

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is an introductory section of the present study. It consists of background of the study, research questions, aims of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study, clarification of key terms, and organization of the paper.

1.1 Background of the Study

The function of language has become more important especially when it comes to debating. A debate forum functions as a media which provides some 'big' ideas for the people who are the audience of the forum to assess one's interests through the language used by the debaters. A debater is forced to speak well, to the point and to follow the context of the current issues which is being discussed. Context of language use is limited from everything that is outside the text knowing context is a natural trait that grows beyond language or discourse meaning in speech (Saragih, 2006).

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, 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).

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the knowledge of conversational implicatures is needed when we are about to observe one's interest through language. A debate is one of activities in which implicatures occur. This happens because the participants are not only forced to answer panelist's questions critically, but also they need to get their opinions delivered and accepted by the people in the forum.

Lately, a candidate debate in Indonesia has been one of the social phenomena. Particularly in Indonesia, the occurrence of such phenomenon is due to the election of governor which is directly elected by the people. In other words, direct election provides more optimism towards the establishment of democracy as opposed to the format of governor election done through people council mechanism. Such optimism promises the birth of democracy supported by rational political values, with the hope that people will critically elect their leaders who possess capability, quality and integrity.

Participating in politics is a consequence of politicizing communication (Nimmo, 2011). Such notion is done through one's socializing experience in establishing trustworthiness, value and hopes that are relevant with politics. It causes the grown-ups to actively play a role in politics.

As a form of evaluation towards the election, there is an urgent need to give a concrete effort in participating towards the provision of candidates capable of improving the election quality. One of the efforts done in doing so is through a candidate debate.

A candidate debate forum or candidate dialogue has been a means of improving candidates' quality given that in this forum (1) the candidate will describe the background of their participation as well as the programs to be done once they get elected, (2) the candidates are able to convince people with constructive and critical insights, (3) the people will freely and democratically get acquainted with the agendas proposed by the candidates, (4) the candidates are demanded to truthfully compete with other candidates' programs, visions and missions.

In the candidate debate forum, the candidates are required to communicate well and assertively. There is a crucial need to consider the linguistic context suitable with current society condition. The classification of context is very facilitative in interpreting the meaning of language used by such candidates. The public needs pragmatic-related knowledge to get a grasp on the meanings beyond such political language.

The classification of context puts ease in interpreting a meaning as shown in illustration as follow. A panelist asked a question to a governor candidate regarding what action that he will take in order to clear problems of the city which he is about to govern once he wins the election.

(A) "What actions will you take when you win the election?"

(B) "There are things that I would like to do once I become the governor. I know clearing all the problems in this city will not be easy. But, If I win this election, I promise I will make this city better than before."

In this illustration, B expresses more meanings than just a group of words he has delivered. The response given by B was not informative towards A's question. B has obviously violates relevance maxim: when A wants clear strategies or actions that B will conduct when he is elected, B only promises that he will make the city he is about to govern better. Here, a possible implicature is that B only focuses on promoting himself and has no clear strategy to conduct once he is elected as a governor.

A debate is consequently a crucial vehicle for candidates to advance their ideas or interests. Hence, today's candidate debates are publicized by way of any media to reach broader audience. This is considered effective to express one's interest in the politics.

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. Since he 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.

A Similar line of research came from Nanda (2012) through his analysis through “Take Me Out Indonesia”. He found that the conversational implicatures were analyzed in the same way which was by analyzing what maxims were not observed during the conversation.

Departing from some of the results obtained from the previous studies, there appears a gap that it is not only violations that pose a conversational implicature, but also the form of adherence to the Grice (1975)’s principles of cooperation. Conversational implicatures with the intention of explaining what might be interpreted, implied, or intended by the speaker in a conversation serve as the main element in conveying humor or other purposes which is missing from all the studies.

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.

1.2 Research Questions

The research questions of this study are as follows:

1. What cooperative principles were not observed in the 2012 Jakarta Governor’s election?
2. What conversational implicatures were generated during the debate as a result of the violation of cooperative principles?

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study aims to do the following:

1. To reveal what cooperative principles were not observed in the 2012 Jakarta Governor's election.
2. To reveal what conversational implicatures were generated during the debate as a result of the violation of the cooperative principles.

1.4 Scope of the Study

This study is limited to a discussion of the principles of cooperation in conversation when maxims are not observed or violations are difficult to avoid during a debate between 2012 candidates of DKI Jakarta governor. The selected data were taken from a debate forum which was shown by Metro TV on August 18, 2012.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is to serve as the basis for future plans to teachers/researchers who are working in the field of pragmatics. The result is hoped to shed light on how exactly maxims are purposely violated by the speaker in order to conceal some of his or her intentions or interests. Furthermore, this study is expected to benefit some future researchers by providing the facts needed to compare their study during the time they conduct similar studies.

1.6 Research Methodology

In order to solve the problem of this research, there were three steps being taken, namely 1) data collection, (2) analyzing the data, and (3) presenting the results of data analysis (Sudaryanto, 1993). The selected data were taken from a debate forum which was shown in Metro TV on August 18, 2012. The debate show was transcribed and analyzed by using Grice (1975)'s cooperative principles theory. The result of this analysis will be presented by using an informal method which is presenting data by putting all data collections and results altogether then analyze them thoroughly (Sudaryanto, 1993).

1.7 Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters, preceded by Abstract, Table of Content and Acknowledgments. The first chapter is the Introduction, which consists of the Background of Study, the Statement of the Problems, the Purpose of the Study, the Scope of the Study and The significance of the study. The second chapter contains a literary review. The third chapter contains Research Methodology. The fourth chapter is the Analysis of the discussion towards the data analysis. The last chapter is the Conclusion, followed by Bibliographies and Appendices.