. The population of the study is all utterances in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show. After collecting the utterances, I choose some utterances to be analyzed. The chosen utterances are called ‘sample’. I use purposive sampling technique in collecting the samples. The samples of the study are 24 utterances that have implicit meanings of social criticism. However, I choose 10 utterances from the samples by using random sampling technique to be presented in the discussion.

The data are taken from “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show broadcasted on Metro TV. I use 16 episodes of the talk show aired from July 7, 2014 to October 27, 2014.

3.3. Methods of Collecting Data

The method of collecting data used in the study is non-participant observation, meaning that I do not involve in the situation being observed.

I observe the conversation in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show without getting involved in the conversation. The speakers’ utterances containing social criticism in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show are collected by using an audio visual medium called YouTube. The utterances are observed by watching and listening to the talk show. Then I download some episodes of the talk show from YouTube and take note of utterances containing social criticism.

3.4. Methods of Analyzing Data

The method that I use to analyze the utterances is pragmatic *padan* method and reflective-introspective method. The pragmatic *padan* method uses the speaker’s partner as the determiner (Sudaryanto, 1993). In the study, I observe the audiences of “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show to determine what statements or utterances that implicitly express social criticisms. I find that the audiences would laugh or express dislike by saying “*huu*” whenever they noticed the utterances containing social criticism.

Reflective-introspective method is used to explain social criticisms that the speakers in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show want to deliver. In reflective-introspective method, a researcher needs to use her knowledge about the socio-political issues and about the language used by the speakers as the determiner. In the study, this method is useful to guess what social criticisms expressed by the speakers. Since I observe utterances produced by Indonesian people, the social criticisms found in the talk show are related to politics and government in Indonesia.

There are five procedures in the study:

1. Watching and observing “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show;
2. Taking notes of the utterances that contain social criticism;
3. Showing and classifying the maxim violations found in the talk show;
4. Interpreting the possible inferences of the utterances; and
5. Identifying and explaining what social criticisms are expressed by the speakers

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This chapter is the analyzing of the data, which includes the explanation of the violation of quantity maxim (4.1.1.), violation of quality maxim (4.1.2.), violation of relevance maxim (4.1.3.) and violation of manner maxim (4.1.4.).

4.1. Maxim Violations Found in “Sentilan Sentilun” Talk Show

In “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show broadcasted on July 7, 2014, until October 27, 2014, there are 24 utterances that contain social criticisms. These implicatures are conversational implicatures, in which they occur in conversations and are based on Grice’s cooperative principles or maxims. Therefore, I looked for maxim violations occurred in the talk show to discuss the social criticism that was conveyed by the speakers. All implicatures found in “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show are particularized conversational implicatures, where the listeners need to have special background knowledge in order to get the speakers’ implicit meanings.

The findings are presented as follows:

The Percentages of Maxim Violations in “Sentilan Sentilun” Talk Show

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

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

4.1.1. The Violation of Quantity Maxim

- (4) Ndoro : Tapi pernah kita juga diatur dalam penjara. Pernah ya?
 Pak Budi : Nah, itu dia.
 Sentilun : Malu-maluin, Ndoro.
 Markonah : Lho? Di dalam penjara, Ndoro?
 Ndoro : Wah, ada. Pak Budi bisa njelasin. Saya pura-pura nggak tahu.
 Markonah : Masa *to*?
 Sentilun : **Itu termasuk salah satu keajaiban di negeri ini.**
 Markonah : Oo... keajaiban dunia jangan-jangan.
 Sentilun : Lho iya. Pengurus bola mengendalikan organisasi dari dalam bui.

The preceding conversation was taken from “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show entitled “Pilpres VS Piala Dunia”, broadcasted on July 7, 2014. The speakers involved in the conversation were Ndoro Sentilan, Sentilun, and the two guests, Pak Budi and Markonah. Pak Budiarto Shambazy is a soccer analyst, and Markonah is a beautiful widow played by a famous Indonesian actress Happy Salma. The context is that Ndoro Sentilan talked about Indonesian soccer club which was once led by a prisoner.

In the conversation, Sentilun violated maxim of quantity in 8th line when he gave his opinion about what Ndoro Sentilan were talking about. This can be seen in his statement “*Itu termasuk salah satu keajaiban di negeri ini*” (“**That was one form of wonders that happened in Indonesia**”). “*Itu*” in Sentilun’s utterance referred to the moment when Indonesian soccer association *PSSI* was led by a prisoner. From Sentilun’s statement, we see that Sentilun gave more information

than was necessary, in that he did not just affirm Ngoro's statement about Indonesian soccer association *PSSI* that was led by a prisoner, but also he supplied the listeners with additional information.

The additional information is also an indication of Sentilun's violation of quality maxim. Sentilun gave untrue information, for he said that the moment when Indonesian soccer association *PSSI* was led by a prisoner was one form of wonders that happened in Indonesia.

Sentilun's implicature is a particularized conversational implicature because the listeners needed to recall their background knowledge in order to be able to interpret Sentilun's implicature. In the conversation, the listeners had to assume that the moment Sentilun meant in his utterance was the moment when Nurdin Halid was imprisoned due to a corruption case, and this is what Sentilun criticized.

The possible inference of Sentilun's implicature is that Sentilun criticized the former head of *PSSI* (Indonesian soccer association), Nurdin Halid, who was involved in corruption. Nurdin Halid still led the organization when he was imprisoned, while the heads of soccer association should not be involved in crime. By using the word "wonder" to describe the moment when Indonesian soccer association *PSSI* was led by a prisoner, Sentilun implied that the moment was unusual or rare to happen. In this case, Sentilun said that Nurdin Halid should not have been involved in the corruption case. It was also shameful that the head of Indonesian soccer association was involved in corruption. Moreover, Sentilun also

criticized other Indonesian leaders who are corrupt and worsen Indonesia's social condition.

The listeners could also understand that the moment embarrassed the Indonesian people by observing Ngoro's response to Markonah's question. Ngoro said that he would act as if he had not known the moment. This proved that the moment was shameful that Ngoro Sentilan did not want to talk about it.

In the same episode, there was also another violation of quantity maxim performed by Markonah:

- (1) Sentilun : Apa kamu nggak pingin pacar kamu tu bukan pemain bola?
 Misalnya politisi gitu?
 Markonah : Waduh, wah. Haha....
 Sentilun : Kenapa?
 Markonah : **Serem juga, Mas.**
 Ngoro : Takut ya?
 Markonah : Iya.
 Ngoro : Artis banyak yang dipanggil KPK.
 Markonah : Itu lho. Nanti kebawa-bawa. Nanti aku dikasih bunga, eh, gara-gara bunga itu aku dipanggil KPK juga.

In the context of the conversation, Sentilun asked Markonah whether she would be willing to have a boyfriend other than a football player, say, a politician. Markonah responded Sentilun's question by giving an expression of doubt. Sentilun saw Markonah's expression and asked for her explanation. Markonah said that it was awful.

From Markonah's response in the 5th line, "**Serem juga, Mas**", I found the violation of quantity maxim. Markonah's answer was not informative enough to Sentilun, but it did answer his question. By saying that it was awful, Markonah wanted to say that she did not want to date a politician. However, Sentilun had not

gotten the reason why Markonah did not want to date a politician. There must be an additional meaning that Markonah wanted to communicate.

To understand Markonah's implicit meaning, Sentilun and other listeners should have background knowledge about Indonesian politicians. Therefore, Markonah's implicature is a particularized conversational implicature. In this case, the listeners should have known that many Indonesian politicians are corrupt.

However, we could not understand what Markonah really wanted to express by saying that it was awful to date a politician. This can be seen in Ndoro's statement that Markonah was afraid to date a politician because there are a number of actresses who were investigated by *KPK* (Corruption Eradication Commission). This became clear when Markonah affirmed Ndoro's statement, saying that "I may be investigated by *KPK* simply because I was given flowers". This suggests that what Markonah meant by saying "awful" was to be investigated by *KPK* and involved in corruption.

As an Indonesian actress, Markonah was disappointed with a number of Indonesian politicians who involved some Indonesian actresses into the corruption that the politicians did by giving the actresses money. In fact, the actresses did not know where the money came from. Furthermore, Markonah criticized the Indonesian politicians that they are corrupt and create a corrupt government in Indonesia.

Another example of the violation of quantity maxim (and the violation of relevance maxim) is discovered in Sentilun's utterance in conversation (7):

- (7) Cak Lontong : Ini kalo bisa, misalnya damai bisa, nggak, Ndoro?
 Sentilun : Ndak bisa.
 Cak Lontong : Saya bawa ke ketok magic itu lho.
 Sentilun : Tidak bisa. Kamu itu bawaannya cuma mau membela diri terus. Ingat, ya, Cak lontong, **sepandai-pandai tupai meloncat akhirnya akan jatuh juga. Sepandai-pandainya mengambil uang negara akhirnya tertangkap di KPK.**

The conversation was from the episode “Calon Menteri Jokowi”, broadcasted on September 8, 2014. The speakers were Sentilun, Ndoro Sentilan, Chacha, and Cak Lontong. Chacha Frederica is a famous Indonesia actress, while Cak Lontong is a famous Indonesian comedian. In this episode, Cak Lontong played as Chacha’s boyfriend. He lied to Chacha and it hurt Chacha. Chacha reported Cak Lontong’s behavior to Ndoro Sentilan, who he asked Cak Lontong to be responsible for what he did, but Cak Lontong defended himself. Sentilun jumped to the conversation by saying that Cak Lontong only defended himself. He added that “*sepandai-pandai tupai meloncat akhirnya akan jatuh juga, sepandai-pandainya mengambil uang negara akhirnya tertangkap di KPK*”.

Sentilun violated quantity maxim (the 6th line), in which he gave information more than necessary. Sentilun responded to Cak Lontong’s statement and said that he did not agree with Cak Lontong’s request, but he also gave additional information related to Indonesian corruptors. There must have been another meaning that Sentilun wanted to communicate.

Sentilun also violated the relevance maxim, in that he did not give a relevant contribution to Cak Lontong. It was showed in the boldface that he added his response by giving information that was not related to the topic. The topic was that Cak Lontong had hurt Cacha; however, Sentilun also talked about Indonesian

corruptors that were arrested by *KPK*. Sentilun's irrelevant and changing topic was an indication that he had an implicit meaning of social criticism.

The criticism was given to the Indonesian politicians. Sentilun criticized Indonesian politicians' dishonest behavior, in which they cheat Indonesian people and do corruption. Sentilun said that corruption is wrong, so how good the politicians are corrupt or hide their wrong deeds, the corruptors will eventually be arrested.

The listeners should have background knowledge concerning how corrupt Indonesian government officials and politicians were in order to be able to understand Sentilun's implicit meaning. Thus, the implicature found in the previous conversation is also a particularized conversational implicature.

4.1.2. The Violation of Quality Maxim

- (8) Sentilun : Ndoro, kalau kita cermati ya, sekarang ini tidak saja banyak lembaga survey, tapi juga banyak sekali tu lembaga konsultan politik.
 Ndoro : Maksudnya apa itu?
 Sentilun : Semua *dikonsultaseni*. Soal penampilan capres, konsultasi.
 Ndoro : Kaya gimana, kaya gimana?
 Sentilun : Penampilan, jambulnya aja diatur, Ndoro. Itu ada konsultannya. Cara bicaranya.
 Chacha : Cara jalan mungkin, cara jalan?
 Sentilun : Cara jalan, *thumuk thumuk*.
 Chacha : Ada konsultannya?
 Sentilun : Ada. Ini konsultannya. **Konsultasi cara jalan capres, moonwalker.**
 Chacha : Munduur. Munduur.

In the episode entitled "Bukan Sekedar Presiden Quick Count" broadcasted on July 14, 2014, Ndoro Sentilan, Sentilun and Chacha Frederica were talking about political consultants, i.e. consultants to whom Indonesian president

candidates consulted a number of issues related to their candidacy. Chacha asked Sentilun whether there was a consultation for the way president candidates walked. Sentilun showed Chacha how to moonwalk, and he said that the way president candidates walked is like a moonwalker. Chacha responded to Sentilun's words, saying that it was walking backwards.

In the line 12, Sentilun violated maxim of quality, where he said untrue information about the way president candidates walked, "*Konsultasi cara jalan capres, moonwalker*" ("**The consultation of the way president candidates walked, a moonwalker**"). Everyone in the talk show, through their background knowledge, knew that Sentilun's statement was not true because "moonwalker" is a term used by Michael Jackson, an American singer, to describe his dance style of walking backwards. Therefore, there must be another meaning of Sentilun's utterance that is an implicature of social criticism.

Observing Sentilun's utterance, I found that what Sentilun meant by using the word "moonwalker" to describe the way Indonesian president candidates walked concerns the quality of the president candidates. Normally, people do not walk backwards. If someone walks backwards instead of walking forward, he may suffer from an illness or something bad that makes him walking backwards. In this case, Sentilun said that the quality of president candidates is bad because they often lie. They often break all their promises since what they said in the president campaign is not consistent with what actually happened.

In the following conversation, there was also a violation of quality maxim that includes two principles of this maxim: do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence; and do not say what you believe to be false.

- (9) Mucle : Yah, nasib kalau jadi orang miskin seperti saya ini harusnya kan dipelihara oleh negara.
 Ndoro : Harusnya....
 Mucle : Sesuai dengan amanat undang-undang.
 Ndoro : Betul, betul.
 Mucle : **Lha ini negara malah memelihara koruptor, lebih banyak daripada fakir miskin.** Sedih saya, Ndoro.
 Ndoro : Tenang. Jangan nangis dulu dong. Di bulan Ramadhan ini, kamu itu tidak usah cemas. Soal rejeki sudah ada yang ngatur. Iya kan. Yang penting itu kita bersyukur, ya kan. Ada duit sedikit bersyukur, ya kan. Orang yang bersyukur itu selalu hatinya tenang. Gitu.
 Sentilun : Sebagai batur, saya juga selalu bersyukur. Jadi orang miskin di negara ini memang mesti banyak bersyukur. Dikit-dikit bersyukur. Apalagi kalau sekarang ini, Ndoro. **Musim kampanye gini bersyukur dapat serangan fajar. Itulah fungsi utama orang miskin di Indonesia. Dibutuhkan hanya pada saat kampanye seperti sekarang ini.**

The conversation took place in the episode entitled “Pemimpin dalam Islam” broadcasted on July 21, 2014. The speakers were Ndoro Sentilan, Sentilun and Mucle. Mucle is an Indonesian comedian and actor, and in this episode, he acted as the poor. Mucle was lamenting for his fate as the poor. He said that poor people should be looked after by the state based on the law.

In the 6th line, Mucle violated the maxim of quality, in which he gave information for which he lacked adequate evidence. He claimed that the number of corruptors that Indonesia “takes care of” is higher than the number of the poor. The listeners, through their background knowledge, knew that there has not been a study about the ratio of the number of corruptors and the poor people in

Indonesia. Mucle was just claiming that in Indonesia the number of corruptors is higher than that of the poor.

There is also a violation of quality maxim conducted by Sentilun, as is shown in line 17. He provided untrue information by saying that the main role of Indonesian poor people is to receive “*serangan fajar*” during the election campaign. He added his statement by saying that the poor people are only needed during the election campaign.

Sentilun’s statement about “*serangan fajar*” and the main role of Indonesian poor people is also obscure, in which it does not clear what Sentilun exactly implied by saying that he thanked God for the “*serangan fajar*” during the election campaign because it is the main role of his as the poor. Therefore, Sentilun also violated the maxim of manner.

In order to understand the implicit meaning, the listeners should understand what the term “*serangan fajar*” means. The literal meaning of the words “*serangan fajar*” is a morning attack. In the context of Indonesian history, the term “*serangan fajar*” refers to “*Serangan Umum 1 Maret*” (1 March General Attack). It was the moment when Indonesian army attacked the Dutch on March 1, 1949 in order to get Yogyakarta¹ back from the Dutch colony. In this case, “*serangan fajar*” means a sudden attack to the center of the enemy defense in the early morning where the enemies were still asleep.

In the context of Indonesian politics, the words “*serangan fajar*” is a term used to refer to money politics given to the people so that they would be willing to

¹ During 1945-1949 (the Indonesian National Revolution), the city of Yogyakarta became the capital of Indonesia after the fall of Jakarta to the Dutch.

vote for a particular party or a candidate. The money was given early in the morning before the election and generally given to the lower class people. In other words, the term “*serangan fajar*” is used to refer to money politics which is distributed early in the morning. This was considered to be a strategy or tactics carried out by Indonesian president candidates to get people’s votes.

Both Mucle and Sentilun criticized the Indonesian government officials. Indonesia is a developing country that has a lot of poor people. By saying that the number of Indonesian corruptors is higher than that of the poor, Mucle implied that there are a large number of corruptors in Indonesia. Mucle also criticized the Indonesian government, in that the government has not been able to overcome poverty and corruption in Indonesia. The worst is that a number of government officials who should overcome poverty are corrupt and create a corrupt government.

Besides, by saying that the main role of poor Indonesians is to receive “*serangan fajar*”, Sentilun criticized the dishonest behavior of the president candidates. It is also a criticism towards the Indonesian government that cannot solve the problem of money politics in the government. Sentilun also criticized Indonesian politicians who care about the poor only when they need their votes at the election.

Furthermore, Sentilun also dispraised the Indonesian people who receive “*serangan fajar*”. By saying that he thanked God for the “*serangan fajar*” given to the poor, Sentilun wanted to say that the people who received the bribes were

also dishonest. He implicitly said that the poor should not have legalized everything for money.

4.1.3. The Violation of Relevance Maxim

- (11) Ndoro : Jadi gini, lho, relawan itu beda sama kamu, lho.
 Sentilun : Bedanya gimana?
 Ndoro : Kamu itu *ndak* rela, ngeluh. Nggak dapet gaji, ngeluh. Dapet gaji, ngeluh.
 Sentilun : Ha, kalo pembantu kaya saya ini, ngeluh ya wajar, Ndoro.
 Ndoro : Kenapa?
 Sentilun : **Ya, asalkan jangan terus-terusan prihatin.** Jangan. Makanya saya berharap betul, pemimpin yang baru ini jangan kerjanya cuma prihatin-prihatin mulu.

The previous conversation was taken from the episode entitled “Pemimpin Baru Indonesia Baru” broadcasted on August 4, 2014. Ndoro Sentilan and Sentilun were talking about volunteers that participated in the 2014 presidential election. Ndoro said that Sentilun differed from those volunteers because Sentilun always grumbled. Sentilun said that it did not matter if he grumbled because he was just a servant.

Sentilun’s response “*Ya asalkan jangan terus-terusan prihatin*” was not relevant to Ndoro’s question. Sentilun’s irrelevant answer violated the maxim of relevance. In order to understand Sentilun’s criticism, the listeners needed to have background knowledge regarding what made Sentilun said that complaining was better than just expressing sympathy. The listeners should also have background knowledge related to which president that Sentilun meant in the conversation.

Indonesian people know that the president Sentilun meant was the former president of Indonesia, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono or SBY. SBY was known to always respond to problems faced by Indonesian people by saying “*saya*

prihatin". The statement "*saya prihatin*" was often used in his speech, and it was known as his habit to say it. His behavior was often criticized by netizen², and this was also criticized by Sentilun.

The criticism that Sentilun wanted to communicate is that as a president, SBY could only express sympathy, but he did not do anything to solve the problems that happened in Indonesia. In other words, he only talked but did no action.

Sentilun also hoped that the new president of Indonesia did not just express sympathy; in other words, he hoped that the new president would really work for Indonesia and did not just express sympathy.

Another conversation that also contains violation to the relevance maxim is that:

- (12) Cak Lontong : *Edan, edan, apa?*
 Sentilun : *Lha wong tidak punya mobil kok bawa kunci segede ini!*
 Ndoro : *Siapa bilang kunci? Gergaji!*
 Cak Lontong : *Gergaji gimana to, Ndoro? Ini kunci!*
 Ndoro : *O, kunci.*
 Sentilun : *Kalo kuncinya segede gitu, lalu mobilnya segede apa, Cak?*
 Cak Lontong : **Haha...orang nggak ngerti. Mending bawa kunci besar daripada bawa dosa besar, iya kan?** Ini, Sentilun ini cuma ngiri, Ndoro, karena saya punya mobil. **Saya kalo kaya tu gini, kemana-mana bawa kunci mobil besar. Lha, kamu bawa kunci borgol!**

In the episode "BBM Hebat Solusi Tepat" broadcasted on September 15, 2014, Cak Lontong, Ndoro Sentilan, and Sentilun were discussing the use of subsidized and non-subsidized gasoline in Indonesia. Cak Lontong brought a big car key, and this made Sentilun and Ndoro Sentilan wondered why he did it.

² Netizen is the Internet users, especially those of habitual or keen ones.

Sentilun asked Cak Lontong about what kind of car that had such a big key, but Cak Lontong's answer was not relevant to Sentilun's question because instead of telling Sentilun about the car type, Cak Lontong replied that it would be better to bring a big key than to bring a big sin. This statement actually had an implicit meaning of social criticism.

The implicit meaning of Cak Lontong's utterance became clearer after we observed his last statement. He said that as a rich man, he always brought a big car key, differed from Sentilun who always brought a handcuff key. The listeners understood that Cak Lontong said untrue information because Sentilun did not bring a handcuff key at that time. Therefore, Cak Lontong also performed a violation of quality maxim.

In the context of the conversation, the listeners need to have background knowledge about the relation between the rich people with handcuffs. They should also understand why Cak Lontong said that he preferred to bring a big car key than to bring a big sin.

In this episode, they discussed the rich people who had expensive cars, but they used the subsidized gasoline. Cak Lontong's joke was the introduction to the topic that would be discussed. Therefore, Cak Lontong's criticism had relation to the topic of the conversation, i.e. the use of gasoline in Indonesia.

Looking at the two utterances that were the indication of maxim violations performed by Cak Lontong, we knew that he criticized the politicians who were corrupt. Besides, looking at Cak Lontong's statement "*Mending bawa kunci besar daripada bawa dosa besar*", he dispraised people who rode expensive cars, but

they used the subsidized gasoline anyway. In fact, the subsidized gasoline was given to the middle and lower class people. Unfortunately, it was often found as well that some of the rich who used subsidized gasoline were Indonesian government officials.

4.1.4. The Violation of Manner Maxim

- (24) Ndoro : Kira-kira apa, ya, yang menarik, ya, kalo nilai-nilai kepahlawanan itu, Mas, ya, dibikin film seperti superhero. Mungkin Mas Hanung tertarik bikin superhero; judulnya bukan Superman, tapi, misalnya Super Sentilun. Itu gimana?
 Sentilun : Lah, nanti slogannya lain, Ndoro.
 Ndoro : Apa dong?
 Sentilun : Sentilun, Pahlawan yang Tidak Terkalahkan. **Ha iya, kalo kalah langsung nggugat ke MK.**

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

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

As Indonesians, the listeners understand the moment that happened in Indonesia when one of 2014 president candidates lost in the presidential election, and he sued the General Elections Commission (*Komisi Pemilihan Umum* or *KPU*) to The Constitutional Court (*Mahkamah Konstitusi* or *MK*). The man was Prabowo. Looking at Sentilun's last statement, he dispraised Prabowo's attitude that he did not accept the result of the presidential election. His attitude had actually embarrassed himself and his partner Hatta.

There was also another violation conducted by Sentilun that was related to manner maxim, i.e. to avoid ambiguity.

(22) Sentilun : Kalo itu begini, Ndoro. Menurut, analisis saya, di Indonesia itu, Ndoro, ada beberapa tipe pemimpin. Kalo dulu, ya, Bung Karno itu menyelesaikan masalah dengan cepat. Makanya sering disebut pemimpin yang selalu turun tangan. Kalo jaman Pak Harto, dia kan inginnya menciptakan pemerintahan yang stabil, maka sering disebut sebagai pemimpin yang campur tangan.

Ndoro : Ya, ya, ya, ya.

Sentilun : Karena sering kita dengar *to*, "Saya akan campur tangan, Saudara-saudara". Dulu itu.

Ndoro : Nah kalo pemimpin yang sekarang gimana?

Sentilun : ***Lha* kalo pemimpin yang sekarang itu bercita-cita menciptakan pemerintahan yang bersih, maka dia sering cuci tangan.**

In "Politik Panggung Sandiwara" broadcasted on October 6, 2014, Ndoro Sentilan and Sentilun were talking about *RUU Pilkada* and the walk out action by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono at the plenary session. Sentilun was giving information about the types of leaders in Indonesia and comparing two former Indonesian presidents, Soekarno and Soeharto.

In line 12, Sentilun violated the maxim of manner since he uttered an ambiguous expression. This can be seen in the statement "***Lha, kalo pemimpin***

yang sekarang itu bercita-cita menciptakan pemerintahan yang bersih, maka dia sering cuci tangan". The word "*bersih*" as well as the phrase "*cuci tangan*" is ambiguous. Literally, "*bersih*" means clean while "*cuci tangan*" means to wash hands. Non-literally, "*bersih*" means no corruption or bribery while the phrase "*cuci tangan*" is an Indonesian idiom that means being irresponsible or unwilling to take responsibility. Sentilun should have said that in order to create a clean government, the president had to enforce the law or to give sanction to those who corrupted or bribed. However, Sentilun used the words "*bersih*" and "*cuci tangan*" literally because he wanted to joke and criticize current Indonesian president, who frequently refused to be responsible for Indonesian problems.

Using the background knowledge, Indonesians know that Sentilun was talking about current president of Indonesia Jokowi, who is used to saying "*itu bukan urusan saya*" ("it's not my business") when he is to give his opinions regarding some problems occurring in Indonesia. The idiomatic phrase "*cuci tangan*" thus refers to Jokowi's tendency.

Sentilun seemed to interpret Jokowi's tendency to say "*itu bukan urusan saya*" as an indication that the president was unwilling to handle problems happening in Indonesia. Sentilun criticized Jokowi as he was irresponsible with Indonesian problems. In fact, in some occasions, Jokowi often answers the netizen's questions about issues in Indonesia by saying "*itu bukan urusan saya*". Although there are ministries that are responsible to handle the issues, as the president, Jokowi should at least give a statement of solution for the issues. He

should have understood his responsibility as the president of Indonesia, the person on whom Indonesian people depend.

Another violation of manner maxim, i.e. to avoid obscurity, was also found in Sentilun's utterance.

- (13) Ndoro : Emang bener lho, situasi permainan bola itu nggak bisa dipisahkan ama situasi politik, ya Pak, ya? Sering sepakbola itu dipakai untuk sarana politik. Di piala dunia Brazil sekarang ini, eee, *ndak* semua lho setuju. Banyak yang nggak setuju.
- Sentilun : Masa, Ndoro?
- Ndoro : Iya. “Apa ini? Pemborosan”, gitu bilangny. Betul nggak, Pak, gitu Pak?
- Pak Budi : Yaa...pemerintah Brazil menghabiskan sekitar 13 triliun untuk piala dunia. Itu pemborosan.
- Sentilun : **Kalo di Indonesia, nggak usah ada piala dunia, borosnya itu permanen. Malah bocor kemana-mana.**

The preceding conversation was taken from the episode “Pilpres VS Piala Dunia” broadcasted on July 7, 2014. Ndoro Sentilan said that the World Cup in Brazil was also often used for political interests. Pak Budi added that Brazilian government spent 13 trillion rupiahs for the FIFA World Cup Brazil 2014, which was inefficiency. Sentilun joined the conversation, saying that in Indonesia, inefficiency was “the case” and this happened in all governmental levels.

Sentilun violated the manner maxim in saying “*Kalo di Indonesia nggak usah ada piala dunia, borosnya itu permanen. Malah bocor kemana-mana*”. Sentilun could actually have said clearer expression, for example, using the word “corrupt”, “inefficiency”, or “manipulation”, instead of using the word “*bocor*”.

In this case, the listeners had to understand what *boros* (excessive) and *bocor* (leak out) referred to. Those words referred to the corruption, collusion and

manipulation that happen in Indonesia. By saying that inefficiency in Indonesia was permanent, Sentilun said that Indonesia was worse than Brazil.

Sentilun's utterance once again contains social criticism towards the Indonesian government. He criticized the excessive use of budget in Indonesia by saying that the inefficiency in Indonesia was permanent and occurred in all levels of the government. Sentilun also criticized the condition of Indonesian government that was (and is) full of corruptors. Some government officials had used the budget for their own needs, while many people suffered from poverty.

The following datum was related to the violation of manner maxim, in which a speaker needs to be brief.

- (23) Ndoro : Jadi gini, hebatnya politikus kita itu, mereka itu memakai kata-kata survey dan data itu sebenarnya untuk kelihatan pintar. Kan gitu, ya.
 Sentilun : Iya.
 Ndoro : Tapi ketika dia ngomongin berdasarkan survey, lho kelihatannya kok kaya berbohong, ya.
 Sentilun : Betul, Ndoro. **Mengharapkan politikus tidak berbohong itu ibaratnya seperti melarang pengantin baru tidak boleh menikmati malam pertama.**

The previous conversation was taken from the episode entitled "Bukan Sekedar Presiden Quick Count" broadcasted on July 14, 2014. Ndoro Sentilan said that the use of the words "based on surveys" in Indonesian politicians' speeches was meant to make the politicians sound smart. However, they seemed to lie. Sentilun agreed with Ndoro Sentilan and said, "*Mengharapkan politikus tidak berbohong itu ibaratnya seperti melarang pengantin baru tidak boleh menikmati malam pertama*".

I found a violation of manner maxim in Sentilun's last statement, for he was not being brief. He said that hoping the politicians not to lie was like banning a newlywed not to have a honeymoon. Sentilun could have said a brief statement, saying that the politicians were lying.

Sentilun's criticism can also be considered as a violation of quantity maxim. Sentilun could have said that Indonesian politicians often lie. However, he added his agreement to Ngoro's opinion, stating a simile that equates politicians' tendency to lie to the first night of newlywed couples.

In order to understand Sentilun's implicit meaning, the listeners should understand the chronicle of Indonesian politicians. People in Indonesia do not believe in Indonesian politicians because they are known to always lie. The listeners should also realize that Ngoro's statement about a politician who used surveys to affirm his statement particularly referred to SBY. He was known to refer to surveys in his speech so as to affirm his opinions.

Generally, the criticism concerns Indonesian politicians' tendency to lie. For example, they break their promises at the political campaign or they do not say the truth of an issue in Indonesia. They promise to overcome poverty in Indonesia, but after they are chosen, they are corrupt. This builds an assumption in Sentilun's mind that politicians are liar. Like a newlywed who will have a honeymoon after getting married, Indonesian politicians will lie so as to be selected.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The chapter consists of a conclusion of the discussion and the suggestion for the next researchers who are interested in conducting the same research. There are two conclusions that I can draw after analyzing “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show. Firstly, I found 24 utterances in the “Sentilan Sentilun” talk show that contain social criticism. Among these utterances, the violations concern 4 maxim violations, i.e. violation quantity maxim, quality maxim, relevance maxim, and manner maxim. Among those maxims, the most violated maxim is the manner maxim (50%), the quantity maxim (29.17%), the quality maxim (12.5%) and the relevance maxim (8.33%). Each utterance shows one maxim violation; yet, there is also one utterance that reflects two maxim violations.

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

cases that happened in Indonesia, e.g. corruption in the government, bribery in the election and poverty.

The suggestion for the next researchers is that they can use another theory to examine the implicatures, for example Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory (1995). Besides, they can also explain the reasons the speakers say the criticisms implicitly than saying them explicitly.

REFERENCES

- Aini, N. (2012). Tuturan Tayangan Humor Politik Sentilan Sentilun di Metro TV: Sebuah Analisis Teori Implikatur Percakapan Grice. *Jurnal Skriptorium*, 1 (1), 152-161. Retrieved from http://journal.unair.ac.id/article_6743_media45_category8_html
- Dewi, S. K. (2010). *Kritik Sosial terhadap Pemerintahan Jaman Victoria seperti yang Tercermin dalam Puisi 'At a Country Fair' karya Thomas Hardy* (Unpublished Bachelor Degree Thesis). Diponegoro University, Semarang.
- Djajasudarma, T. F. (2006). *Metode Linguistik: Ancangan Metode Penelitian dan Kajian*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Druzhinina, M. (2009). *Social Criticism Gets Animated. Satire and Humor in Corpse Bride (2005) by Timothy Burton* (Unpublished thesis). Haskoli Islands, Reykjavik. Retrieved from <http://skemman.is/en/item/view/1946/2965>.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Petersson, Sara. (2011). *The Hunger Games by Suzanne Collins: Entertainment or Social Criticism?* (Unpublished Bachelor's Degree thesis). Lund University, Lund. Retrieved from <http://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/lup/publication/2302969>
- Riekkinen, N. (2009). *'This is not criticism, but...'* Softening Criticism: The Use of lexical hedges in academic spoken interaction (Unpublished MA thesis). University of Helsinki, Helsinki. Retrieved from <http://www.helsinki.fi/englanti/elfa/research.html>
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: Second Edition*. London: Hodder Education.
- Sentilan Sentilun: Pilpres VS Piala Dunia – 7 Juli 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0IYRW-zdzKY> [Accessed on March 03, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Bukan Sekedar Presiden Quick Count – 14 Juli 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Xmz7mMaOLg> [Accessed on March 05, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Pemimpin dalam Islam – 21 Juli 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-fYQUIVkrQg> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Saatnya Bermaaf - maafan – 28 Juli 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bEsKH2_mKMI [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Pemimpin Baru Indonesia Baru – 4 Agustus 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EdPQuse7sa0> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Nasib Jakarta Tanpa Jokowi – 11 Agustus 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rHMoHav-RF4> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Ekspresi Kemerdekaan – 18 Agustus 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BjgloR-PGOY> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Industri Kreatif Penyumbang Devisa – 25 Agustus 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iPiEjrO9DSg> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: BBM Langka Rakyat Sengsara – 1 September 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sZ-fFOMkjbA9> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Calon Menteri Jokowi – 8 September 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ad8MqP7xxnk> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: BBM Hebat Solusi Tepat – 15 September 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3cIHL_13klU [Accessed on March 13, 2014]

Sentilan Sentilun: Suara Rakyat Suara Tuhan – 22 September 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QrxN4SvGuDQ> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Kugadaikan SK-Ku – 29 September 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e-bz27Ectgk> [Accessed on March 13, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Politik Panggung Sandiwara – 6 Oktober 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SRFc3WhrADg> [Accessed on April 09, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: Aspirasi dari Media Sosial – 13 Oktober 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZzCID6kxdP0> [Accessed on April 18, 2015]

Sentilan Sentilun: BBM Naik – 27 Oktober 2014 [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8L6LQXmK6uk> [Accessed on April 18, 2015]

Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pagmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX

Types of Maxim Violations in “Sentilan Sentilun” Talk Show on July 7, 2014 until October 27, 2014

1. Violation of Quantity Maxim

- (1) Sentilun : Apa kamu nggak pingin pacar kamu tu bukan pemain bola?
Misalnya politisi gitu?
Markonah : Waduh, wah. Haha....
Sentilun : Kenapa?
Markonah : **Serem juga, Mas.**
Nodoro : Takut ya?
Markonah : Iya.
Nodoro : Artis banyak yang dipanggil KPK.
Markonah : Itu lho. Nanti kebawa-bawa. Nanti aku dikasih bunga, eh, gara-gara bunga itu aku dipanggil KPK juga.
- (2) Sentilun : Jadi gini, Nodoro. Menurut, analisis saya, di hari lebaran ini, Nodoro, kita itu mesti bergembira dan berbahagia. Karena kita sekarang sudah punya presiden baru.
Nodoro : Harapannya apa? Harapannya apa?
Sentilun : Ya moga-moga presiden baru ini benar-benar bekerja untuk mengubah nasib rakyat menjadi lebih baik. **Nggak cuma jadi presiden yang hobinya dikit-dikit prihatin terhadap nasib rakyat.**
- (3) Sentilun : Lho, saya itu bingung, Nodoro, karena kalo sampai harga BBM naik,
Nodoro : Apa?
Sentilun : Kan berarti saya tambah miskin.
Nodoro : Lho, hubungannya apa?
Sentilun : BBM naik, harga-harga kan langsung naik.
Nodoro : Nah terus?
Sentilun : Tapi, *mosok* gaji saya naik? Nggak *to*?
Nodoro : Lho, itu menetap. Nah itu harus menetap, konsekuen, ya kan.
Sentilun : **Giliran rakyat kecil miskin disuruh permanen miskinnya.**
- (4) Nodoro : Tapi pernah kita juga diatur dalam penjara. Pernah ya?
Pak Budi : Nah, itu dia.
Sentilun : Malu-maluin, Nodoro.

Markonah : Lho? Di dalam penjara, Nodoro?
Ndoro : Wah, ada. Pak Budi bisa njelasin. Saya pura-pura nggak tahu.
Markonah : Masa *to*?
Sentilun : **Itu termasuk salah satu keajaiban di negeri ini.**
Markonah : Oo... keajaiban dunia jangan-jangan.
Sentilun : Lho iya. Pengurus bola mengendalikan organisasi dari dalam bui.

- (5) Asti Ananta : Kira-kira ni kalo Mas Sentilun jadi pembantu di rumah aku, mau nggak ya?
Sentilun : *Sorry*, ya. Terimakasih, Mbak Asti, tawarannya. Maaf, ya, saya tidak boleh rangkap jabatan.
Ndoro : Hmm...*gayamu. Mbelgedes*, pembantu rangkap jabatan nalar dari mana.
Sentilun : Lho, kalo saya jadi pembantunya di Nodoro lalu rangkap jabatan di tempatnya Mbak Asti, itu melanggar kode etik pembantu. **Nggak boleh rangkap jabatan beda sama pemimpin partai, seringkali, rangkap jabatan, ya.**
- (6) Ndoro : Hebat ya Indonesia ya. Kamu mau jadi apa coba? Mau nggak jadi pemain bola? Mau nggak?
Sentilun : Gini, Nodoro. Menurut, analisis saya, menjadi pemain bola itu kan karirnya singkat, Nodoro. Pendek banget, beda kalo aku jadi pembantu, jadi jongos, karirnya tidak singkat, *long term*.
Ndoro : Pemain bola tu paling tua berapa?
Pak Budi : Ya bisa kalo *keeper* sampai 42 ada.
Sentilun : Lho kalo aku jadi jongos itu bisa 72 tahun, Nodoro.
Markonah : Tergantung kuat nggak nya, ya.
Sentilun : Bisa konsisten jadi batur. Lagi pula, ya, kalo jadi pemain bola itu pangkat paling tinggi itu pol-polnya cuma kapten. Paling banter jadi kapten, ya, kapten Tsubasa.
All audiences : Hahaha...
Sentilun : Kalo saya, ya, Nodoro, ya, sangat berharap itu sepakbola kita makin baik. Para pemainnya juga semakin baik, nasibnya berubah tambah baik. **Jangan kaya nasib rakyat Indonesia yang dari tahun ke tahun konsisten menderitanya.** Kalo sepakbola kita berprestasi, kita semua rakyat nusantara raya pasti tambah bangga.
- (7) Cak Lontong : Ini kalo bisa misalnya damai bisa nggak, Nodoro?
Sentilun : Ndak bisa.
Cak Lontong : Saya bawa ke ketok magic itu lho.
Sentilun : Tidak bisa. Kamu itu bawaannya cuma mau membela diri terus. Ingat, ya, Cak lontong, sependai-pandai tupai

meloncat akhirnya akan jatuh juga. **Sepandai-pandainya mengambil uang negara akhirnya tertangkap di KPK.**

2. Violation of Quality Maxim

- (8) Sentilun : Ndoro, kalau kita cermati ya, sekarang ini tidak saja banyak lembaga survey, tapi juga banyak sekali tu lembaga konsultan politik.
Ndoro : Maksudnya apa itu?
Sentilun : Semua dikonsultaseni. Soal penampilan capres, konsultasi.
Ndoro : Kaya gimana, kaya gimana?
Sentilun : Penampilan, jambulnya aja diatur, Ndoro. Itu ada konsultannya. Cara bicaranya.
Caca : Cara jalan mungkin, cara jalan?
Sentilun : Cara jalan, *thumuk thumuk*.
Caca : Ada konsultannya?
Sentilun : Ada. Ini konsultannya. **Konsultasi cara jalan capres, moonwalker.**
- (9) Mucle : Yah, nasib kalau jadi orang miskin seperti saya ini harusnya kan dipelihara oleh negara.
Ndoro : Harusnya....
Mucle : sesuai dengan amanat undang-undang.
Ndoro : Betul betul.
Mucle : **Lha ini negara malah memelihara koruptor, lebih banyak daripada fakir miskin.** Sedih saya, Ndoro.
Ndoro : Tenang. Jangan nangis dulu dong. Di bulan Ramadhan ini, kamu itu tidak usah cemas. Soal rejeki sudah ada yang ngatur. Iya kan. Yang penting itu kita bersyukur, ya kan. Ada duit sedikit bersyukur, ya kan. Orang yang bersyukur itu selalu hatinya tenang. Gitu.
Sentilun : Sebagai batur, saya juga selalu bersyukur. Jadi orang miskin di negara ini memang mesti banyak bersyukur. Dikit-dikit bersyukur. Apalagi kalau sekarang ini, Ndoro. Musim kampanye gini bersyukur dapat serangan fajar. **Itulah fungsi utama orang miskin di Indonesia. Dibutuhkan hanya pada saat kampanye seperti sekarang ini.**
- (10) Ndoro : Makanya saya *pingin* dikenang sebagai pemimpin yang baik.
Sentilun : Waahh, *lha* kalo itu gampang, Ndoro.
Ndoro : Apa?
Sentilun : **Ndoro tinggal belajar acting.** Sebagai pemimpin, Ndoro harus *acting* prihatin atau terkejut.

3. Violation of Relevance Maxim

- (11) Ndoro : Jadi gini, lho, relawan itu beda sama kamu, lho.
Sentilun : Bedanya gimana?
Ndoro : Kamu itu *ndak* rela, ngeluh, nggak dapet gaji, ngeluh, dapet gaji, ngeluh.
Sentilun : Ha kalo pembantu kaya saya ini ngeluh ya wajar, Ndoro.
Ndoro : Kenapa?
Sentilun : **Ya asalkan jangan terus-terusan prihatin.** Jangan. Makanya saya berharap betul, pemimpin yang baru ini jangan kerjanya cuma prihatin-prihatin mulu.
- (12) Cak Lontong : *Edan, edan*, apa?
Sentilun : *Lha wong* tidak punya mobil kok bawa kunci segede ini!
Ndoro : Siapa bilang kunci? Gergaji!
Cak Lontong : Gergaji gimana *to*, Ndoro? Ini kunci!
Ndoro : O, kunci.
Sentilun : Kalo kuncinya segede gitu, lalu mobilnya segede apa, Cak?
Cak Lontong : **Haha...orang nggak ngerti. Mending bawa kunci besar daripada bawa dosa besar, iya kan?** Ini, Sentilun ini cuma ngiri, Ndoro, karena saya punya mobil. **Saya kalo kaya tu gini, kemana-mana bawa kunci mobil besar. Lha, kamu bawa kunci borgol!**

4. Violation of Manner Maxim

- (13) Ndoro : Emang bener lho, situasi permainan bola itu nggak bisa dipisahkan ama situasi politik, ya Pak ya? Sering sepakbola itu dipakai untuk sarana politik. Di piala dunia Brazil sekarang ini, eee, *ndak* semua lho setuju. Banyak yang nggak setuju.
Sentilun : Masa, Ndoro?
Ndoro : Iya. “Apa ini? Pemborosan”, gitu bilanginya. Betul nggak, Pak, gitu Pak?
Pak Budi : Yaa...pemerintah Brazil menghabiskan sekitar 13 trilyun untuk piala dunia. Itu pemborosan.
Sentilun : **Kalo di Indonesia, nggak usah ada piala dunia, borosnya itu permanen. Malah bocor kemana-mana.**
- (14) Ndoro : Jadi, emang pildun, ya, sama pilpres itu, apa ya yang kira-kira menarik untuk diperbandingkan. Nah, ini harus diperbandingkan. Misalnya....
Sentilun : Umpamanya, umpamanya?
Ndoro : Di bola kan ada wasit, di pemilu kan ada KPU.
Sentilun : Oo...wasit juga.
Ndoro : Naahh, iya kan. Aturan-aturannya itu kan ada di viva kan ada statuta, kan begitu. Soal *supporter*, pendukung capres.

Sentilun : Sama.
Markonah: Kok sama, ya.
Sentilun : Banyak kesamaannya, ya, Mas Budi.
Ngoro : **Ada wani piro-nya juga nggak itu?**
Pak Budi : Hahaha...nggak boleh.

(15) Mucle : Tapi menurut saya pada kampanye itu, ee, Ngoro nanya tadi ada yang menarik *ndak*.

Ngoro : Ya, ada yang menarik nggak?

Mucle : Menurut saya, nggak, karena saya bukan menarik. **Saya ditarik justru. Ditarik - tarik gitu, para capres ini.** “Ayo-ayo ikut saya. Ayo ikut saya”. “Nggak, saya mau ikut orang tua saya aja”. Saya ditarik-tarik, Ngoro.

(16) Cak Lontong : Dia itu mau, sebenarnya mau nyamar jadi presiden

Ngoro : O gitu, gitu ya..

Sentilun : Nyamar jadi pesiden?

Cak Lontong : Iini. Tapi elektibilitasnya ini yang nggak pas. **Malah suka mbayar-mbayar lembaga survey.** Elektibilitasnya nggak naik, yang naik malah dosanya.

(17) Sentilun : Aku tu udah terbiasa, udah hafal tabiat majikanku itu. Selalu aku...

Ngoro : Ajarin, ajarin.

Sentilun : Jadi jongosnya ini, disuruh makan anggiinn melulu. Gaji telat melulu. Jadi begini, lho, Mas Mucle, ya. Kita ini kan, ya, sesama pembantu, levelnya sama, sesama rakyat kita, ya. **Jadi, ya, biasa to, kalau kita itu selalu dikibuli oleh orang-orang seperti mereka itu.**

(18) Mucle : Harus ada keseimbangan antara pemimpin dan rakyat, cintanya harus berimbang, pemimpin mencintai rakyat, rakyat mencintai pemimpin. **Jangan sampai cinta antara pemimpin dan rakyat bertepuk sebelah tangan.**

Sentilun : Hmm...cocok.

Ngoro : Emang susah, ya. (bertepuk sebelah tangan)

Mucle : Iya. Atau jangan sampai seperti judul lagu dangdut.

Ngoro : Apa itu?

Mucle : Buka *sithik*, jos.

All audiences: Hahaha....

Mucle : *Ora sithik-sithik.* Buka sing lebar. Jadi, pemimpin harus transparan.

Ngoro : Nggak boleh *sithik-sithik*, nggak boleh, ya.

Mucle : Nggak boleh, **transparan biar tidak terjadi yang namanya bocor.**

- (19) Pak Anies : Dan kita juga menyaksikan orang-orang profesional yang bekerja dengan sepenuh hati. Ada yang bekerja profesional tapi tidak sepenuh hati. Kenapa? Yaa...saya bekerja semata-mata karena profesi. Tapi yang di sana terjadi adalah ada yang relawan dan ada profesional yang bekerja juga merasa karena saya melakukan ini bukan sekedar karena profesi tapi karena saya tahu ini punya dampak untuk Indonesia. Oh itu luar biasa. Itu pengalaman yang luar biasa.
- Ndoro : Ini mesti berdo'a ini. **Ya Allah, kami mudah-mudahan cepat terbebas dari suasana wani pira.**
- Caca : Amin, amin. Amin, amin, amin. Amin.
- (20) Sentilun : Mbak Asri udah denger belum soal RUU Pilkada itu?
Asri Welas: Terus terang kalo saya soal Pilkada nggak tahu, tapi Pil KB saya tahu.
- Sentilun : Bedaaa.
- Ndoro : Gimana, gimana, *bedane apa?*
- Sentilun : Pil KB, kalo lupa langsung jadi. **Kalo Pilkada, begitu jadi langsung lupa.**
- (21) Hamdi Muluk : DPRD tingkat 2 itu presentase yang menggadaikan tu sampai 80 sampai 90. Itu hampir semua. DPRD 1 berkurang dikit, tapi masih di sekitar 70 persen. Nah, saya *ndak* tahu itu kalo DPR pusat.
- Ndoro : DPR pusat juga menggadaikan?
- Hamdi Muluk : Ada nggadai-nggadaikan.
- Sentilun : Ooo DPR pusat nggak pernah menggadaikan SK.
- Caca : Tahu dari mana, Mas Sentilun?
- Sentilun : **Yang digadaikan itu kehormatannya.**
- (22) Sentilun : Kalo itu begini, Ndoro. Menurut, analisis saya, di Indonesia itu, Ndoro, ada beberapa tipe pemimpin. Kalo dulu, ya, Bung Karno itu menyelesaikan masalah dengan cepat. Makanya sering disebut pemimpin yang selalu turun tangan. Kalo jaman Pak Harto, dia kan inginnya menciptakan pemerintahan yang stabil, maka sering disebut sebagai pemimpin yang campur tangan.
- Ndoro : Ya, ya, ya, ya.
- Sentilun : Karena sering kita dengar *to*, “Saya akan campur tangan, Saudara-saudara”. Dulu itu.
- Ndoro : Nah kalo pemimpin yang sekarang gimana?
- Sentilun : **Lha kalo pemimpin yang sekarang itu bercita-cita menciptakan pemerintahan yang bersih, maka dia sering cuci tangan.**

- (23) Ndoro : Jadi gini, hebatnya politikus kita itu, mereka itu memakai kata-kata survey dan data itu sebenarnya untuk kelihatan pintar. Kan gitu, ya.
- Sentilun : Iya.
- Ndoro : Tapi ketika dia ngomongin berdasarkan survey, lho kelihatannya kok kaya berbohong, ya.
- Sentilun : Betul, Ndoro. **Mengharapkan politikus tidak berbohong itu ibaratnya seperti melarang pengantin baru tidak boleh menikmati malam pertama.**
- (25) Ndoro : Kira-kira apa, ya, yang menarik, ya, kalo nilai-nilai kepahlawanan itu, Mas, ya, dibikin film seperti superhero. Mungkin Mas Hanung tertarik bikin superhero; judulnya bukan Superman, tapi, misalnya, Super Sentilun. Itu gimana?
- Sentilun : Lah, nanti slogannya lain, Ndoro.
- Ndoro : Apa dong?
- Sentilun : Sentilun, Pahlawan yang Tidak Terkalahkan. **Ha iya, kalo kalah langsung nggugat ke MK.**