

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the research findings and discusses them afterward within the following framework of the study:

1. the violations to conversational maxims in the talk shows;
2. the occurrence of the violations;
3. the frequency of the violations; and
4. the reasons of the occurrence of the most frequent violated maxim in the talk shows.

4.1 Violation to Conversational Maxims in Each Talk Show

The findings and discussion are presented in forms of utterance analyses per talk show. Following the presentation of findings, full discussion on each respective relevant data will be presented. Number of lines in each analyzed utterance of the three talk shows is attached to make it easier to find the violation of the conversational maxims that occurs in the utterance. Moreover, green highlight mark is used to differentiate the violated chunk of an utterance with inviolate one—in the same line. Blue highlight mark is used to mark different type of violated maxim in the same utterance. Subsequently, the result of the analyses is transferred into summary tables to observe the most violated maxim easier in the talk shows. The talk shows include:

- a. “Padamu Negeri” ;
- b. “Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue”; and
- c. “Today’s Dialogue”.

a. Padamu Negeri

Padamu Negeri is a talk show using electronic voting system to involve all of the participants to the discussion. Hosted by DG this show is broadcasted every Thursday at 20.00 on Metro TV.

Broadcasted in November 22, 2007, “Televisi sebagai Guru Bangsa” was randomly chosen as one of the show’s topics to be examined in this study. The depiction of violation to conversational maxims analysis in *Padamu Negeri* is presented below:

1. DG : *Kurang variatif itu apakah jenisnya atau isinya, bu?* 1
(Less various, is it the kind or the content, Ma’am?)
- IK : *Ya, isinya. Bahwa ada kecenderungan misalnya tayangan TV yang satu itu menguntungkan misalnya yang mistis atau kekerasan cenderung diikuti oleh TV-TV lain. Juga kurang variatif...ehm...proporsionalnya itu kurang. Dimana nuansa hiburannya itu lebih menonjol dari nuansa edukatifnya. Kecuali Metro TV dan TVRI.* 5
(The content, of course. That there is a tendency that, for example, a particular TV show is advantageous, let’s say mystical or violence shows, and will be mimicked by the other TV stations. It’s also less various in terms of... emm... the proportion. Where the nuance of entertainment is more prominent than that of education. Except Metro TV and TVRI.). 10 15

The question from DG above requires ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. However, after answering ‘yes’, IK—a representative of Group B, the Children Development Foundation and the Coalition of No-Television Day—added an explanation of her answer about the tendency of television programs. She also explained how television programs could not be considered varied. It was more informative than was required. It can be seen in highlighted lines (3) to (9), or in (10) to (17).

2. DG : *Baik terima kasih. Itulah barangkali yang diinginkan ibu-ibu adalah yang variatif dan juga mendidik bagi anak-anaknya. Silakan kelompok C dulu! Nama Anda dan opini Anda?* 1
 (Alright, thank you. That’s perhaps what the women want is various as well as educating programs for their children. Please, Group C, first! Please mention you name and opinion!). 5
- CT : *Saya CT. Menurut kami, tontonan televisi memang variatif soalnya dilihat dari informasi ada. Di TV Khan ada misalnya informasi tentang kesehatan. Khan udah ada di TV.* 10
 (I’m CT. In our opinion, TV shows are indeed various, because we see it from the information given. On the television there is information, for example, of health. It’s there on the television). 15

DG gave information much more than was required. In the situation above, he gave a chance to group C to put forward their opinion. Nonetheless, he did not do that directly. He thanked the representative of group B for delivering her opinion first, and then he made a conclusion from what the representative of group B said. It can be seen in highlighted lines (1) to (3), or in (5) to (7).

The same case also occurred as CT—a representative of Group C, coalition of five universities—answered the question given by DG. CT gave a respond to the question more than was required. The question needed ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. However, after answering ‘yes’, she added information that actualy was not required. It can be seen in highlighted lines (10) to (12) or (14) to (26).

3. DG : *Informasi kejahatan tentang misalnya orang yang 1
perutnya disobek-sobek, perlu ga itu?*
(Crime information about, for example, someone’s
stomach being ripped, is it needed?)
- CT : *Oh, kalau itu khan untuk informasi supaya orang 5
lebih warning terhadap sekitarnya.*
(Oh, well, that kind of information is intended to
make people more warning [aware] of their
surrounding.)

In the dialogue above, CT unclearly answered the question given. She did not mention clearly whether the kind of news should be informed or not. She only mentioned that the kind of news functioned as an information to make people more aware of their surroundings. Lines (5) to (6) or (7) to (9) show the violation.

4. DG : *Kejahatan kesadisan itu perlu ga ditampilkan seperti 1
itu? dengan kamera yang jelas misalnya?*
(It means that should the sadistic crime be shown like
that? With a close-up clear camera perspective, for
example?) 5
- CT : *Tapi khan di televisi itu udah ada batasan- 10
batasannya. Jadi informasi udah ada, edukasi untuk
anak-anak juga khan terkadang ada di televisi.*
(But, the television has its own boundaries. So the
information is there, education for children is also,
sometimes, there).

CT mentioned that there were limits to broadcast a show and there was educational program for children in television instead of mentioning clearly whether the kind of news was needed to be informed or not. It can be viewed in lines (6) to (8) or (9) to (11).

5. DG : *Ya, pemirsa kembali lagi dalam survey interaktif padamu negeri. Tadi, kedua kelompok sudah memberikan argumentasinya. Sekarang tinggal dari kelompok A. Silakan! Singkat saja.* 1
 (Well, viewers, [we're] back again in the interactive survey Padamu Negeri. Previously, two groups have presented their argumentations. Now, it left only opinion of Group A, please! Make it brief.) 5
- AL : *saya AL dari RCTI. Menurut kami program televisi sudah variatif dan informatif. Kalau misalnya kita lihat TV dari sisi variatif, sebenarnya kategori program itu terdiri dari beberapa macam. Yang pertama entertain. Entertain juga ada genrenya masing-masing. Kemudian kita bicara masalah series, sports, news. Dan hampir setiap program ini, kategori ini, hampir di setiap TV itu ada. Mungkin satu TV kategorinya terbesar katakanlah di series, kemudian yang lain seperti metro TV ini...* 10
 (I'm AL from RCTI. We think that television programs have been various and informative. If we see television programs from the 'various' side, actually the category of the programs consists of several kinds. The first is entertainment, and this entertainment has its own separate genres. Then we talk about series, sports, news. And almost in every programs, category, and television, they exist. Perhaps a television has biggest category of series, and the other like Metro TV...) 15 20 25

DG gave a chance to group A to present their ideas. Nonetheless, before he did so, he welcomed all the participants and viewers back to the show. He did not state his utterance briefly. Highlighted lines (1) to (3) or (5) to (7) show the violation.

Still in the context above, AL—a representative from the Association of Indonesia Private Televisions and the Community of Indonesia Televisions or Group A—gave much more information than was required to the participants. He only needed to answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’. However, after answering ‘yes’, he added more information about the television programs categories in terms of variation. It can be viewed in highlighted lines (10) to (18) or (20) to (28).

6. DG : Trend *atau memang ga ada ide lain?* 1
 (Is it trend, or because there’s no idea?)
 AL : *Itu trend. Katakanlah kemaren kita booming dengan reality show. Semua masuk dengan reality show, Jadi itu artinya adalah kita Bergeraknya adalah kalau di industri TV adalah memaksimalkan penonton di masing-masing station TV.* 5
 (That’s trend. Let’s say yesterday we’re booming with reality shows. Every one comes in with reality show. So it means that our movement, in the TV Station, is to optimize each station’s viewers.) 10

AL was supposed to say whether the discussed issue was a trend or not. He actually said that it was. Nevertheless, he added information about the trend of television programs. That information was not asked. Highlighted lines (3) to (7) or (8) to (11) show the violation.

7. DG : *Baik, terima kasih. Jadi Pak menteri, Kalau jawaban dari teman-teman dari RCTI atau asosiasi televisi swasta itu adalah sudah merasa variatif, tapi ibu sebagai penonton variatif dalam artian keberagaman akomodir kebutuhan masyarakat. Misalnya begini satu TV menayangkan yang mati pake belatung, semuanya pake belatung gitu loh, ini bagaimana bapak melihat? Apakah sudah variatif dan informatif?* 1
(Alright, thank you. So, Mr. Minister, the answer from the RCTI or ATVSI, fellows stated that they have been various, while that Ma'am as spectator stated that various is in terms of the variety to accommodate people's needs. For example, a TV station shows a man dead with maggots, the other stations follow suit to show a dead man with maggots, how do you see this? have they been various and informative?) 5
 10
 15
 20
 25
- Minister : *variatif atau informatif itu saya kira nomor yang kedua. justru yang paling penting itu substansinya. Meskipun variatif, tapi kalau substance, content dari apa yang disampaikan itu tidak tepat, tidak memiliki unsur-unsur edukasi, tidak ada gunanya.*
(Various or informative is the second in my opinion; the most important is the substance. Although it's various, but if its content or substance is not appropriate, have no educational elements, it's useless).

The point of this situation was to ask the Minister for his opinion. However, DG did not do that straightforwardly. Before he did that, he thanked the representative of group A for answering the question and concluded all the answered given by the representatives of each group. In other words, the violation occurred as DG did not avoid the prolixity in his utterance. It can be viewed in highlighted lines (1) to (7) or (10) to (17).

Still in the context above, the Minister of Communication and Informatics answered vaguely whether television programs in Indonesia had been variatif or informative or not. He stated that being various and informative was less important than the substance of the programs. It can be seen in highlighted lines (19) to (20) or (25). Moreover, he also added some unrequired information about the substance of the program. It can be viewed in highlighted lines (21) to (24) or (26) to (29).

8. DG : *Ok, saya pindah ke sini dulu pak menteri. Silakan* 1
AA! Apa pendapat Anda?
(Alright, I'll move here, for the moment, Mr.
Minister. I have to interfere. AA, please! What's
your opinion?) 5
- AA : *Ya, hanya khan begini. Kalau semuanya sama,*
samalah, tapi yang dimaksud keberagaman tadi, ini
kok suasananya begini semua, kenapa ga ikut-ikutan
bikin padamu negeri? versi lain khan ada padamu
bangsa, padamu apa khan bisa. Nah, ini mungkin 10
pertanyaannya.
(Well, it's just like this. If all are the same, so be it,
but what is meant by the 'various' previously is that
why the atmosphere are all the same, why not follow
suit to create Padamu Negeri? There are other 15
versions of it, right, Padamu Bangsa, Padamu
whatsoever, you can do it, right? Perhaps this is the
question.)

In the dialogue above, DG did not say what he meant briefly.

The point of DG's statement was to ask AA. However, before he gave a chance to AA to talk, he told the minister that he would be asking AA. Highlighted lines (1) to (2) or (3) to (4) show the violation.

Still in this dialogue, AA—a journalist, man of letters, and television practitioner—stated his argument unclearly. He did not say his opinion clearly—whether he thought that the television programs had been varied or not. Lines (6) to (11) or (12) to (18) show where the violation occurs.

9. DG : *Baik mas MR, apa Anda melihat apakah sudah cukup apa yang diinginkan oleh masyarakat? Lalu tindakannya seperti apa kalau misalnya ternyata cukup merugikan masyarakat?* 1
 (Alright Mas MR, from KPI did you see whether it's sufficient or not of what people wants? And what kind of action [to take] if it is quite harming the society, perhaps here?) 5
- MR : *Tentunya tugas kami disini khan harus fair dengan masyarakat...* 10
 (Of course our duty here is to be fair with the society...)

In the situation above, MR—a member of central KPI (Indonesia Broadcasting Commission)—answered the questions vaguely.

● He did not mention what actually needed to answer the questions was. He did not mention whether existing television programs had made audience satisfied. He neither answered what his organization action to solve the discussed problem. He only mentioned that his organization had to be fair to the public. It can be viewed from his utterance in lines (9) to (10) or (11) to (12).

He answered that way possibly due to an interruption made by another participant. The interruption itself can be viewed from the next dialogue—in the next number.

10. AA : *Sama yang punya TV berani ga KPI?*
 (With the TV owner, does KPI dare or not?)
 MR : *ya, tentunya harus ada keberanian.*
 (Of course that courage must exist)

MR unclearly stated whether his organization had any courage to warn the owners of Indonesian television stations. He stated that his organization should be brave in reproving them. Line (3) or (4) shows where the violation occurs.

11. AA : *Harusnya? Ama orang televisi ada yang berani ga?* 1
 (It should be...? Is there anybody dares [to deal] with the television people?)
 MR : *Tapi yang jelas saya setuju dengan kelompok B dimana saya menganggap kurang variatif. Karena kalau dilihat dari segmen tingkat layaknya, karena semua kelompok dewasa yang menjadi konsumsi...isi siaran itu yang menjadi concern ya.* 5
 (Anyway, certainly, I agree with group B where I think it's less various. Because if we see the segment of its appropriateness, because the entire adult group who become consumers...the content is the concern...) 10

In the situation above, MR answered the question given by AA irrelevantly. The question was about the braveness of KPI in admonishing television stations in Indonesia. However, MR answered the question by saying that he agreed with group B's opinion and he also gave his reason of agreeing with them. Lines (4) to (8) or (9) to (13) show the violation.

12. DG : ...*apakah industri televisi di Indonesia ini sudah berlangsung secara sehat? ataukah tidak sehat?...Saya akan memberikan kesempatan pada kelompok B dulu! Silakan, mas!* 1
 (...has television industry in Indonesia go fairly? Or unfairly?...I will give the first chance to answer the question to group B first. Go ahead, Mas!) 5
- IB : *Saya kira persaingan industri televisi di Indonesia tidak perlu dikatakan ada persaingan. Tetapi justru hanya dikuasai segelintir orang dalam konglomerasi media yang sangat mengurita.* 10
 (I think the competition of television industry in Indonesia can't be said there's any competition. It's just controlled by a few people in the media conglomeration that has vast network.) 15

IB—a representative of Group B—answered the question unclearly. He did not mention whether competition between Indonesia television stations had been going on well. He stated that there was no competition in Indonesian television world. It can be seen in highlighted lines (8) to (9) or (12) to (13). Still in the context above, MI added unrequired information that there were some people controlling the television stations. Highlighted lines (10) to (11) or (14) to (15) show where the violation occurs.

13. DG : *Jadi sesungguhnya tidak ada persaingan di sana?* 1
 (So, there's no competition, there?)
- IB : *Saya kira demikian.*
 (I think so...)

In the dialogue above, IB stated unclearly if there was any competition in Indonesian television stations. He answered that he guessed that there was no competition in it. Line (3) or (4) shows the violation.

- 14.DG : *Baik, terima kasih. Silakan kelompok A! Menurut Anda, apakah sudah sehat persaingan industri televisi Indonesia?* 1
 (Alright, thank you. Go ahead group A! Do you think Indonesian television industry has been going on fairly?) 5
- GL : *Terima kasih, nama saya GL. Sebenarnya untuk mengukur persaingan sehat atau ga itu cuma ada indikator. Indikator pertama itu pricing policy. Bagaimana kebijakan harga di dalam suatu industri. sampai hari ini tidak ada suatu kelompokpun, kalau mau dibidang kelompok, yang mengendalikan harga. Indikator kedua adalah penguasaan pasar. Sampai detik ini tidak ada yang menguasai lebih dari 35% audience share maupun advertising market share. Yang ketiga adalah, akses entrydaril ...akses orang masuk ke dalam industri...* 10
 (Thank you, I'm GL. Actually to measure the fair or unfair competition, there are only indicators. The first indicator is the pricing policy. How the pricing policy in an industry is. Up to this moment, there's no single group, if you may say so, that control the price. The second indicator is the market share. Up to now, there's no one controlling more than 35% audience share or advertising market share. The third is *entrydaril* access...access for people to get into the industry...) 20 25

In the utterance above, GL—a representative of Group A—did not mention clearly whether the competition had been going on well. He only mentioned that there were three indicators to measure the competition. The information stated by him was actually unneeded. Highlighted lines (7) to (18) or (19) to (28) show where the violation occurs.

15. DG : *Terima kasih. Bagaimana kelompok C? Menurut Anda, apakah sudah sehat persaingannya?* 1
(Thank you. What do you think, group C? Has it been going on fairly?)
- AF : *Assalamualaikum, saya AF, mewakili kelompok C. Dari kelompok C disini balance ya. 45-45. hanya 5 yang menjawab lain-lain. Artinya di sini ada dua pendapat yang sama kuat gitu.. Pendapat saya pribadi sudah berlangsung sehat, wajar-wajar saja. Mungkin ada..teknisnya mungkin membuat suatu jargon-jargon misalnya RCTI oke, SCTV ngetop, itu sah-sah saja.* 5
(Assalamualaikum, I'm AF, for Group C. [The answer] from group C is balanced, right, 45-45, only 5 that answer others. It means that there are two opinions that are equally strong. My personal opinion, [it] has been fair, natural. Perhaps there's...the technical practice perhaps by making jargons like RCTI oke, SCTV ngetop, it is fine.) 10 15

Here, AF—a representative of Group C—said more information about the balance answer that his group had, which was actually not required to mention before answering the question. Moreover, he added unrequired information about the technical practice in Indonesian television stations competition. It can be viewed in highlighted lines (5) to (8) and (10) to (12) or (13) to (16) and (17) to (19).

16. DG : *...Apakah sudah bisa dikatakan sehat dalam bersaing? Silakan Pak Menteri!* 1
(... Can we say that the competition has been going on well? Go ahead Mr. Minister!)
- Minister : *Yang menarik bukan urusan persaingan sehat tidak sehat, tapi justru apakah yang disajikan TV itu bisa menyehatkan masyarakat. Meskipun persaingannya sehat, tapi kalau masyarakat menjadi tidak sehat, manfaatnya nda ada.* 5

Kriteria sehat itu saya merumuskan, apa yang disajikan oleh TV itu ada edukasinya, yang kedua ada pemberdayaan—empowering, yang ketiga itu mampu mencerahkan masyarakat, dan yang keempat tentu itu semua dikemas dalam membangun nasional. (What’s interesting is not the matter of fair or unfair competition, instead, whether or not what the TV presents can make the society healthier. Although the competition is fair, but if it makes the society ill, there will be no advantages. That health or fairness criteria were formulated by me, what the television presents must contain education; secondly, it must contain empowering; the third, it must be able to enlighten people; and the fourth, all of it must be framed for national development).

The Minister did not give a clear answer about the competition happening, whether it was fair or unfair. He chose to focus on what television stations gave to the public. He emphasized whether the television programs were good for people to watch or not. The violation can be viewed in highlighted lines (5) to (9) or (15) to (19).

He also gave unwanted information about criteria of a good television program. The violation occurs in highlighted lines (10) to (14) or (20) to (25).

- 17.DG : ...Apakah Anda yakin dengan keakuratan hasil rating satu tayangan televisi di Indonesia?... Silakan sekarang saya jadi tertarik untuk kelompok A dulu. Silakan!
(Do you believe at the accuracy of rating of Indonesia television programs? ...Now, I am attracted to the Group A, go ahead!) 1 5
- MK : Saya MK dari Komteve sebuah lembaga independent yang mengkaji dan mengkritisi kebijakan dari industri televisi maupun pemerintah. *Bicara rating bisa tujuh hari tujuh malam ga selesai. Tapi ini* 10

adalah buah dari metode statistik. Sebagai industri kita bisa berdebat mengenai statistic. Tapi pastinya, pastinya di situ ada unsur jumlah responden sendiri, pergerakan responden, maupun selera yang tidak bisa terwakili. 15

(I'm MK from Komteve, an independent institution that reviewing and criticizing the policies of the television industry or the government.

If we talk about the rating, it may take forever to finish it. 20

But it is the result of statistical method. As the industry we can argue about the statistic. But one thing for sure, there must be the element of the number of respondents themselves, the respondents movement, and unrepresented desire). 25

MK—a representative of Group A—stated his opinion unclearly about the accuracy of rating of Indonesian television program. Instead of discussing the accuracy, he chose to state that it took forever to discuss rating. It can be seen in line (10) or (20) to (21).

Furthermore, he introduced his department to all participants, which had already been done by the host at the beginning of the show. Besides, Moko also talked about a method as a result of the television programs rating and elements in it, which were not asked to be explored here. It can be viewed in lines (8) to (10) and (12) to (16), or in (17), (19) and (22) to (26).

- 18.DG : Terima kasih. Bagaimana pendapat Anda kelompok B? Apakah Anda yakin dengan keakuratannya? (Thank you. What do you think group B? Are you sure about the accuracy?) 1
- SN : *Nama saya SN. Ada tiga isu tadi yang disebutkan itu ada isu metodologis, kemudian kedua masalah audit, audit eksternal tidak ada untuk hasil rating, jadi pak menteri ini menjadi catatan untuk pak menteri* 5

hendaknya. Harus ada audit eksternal. Dan yang ketiga adalah bagaimana kita bisa mempercayai sebuah hasil dari satu lembaga rating. Saya ingin mendorong, pada kesempatan ini, rekan-rekan untuk melakukan rating. Dan kalau perlu mari kita tuntut lembaga rating yang bertanggung jawab.

(My name is SN. There were three issues mentioned; methodology issues, auditory issues, there is no external audit for the rating result, so Mr. Minister, it should be a note for you. There must be the external audit. And the third is how we can believe in a result of a rating institution. I want to urge you, at this occasion, to do the rating. And if we have to, let us demand for a responsible rating institution).

Here, SN—a representative of Group B—added information about three issues in rating. She also suggested the minister to note that there was no external audit in rating. Besides, she convinced the other participants to rate television programs and sued the rating department. All the additional information she added were actually not needed to inform, in this case. She did not state her answer about the accuracy of the rating clearly. Those violations can be seen in highlighted lines (5) to (14) or (15) to (22).

19.DG : *Pemirsa dua kelompok tadi sudah memberikan argumennya. Sekarang saya ke AA. AA silakan! Apa pendapat Anda?*

(Viewers, the two groups have given their arguments. Now, I move to AA. AA, go ahead! What do you think about it?)

AA : *Sebenarnya soal rating itu yakin ga yakin, itu dipakai gitu lho.*

Masalahnya bagaimana menafsirkan rating ini. (Actually about the rating is between believe and doubts, because it is being used.

The problem is how to interpret the rating).

Here, DG's point is to give a chance to AA to talk. However, he informed to the audience first that two groups had put forward their minds. The information actually not needed. Highlighted lines (1) to (2) or (4) show where the violation occurs.

Here, AA gave unclear answer to all the people involved in the discussion. He stated that accuracy of rating was about certainty. It can be seen in lines (7) to (8) or (10) to (11).

He also gave unrequired information as he told the participants and viewers that the real problem was how to interpret the rating, which was actually not required in the context. Line (9) or (12) shows where the violation occurred.

20. DG : Baik, Pak Menteri, bagaimana pendapat Anda? 1
(Okay, Mr. Minister, what do you think?)
- Minister : *Itulah resikonya jika hanya ada satu lembaga rating. Keakuratan ratingnya bisa dipertanyakan. Karena itu, harus ada lembaga rating yang lain, paling tidak untuk ngecek mana yang kira-kira paling credible. Dari situ sebenarnya kredibilitas dari hasil rating itu bisa kita pakai sebagai ukuran, Tolong, rating itu hanya sebagai bagian pertimbangan saja, tapi bukan on off.* 5
(That is the consequences of only having one rating institution. The accuracy is questionable. That is why there must be another rating institution, at least to check which rating is the most credible. Actually, the credibility of the rating can be used as a measurement, please note that the rating as just a part of the consideration, but not on off). 15

The minister answered vaguely about the accuracy of the rating of television programs. Instead of stating his certainty on the rating accuracy—which was the question being asked, he pointed out that accuracy was questionable as a result of a single rating department. It can be seen in highlighted lines (3) to (4) or (11) to (12).

Besides, he gave information that is more informative to the audience and participants. He suggested that it should be more rating departments. He mentioned also that rating of a program was only a measurement and consideration of a program. The violation can be viewed in highlighted lines (5) to (10) or (13) to (17).

21. DG : ...setujukah Anda bahwa Komisi Penyiaran Indonesia
atau KPI mampu mengemban kepentingan publik?
Saya minta kelompok C dulu silakan, DH!
Bagaimana pendapat Anda?
(...do you agree that the Indonesian Broadcasting
Commission (KPI) is able to bear the public interest?
I'll ask Group C first. DH, please, what is your
opinion?)
- DH : Makasih, DG. Jadi menurut saya tuh, jawaban saya
alasan lain. Rencananya mampu. Rencananya,
harusnya mampu. Tapi, untuk saat ini belum. Karena
dia tidak dilengkapi dengan alat-alat untuk bertindak
lebih jauh, yang bisa memberikan penalti atau
sanksi...
(Thank you DG. Well, in my opinion, I answer other
reasons. The plan is to be able to. The plan should
be able. But for this moment, it isn't so. Because it
is not equipped with sufficient tools to act further, to
allow them give sanction or penalty...).

Here, DH gave much more information about his reason in choosing the answer, which was actually not being asked. It can be seen in highlighted lines (10) to (14) or (16) to (19).

- 22.DG : *Okay, terima kasih. Dan tentunya bahwa lembaga penyiaran Indonesia atau KPI ini dalam hal ini bersama pemerintah bisa menjadikan iklim televisi sebagai guru bangsa yang kita inginkan, bukan hanya sebagai media hiburan. Sekarang saya minta kepada kelompok B. Silakan Mas MS* 1
(Okay thank you and of course the Indonesian Broadcasting Commission or KPI in this case, with the government can create the climate of television as teacher of nation, as we hope, not just as an entertainment. Now I ask Group B. Mas MS, go ahead!) 5
 MS : *Kalau berbicara mampukah KPI itu mengemban, mampu, sangat mampu sebagai pengemban saja. Tapi kemana mau embanan itu mau dikemakan, itu yang belum tentu mampu.* 10
(If we talk about whether or not KPI and the government are able to bear the responsibilities, they are capable, very capable. But if we ask about where the bearing will be taken, that's what they perhaps unable). 15
 20

The essence of the utterance uttered by DG was thanking DH for speaking up and giving a chance to MS as a representative of group B for the given question. Nevertheless, before he gave that chance to MS, he put forward his mind too. Here, his own opinion was not required. The violation can be found in highlighted lines (1) to (5) or (7) to (11).

Still in the context above, MS—a representative of group B—did not answer the question briefly about the capability of KPI in

bearing its duty. He stated that KPI was able to do that, nevertheless, he did not say ‘yes’ or ‘no’ briefly. Instead, he repeated the question before presenting his idea. The violation can be found in highlighted lines (13) or (17) to (18).

On the other hand, he gave more information more than was required to the participants. He answered clearly that KPI was able to bear his duty. Essentially, that answer was enough to respond the question; nonetheless, he added where the bearing will be taken by KPI. It can be found in highlighted lines (15) to (16) or (20) to (21).

23. DG : *Terima Kasih. Silahkan kelompok A! Apa pendapat Anda tentang kemampuan KPI dalam mengemban tugasnya?* 1
 (Thank you. Go ahead, group A! What do you think about KPI capability in bearing their duties?) 5
- WK : *Saya WK dari ATSVI. Kenapa kelompok kami ada dua pendapat yang hampir sama. Ini karena sejarah. Sejarah dimana masalah kewenangan pada waktu itu sempet menjadi multi tafsir. Dalam arti bahwa UU pada waktu itu siapa sich yang harus mengawasi mengenai penyiaran. Itu masih menjadi perdebatan. Namun dengan adanya perdebatan tentunya KPI tidak bisa atau kurang mengemban kepentingan publik.* 10
 (I'm Widia Kusumah from ATSVI. Why in our group there are two quite similar opinions. It is because the history. A history where the authority at that time ever been multi-interpreted. It means that the regulations at that time did not settle who should supervise the broadcasting. It's still discussed. However, with the discussion, of course KPI cannot or lack of performance to bear the public interest). 20

WK—a representative of group A—did not answer the question briefly. She talked about the reason of her group to have a similar thought, which was due to history of the unclear authorized party that controlled the Laws. After that, she stated her opinion that KPI could not do its job well. In other words, she did not answer it straightforwardly.

She also added unrequired information—that was a history about the authorized party—in her answer. Those violations can be examined in lines (4) to (10) or (13) to (18).

- 24.DG : *Okay, terima kasih. Mas MR, silakan! Bagaimana pendapat Anda melihat dari hasil polling itu?* 1
 (Okay, thank you. Mas MR, go ahead! What is your opinion seeing the result of the polling?)
- MR : *Memang harus kita akui bahwa kita tidak bisa berdiri sendiri sebagai lembaga yang jumlahnya sembilan orang. Tapi, kita sedang upayakan, dan ini sudah menjadi konkret karena besok tanggal 27, InsyaAllah, kita akan kerja sama dengan MUI dan LSM dalam rangka partisipasi untuk melibatkan masyarakat untuk pengawasan.* 5
 (We have to admit that we can stand alone independently as an institution that consists of only nine people. But we are attempting this, and it is concrete because on the date of 27, Insya Allah we will cooperate with MUI and NGO to participate in involving the society to supervise...) 10
 15

MR gave more information than was required to the audience and participants about KPI collaboration with MUI and LSM. In fact, the information was not required. It can be viewed in highlighted lines (8) to (12) or (15) to (17).

- 25.DG : AA, *bagaimana pendapat Anda? Apakah KPI sudah mampu melakukan tugasnya dengan baik* 1
(AA, what do you think? Has KPI been able to do its job well?)
- AA : *Ketika kita bicara KPI, sebenarnya kan dia kalah tua.... Televisi ini orangnya lebih pintar...Sementara KPI dengan birokrasi yang ada, kalau mau bikin plat-plat porno atau tidak, kekerasan atau tidak, rapat dulu. Nunggu anggaran dulu... Karena KPI ini commission-nya kan begitu kita kumpul, masyarakat dikumpulin, begini rumusannya, gini, gini, gini. Begitu dilanggar, sanksi...tutup!* 5
(If we talk about KPI, actually it is younger...On the television part, the people are smarter...While KPI with the existing bureaucracy, they want to create forms or not, violence or not, they have to hold a meeting first, wait for the fund first. Well, the TV people are smarter...Because KPI is kind of commission that operate when we gather, the public is gathered, the formulation is decided, blah, blah, 10
blah...when it is violated, give the sanction...and it's closed!) 15
20

Here, AA did not comment the problem briefly and orderly. He also did not state his opinion clearly. It was not clear what he tried to say. However, it can be concluded that he criticized KPI. Furthermore, he stated that KPI should close television stations that violate the rules. It can be seen from his statement above from line (5) to (12) or (13) to (22).

- 26.DG : *Pemirsa, kita sampai di sesi yang terakhir yaitu sesi kesimpulan, dan tentunya saya akan langsung saja dengan satu menit akan memberikan kesempatan bagi kelompok A untuk memberikan kesimpulan dari perlihatkan ini, sesungguhnya apakah betul televisi bisa menjadi guru bangsa bagi bangsa kita? Silakan kelompok A!* 1
(Viewers, we arrive at the final session, the conclusion. And of course I will directly give the one 5

minute opportunities to Group A to state their conclusion of this program, is it really true that television can be a teacher of nation for our country? Go ahead, group A!) 10

Group A : *Terima kasih. Salah satu yang bisa kita banggakan sekarang bahwa Indonesia adalah Negara demokrasi terbesar ketiga di dunia setelah Amerika Serikat dan India....Arti kata, yang positif kita tingkatkan, yang kurang mari semua stake holder kita benahi bersama-sama. Terima kasih.* 15
 (Thank you. One thing that we can be proud of now is that Indonesia is the third biggest democratic nation in the world after United States and India...It means, the positive [thing] have to be promoted, the negative have to be fixed together by us, the stakeholders. Thank you.) 20 25

DG's point in the context above was giving a chance to the participants to conclude the discussion. Nevertheless, he did not give a chance to them to do so straightforwardly. He announced first that the segment was the conclusion one and repeated the topic of the show before he asked the participants to present their conclusion to the discussed topic. Highlighted lines (1) to (6) or (8) to (12) show where the violation occurs.

Still in the situation above, the representative of group A did not answer the question clearly. He did not mention whether Indonesian television programs could be considered teacher of nation.

The answer should be 'yes' or 'no'; nevertheless, instead of answering that way, he replied the question with an explanation about three biggest democracy countries in the world and a suggestion to improve Indonesian television programs. The information he gave

essentially was not needed. The violations can be seen in highlighted lines (14) to (19) or (20) to (25).

27. DG : okay. Terima kasih. Silakan dari kelompok B! 1
 (Okay. Thank you. Go ahead group B!)
- GT : *Baik, saya GT dari YPMA... Kami tetap memandang saat ini belum bisa dikatakan bahwa televisi menjadi guru bangsa...Kami sangat-sangat mengharapkan pemerintah memiliki peran yang lebih jelas dalam menata penyiaran kita sehingga masyarakat terutama anak dan remaja ini menjadi lebih terlindungi. Harus ada langkah-langkah nyata bahwa KPI ini ada...sehingga sekali lagi masyarakat mendapatkan manfaat dari kehadiran TV swasta kita. Terima kasih.* 5
 (Okay, I'm GT from YPMA. We still perceive that nowadays television still cannot be regarded as teacher of nation...We really really expect the government to take a clearer role in organizing our broadcast so that the society, particularly the children and teenagers, can be more protected. There must be real actions that [shows] KPI exists ...so that once again, the society can gain advantage of our private television. Thank you.) 10 15 20

GT—a representative of group B—added more information than was required. He did answer that Indonesian television programs could not be considered as the teacher of nation yet. That kind of reply was enough to answer the question. However, he added a suggestion that Indonesian government should play more important role in controlling the television media and that KPI should take serious ways to improve Indonesian television programs for the sake of the public. Highlighted lines (5) to (12) or (15) to (21) show the violation in the context above.

- 28.DG : okay, terima kasih. Silakan DH! 1
(Okay, thank you. Go ahead, DH!)
- DH : *Terima kasih, DG. Kelompok C berkesimpulan bahwa televisi sekarang ini masih jauh daripada menjadi guru bangsa...Jadi langkah ke depan yang saya harapkan adalah menurut saya, saya kasih solusinya, KPI musti dikuatkan. Kita musti men-* 5
develop suatu standar yang bisa mengukur hardware-
nya pertelevisian dan rating tadi, yang bisa 10
mengukur software-nya juga dan brainware-nya.
Kalau televisi mau jalan, hardware-nya harus begitu,
software-nya harus begitu, brainware-nya harus
begitu. lain dari itu, you ga dapet license buat siaran.
(Thank you, DG. Group C concluded that television 15
nowadays is still far away from being teacher of
nation...So the future action expected, in my opinion,
I give the solution, KPI must be empowered. We
have to develop a standard to measure the television
and rating's hardware that can measure the software 20
and the brainware. If the television wants to operate,
the hardware must be like that, the software must be
like that, and the brainware must be like that.
Otherwise, you will not get the license to broadcast).

DH—a representative of group C—concluded the discussed topic more informative than was required. He did state that Indonesian television programs could not be considered yet to be teacher of nation; however, he suggested that KPI should be strengthened. Moreover, he also stated that a standard to measure hardware, brainware, and software of a television station should be developed. The violation occurs in highlighted lines (5) to (13) or (16) to (23).

- 29.DG : *Okay, terima kasih, DH! Mas MR silakan!* 1
 (Okay, thank you, DH! Mas MR, go ahead!)
- MR : *Yang jelas kita menginginkan ke depan betul-betul menjadi satu guru bangsa.*
Televisi tidak boleh kehilangan daya edukasinya, tidak boleh kehilangan daya inovatifnya. Ga hanya di Jakarta aja, tapi yang berbasis pada kultur dan budaya Indonesia. Dan yang selanjutnya televisi mempunyai tanggung jawab sosial pada masyarakatnya. Itu yang penting. 5
(Well, it is clear that we expect in the future television really becomes the teacher of nation. television cannot lose its educational power, cannot lose its innovative power, not only in Jakarta, but also [television] that based on the culture and tradition of Indonesia. And the next television has the social responsibility to its society. That's what important). 10
 15

In the context above, MR did not answer clearly whether Indonesian television programs could be considered teacher of nation or not. He only hoped that television programs could be considered that way. It can be seen in lines (3) to (4) or (11) to (12).

Moreover, he also stated that the programs should be still educational and inovative—not only for Jakarta's television stations but also for all Indonesian television stations. The information actually was not required. It can be seen in lines (5) to (10) or (13) to (18).

30. DG : *Okay. AA, silakan!* 1
 (Okay. AA, go ahead!)
- AA : *Begini, suka atau tidak, televisi ada. Yang mau anti televisi atau tidak, tapi televisi tetap ada.*
Dan untuk berdialog dengan televisi ini hanya satu: semuanya harus terukur. Harus bisa dinyatakan kalau ini tuh industri. Kalau kita cuman ga suka atau suka susah. Makanya ada kayak rating. Nah, 5

kalau begini berarti apa? Kalau tadi dituntut menterinya juga berbuat sesuatu, KPInya juga berbuat sesuatu, pemerintahnya konkret. Sekarang, peraturannya begini, dijalani. Itu baru jalan! 10
 (Look, you like it or not, television exists. Whether you want to be anti-television or not, it exists.
 And to have a dialogue with television, there's only one way: everything has to be measured. We have to be able to say that it is not an industry. If we only like or dislike [it], it'll be hard. That's why rating exists. Well, if it's like this, what does it mean? If it was demanded that the minister also do something, KPI also do something, the government must be concrete. Now, the regulations are like this, and obeyed. Then we can say it's operating well!) 15 20

AA answered the question vaguely. He did not mention whether the answer is 'yes' or 'no'. It can be seen in lines (3) to (4) or (13) to (14). Instead, he argued that everyone should do something useful for the goodness of Indonesian television programs. The additional information was not required. It can be viewed in lines (5) to (12) or (15) to (24).

- 31.DG : Okay. Monggo pak Menteri!
 (Okay. Mr. Minister, please!) 1
- Minister : *Guru tuh apa sih guru itu? Guru itu paling tidak, digugu dan ditiru.*
Baru bisa dijadikan guru kalau yang pertama dia ada ilmunya. Kalau nda punya ilmu ya nda bisa jadi guru. Yang kedua ada kemuliaan di diri kepribadiannya. Dan yang ketiga cita-citanya. Kalau TV itu mau jadi guru bangsa, maka TV itu harus mampu memberikan sesuatu yang sifatnya keilmuan, harus bisa mampu memberikan transformasi budaya, dan TV sendiri harus ada idealisme, cita-cita. Baru dari situlah TV itu bisa jadi guru bangsa. 5 10
 (What is teacher, actually? Teacher is, at least, obeyed and mimicked. 15

Someone can be made a teacher if he, firstly, has knowledge. If you have no knowledge, you cannot be a teacher. Secondly, there must be nobility in his personality. And the third is his dreams. If television wants to be a teacher of nation, it has to be able to give some knowledge, be able to provide a cultural transformation, and TV itself must have idealism, dreams. If so, then TV can be a teacher of nation.) 20

The minister stated his answer unclearly. He did not mention whether Indonesian television program could be considered teacher of nation or not. Instead, he asked what teacher was. It can be seen in lines (3) to (4) or (14) to (15).

Moreover, he mentioned requirements to be called as a teacher instead, which actually were not being asked. Those violations can be seen in lines (5) to (13) or (16) to (23).

Discussion on “Padamu Negeri”

As analyzed above, it was found that three of four conversational maxims were violated in “Padamu Negeri”. They include: maxim of quantity, relevance, and manner. On the other hand, the occurrence of violation to maxim of quality was not found in the talk show.

The three violated maxims were violated when a speaker fails to follow the rules of each maxim:

1. Maxim of Quantity

There were speakers, in the talk show, giving much more or unrequired information. In other words, it was found utterances that did not follow the rules of the maxim of quantity. According to Grice (1975), the

maxim of quantity requires an informative contribution. It cannot be too informative or less informative. When a speaker fails to fulfill the requirement of this maxim, it means that he violates the maxim of quantity (as cited from. Thomas: 1995).

An example of the violation to the maxim of quantity in the talk show can be seen in the dialogue below taken from context (1, p. 37):

- | | | |
|----|--|---------------|
| DG | : <i>Kurang variatif itu apakah jenisnya atau isinya, bu?</i>
(Less various, is it the kind or the content, Ma'am?) | 1 |
| IK | : <i>Ya, isinya. Bahwa ada kecenderungan misalnya tayangan TV yang satu itu menguntungkan misalnya yang mistis atau kekerasan cenderung diikuti oleh TV-TV lain. Juga kurang variatif...ehm...proporsionalnya itu kurang. Dimana nuansa hiburannya itu lebih menonjol dari nuansa edukatifnya. Kecuali Metro TV dan TVRI.</i>
(The content, of course. That there is a tendency that, for example, a particular TV show is advantageous, let's say mystical or violence shows, and will be mimicked by the other TV stations. It's also less various in terms of... emm... the proportion. Where the nuance of entertainment is more prominent than that of education. Except Metro TV and TVRI.) | 5
10
15 |

The question from DG above requires 'yes' or 'no' answer. However, after answering 'yes', IK—a representative of Group B, the Children Development Foundation and the Coalition of No-Television Day—added an explanation of her answer about the tendency of television programs. She also explained how television programs could not be considered varied. It was more informative than was required. Therefore, she violated the maxim of quantity. It can be seen in highlighted lines (3) to (8) or (9) to (15).

Other violations to this maxim in “Padamu Negeri” can be observed in contexts (2, p. 38), (5, p. 40), (6, p. 40), (7, p. 42), (12, p. 46), (14, p.47), (15, p. 48), (16, pp.48-49), (17, pp. 49-50), (18, p.50-51), (19, p.51), (20, p.52), (21, p.53), (22, p.54), (23, p.55), (24, p.56), (27, p. 59), (28, p. 60), (29, p. 61), (30, pp.61-62), and (31, pp.62-63).

2. Maxim of Relevance

In the talk show, the situation which a violation to this maxim occurred can be seen in context below taken from situation (11, p.45):

- AA : *Harusnya? Ama orang televisi ada yang berani ga?* 1
 (It should be...? Is there anybody dares [to deal] with the television people?)
- MR : *Tapi yang jelas saya setuju dengan kelompok B dimana saya menganggap kurang variatif. Karena kalau dilihat dari segmen tingkat layaknya, karena semua kelompok dewasa yang menjadi konsumsi...isi siaran itu yang menjadi concern ya.* 5
 (Anyway, certainly, I agree with group B where I think it's less various. Because if we see the segment of its appropriateness, because the entire adult group who become consumers...the content is the concern...) 10

Thomas (1995:70) states that the maxim of relevance requires the speaker to be relevant to the context and situation in which the utterance occurs. A violation to this maxim occurs when a speaker responds irrelevantly to his interlocutors. Therefore, in the situation above, MR violated the maxim of relevance as he answered the question given by AA irrelevantly.

The question was about the braveness of KPI in admonishing television stations in Indonesia. However, MR answered the question by

saying that he agreed with group B's opinion and he also gave his reason of agreeing with them. Lines (4) to (8) or (9) to (12) show the violation.

3. Maxim of Manner

According to Grice (1975), this maxim is a matter of being clear, brief, and orderly when conversing. Thus, when a speaker fails to follow the rules of this maxim, he will violate it (as cited from Thomas: 1995).

In "Padamu Negeri", it was found that this maxim was violated when a speaker did not follow the abovementioned rules of the maxim in answering the questions given. A sample of the violation to this maxim can be observed in context below taken from situation (10, p. 45):

Arswendo: *Sama yang punya TV berani ga KPI?*
(With the TV owner, does KPI dare or not?)
Riyanto : *ya, tentunya harus ada keberanian.*
(Of course that courage must exist)

In the example above, Riyanto violated the maxim of manner. He unclearly stated whether his organization had any courage to warn the owners about television stations. He stated that his organization should be brave in reprovng them. Line (3) or (4) shows where the violation occurs.

The other violations to the maxim of manner in the talk show can be found in situations (3, p. 39), (4, p. 39), (5, p. 40), (7, p. 42), (8, p. 43), (9, p. 44), (12, p. 46), (13, p. 46), (14, p. 47), (16, pp. 48-49),

(17, pp. 49-50), (18, pp. 50-51), (19, p. 51), (20, p. 52), (22, p. 54), (23, p. 55), (25, p. 57), (26, pp. 57-58), (29, p. 61), (30, pp. 61-62), and (31, pp. 62-63).

Total number of violation found to the three maxims in this talk show was 50. The number of violation to maxim of quantity was 25 (50%), to the maxim of relevance was one (2%), and to maxim of manner was 24 (48%). Therefore, it can be concluded that the most frequent violated maxim in this talk show was maxim of quantity.

b. Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue

Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue was a talk show showed in December 20, 2007 at 20.05 on Metro TV and hosted by FL. The topic was “Menyeleamatkan Karya Budaya Bangsa melalui Hak atas Kekayaan Intelektual, which was chosen randomly.

The analysis of the violated maxims in this talk show is presented

below:

1. FL : *Bung AM, introspeksi, tapi mengapa sampai berlarut-larut? (Mr. AM, introspection, but why long draw out?)* 1
- AM : *Ya, inikan dalam beberapa waktu belakangan ini, karena baru ketahuan. Saya sendiri baru tahu kalau, entah dari mana, ada orang yang tahu di website, ada Reog Ponorogo di negerinya atau lagu Rasa Sayange. Itu kan mulai dari website diketahuinya, nah...harus mulai introspeksi, kita ga bisa marah-marah terus atau segala macam.* 5
- Tapi mulai kita daftarkan kekayaan intelektual kita, kekayaan budaya kita. Presiden sudah membentuk tim nasional untuk inventarisasi semua, karena ini jamannya kita harus daftarkan, inventarisasikan semua!* 15

(Well, it is in these recent past, because it's just discovered. I myself just discover that, don't know where it comes from, there is someone who knows in website, there is Reog Ponorogo in his country or the song Rasa Sayange. That begins from the website he knows. 20

Well...we have to begin reflecting, we cannot be mad all the time or such. But we begin to list our intellectual properties, our cultural properties. The President has formed a national team to inventory; because it's the time we have to list, to inventory all). 25

In this dialogue, AM, the Presidential Spokesperson, gave vague answer to how the problem got more complicated. He did not give the clear answer about it. The violation can be seen in lines (4) to (10) or (16) to (21).

He also said much more than was needed. He gave additional answer by suggesting Indonesians to start listing their heritage. The violation can be found in lines (11) to (15) or (22) to (26).

2. FL : *Bung AM, membicarakan masalah daftarkan dan inventarisasi, kebetulan ini ada HaKI. Kita ke pak AR.* 1
- Pak AR, sudah seberapa parahkah sampai kita harus melakukan upaya yang sedemikian kerja keras nih pak?* 5
- Karena yang harus di inventarisasi ribuan yah pak AR, membicarakan karya budaya bangsa Indonesia memang banyak sekali dari suku-sukunya saja sudah ada ratusan...Seberapa mengkhawatirkan pak AR?* 10
- (Mr. AM, talking about the listing and inventorying, fortunately HaKI is here. We move to Mr. AR.*
- Mr. AR, how bad it goes that we have to do such a great effort, Sir?*
- Because there are thousand to be inventoried, right Mr. AR, talking about Indonesian cultural creations are indeed so numerous from the tribes only there are already hundreds...How worrying, Mr. AR?)* 15

AR : ...dengan nasional heritage tersebut itu sebenarnya
 kalau bisa kita eksploitasi, dikembangkan bahkan
 kita lakukan inventarisasi, dan inventarisasi
 daripada kekayaan kebudayaan ini kita lakukan
 notifikasi... 20
 (...with the national heritage it actually, if possible,
 we exploit, develop, even we do inventory, and
 inventory of these cultural properties we do
 notification ...) 25

FL asked AR—the director of HaKI—about how bad the problem was. However, she did not ask it directly. She told AM first that she was going to ask AR about the inventory. In other words, she did not state her point briefly. It can be seen in lines (1) to (3) or (11) to (12).

She also added some unrequired information. It can be seen in highlighted lines (7) to (10) or (15) to (18). That information was not required since her main question is about how bad the problem was.

Still in the dialogue above, AR answered FL unclearly. He did not provide the clear answer to FL's question about how bad the problem was. He was supposed to rate how bad the problem was; however, he did not do so. In fact, he talked more about the inventory. Although the inventory was discussed by FL, the main question given was about how bad the problem was. The violation can be found in lines (19) to (23) or (24) to (27).

3. FL : Di dalam negeri kita sendiri kita belum terlalu kuat, 1
 mungkin belum ada hukum yang terlalu kuat
 sehingga perlu keluar untuk mencari dukungan dari
 luar. Apa demikian?

(In the domestic fields, we're not too strong yet; perhaps there hasn't been any law that's so strong that we need to go out to find supports from the outsiders. Is that so?)

AR : ...*Begitu juga dari aspek konservasinya, perlindungannya sudah ada melalui undang-undang Cagar Alam. Itu misalnya jangan dirusak, dicuri, dan sebagainya. Hak ekonominya itu melalui undang-undang Hak Cipta, sebab itu hak kekayaan intelektual dimana kalau aset-aset itu bisa kita eksploitasi, bisa kita kembangkan, kemudian kita daftarkan, itu aset-aset intangible-nya luar biasa.* (... It's similar from the aspect of its conservation; its protection is provided by the Conservation Law. It, example, cannot be destructed, stolen, and so on. Its economic rights by the Copyright law, because it is a right of intellectual property where, if those assets are possible, we can exploit, we can develop, and then we register, those assets have exceptional intangible).

AR gave vague answer to the question. He did not give the clear answer about it and added unrequired information about the laws that discusses about copyright and the exploitation of Indonesian heritage that can turn into intangible assets. The violations can be seen in lines (9) to (16) or (17) to (23).

4. FL : *Tapi permasalahannya mengapa bisa sampai Indonesia kecolongan...Ini bagaimana bisa terjadi pak AL?*

(But the problem is how come Indonesia can be fooled ...How can this happen, Mr. AL?)

AL : ...*Memang dalam kebudayaan Malaysia itu, yang dominan adalah kebudayaan mampir. Chinese kebudayaannya mampir di Malaysia, India mampir, Melayu mampir di Malaysia...Karena kalau individu, misal lagu rasa sayange, saya tidak tahu siapa penciptanya. Seharusnya penciptanya itu yang menggugat. Ada juga pengumuman lagu-lagu daerah, cari siapa penciptanya!*

(...It's indeed in Malaysia culture, the dominant is the dropping-in culture. Chinese, its culture dropped in Malaysia, India dropped in, Malay dropped in Malaysia...Because if it's individual, for example the song *Rasa Sayange*, I do not know who the writer is. It supposed to be the writer who accuses (complaints). There is also the notification of 20 national songs, find who the writers are!

AL—a Southeast Asia Observer—gave vague respond to FL's question. FL asked how Malaysia could claim Indonesian cultures as their cultures, in other words she asked how Indonesia could be fooled by Malaysia. AL did not answer clearly and briefly how it happened. In fact, he explained how Malaysia got its culture. Moreover, he talked and asked about Indonesian traditional songs, which were not asked. In other words, he gave much more information than was needed. The violations he made can be viewed in lines (6) to (13) or (14) to (21).

5. FL : *Tapi apa di Malaysia lagu itu popular seperti di* 1
 Indonesia?
 (Well, in Malaysia, is the song as popular as it is in Indonesia?)
- AL : *Ya, karena community di sana berasal dari Indonesia* 5
semuanya, dari Ambon, Jawa. Semua merasa
mewariskan budaya Jawa, Bugis, semuanya di situ.
Jadi bagi dia kebanggaan. Dan menurut saya, hal ini
di Malaysia sudah urgent, sudah isu yang menonjol. 10
Kita aja kebangkaran jenggot. Menurut saya, ini
keterlambatan pemerintah sejak dulu.
 (Yes, because the community there originated from Indonesia, from Ambon, Java. All inherited Javanese, Bugisnese culture, all there. So for him [it's] pride. And I think, this matter in Malaysia is 15
 urgent, is a prominent issue. We, ourselves, are overwhelmed. In my opinion, it's government tardiness since long ago).

In the dialogue above, AL gave much more information than was needed. After answering 'yes', he added additional information about communities who live in Malaysia while the question from FL was only about whether the song was popular in Malaysia or not. It can be seen in highlighted lines (5) to (11) or (12) to (18).

6. FL : *Kita juga kehilangan dua pulau karena terlambat yah?* 1
 (We're losing two islands because we're tardy, aren't we?)
- AM : *Ini bukan soal terlambat tidak terlambat. Kini persoalannya kita tidak tahu orang mana, orang mengambil hak kita. Kita tidak tahu di dunia ini berapa miliar orang yang bisa saja mengambil hak cipta kita atau mengakui hak cipta kita. Kita tidak bisa...kita bisa melarangnya, tapi tidak bisa mengontrolnya.* 5
 (It's not about tardiness or not. Now the problem is we do not know which people, people take our right. We do not know how many billion people can take or claim our copyright. We cannot...we can prohibit it, but we cannot control it.) 15

Here AM did not provide a clear answer to FL's question. The question required 'yes' or 'no' answer. However, he did not mention one between the two answers. He stated that the problem was not about tardiness. Moreover, his response was not brief. It can be seen in lines (4) to (10) or (11) to (15).

7. FL : *Itu tandanya bangsa Indonesia kan manusia juga ya pak, belum menyadari itu hilang?* 1
 (It shows that Indonesians are human, right? Unaware of losing it?)
- AL : *Daftar inventarisasi itu sudah lama dilakukan. Kenapa kita tidak daftarkan sendiri?* 5

(The inventory list has been done for a long time. Why don't we list them ourselves?)

AL explained inventory and suggested Indonesia to register its heritage. It was irrelevant to what FL stated. She stated that Indonesian citizens are also humans who did not realize that they missed something. The violation made by AL can be seen in lines (5) to (6) or (7) to (8).

8. FL : *Bung AM, saya ke Pak HM dulu. Pak HM mewakili DPR. Pak HM, siapa yang salah dalam hal ini sebenarnya?* 1
 (Mr. AM, I move to Mr. HM for the time being. Mr. HM represents the Representative Board. Mr. HM, whose fault it is, actually?) 5
- HM : *Kalau DPR pasti pemerintah yang salah. Karena kita digaji untuk mengkritik pemerintah. Jadi begini, yang pertama itu saya kira yang menjadi tugas pemerintah adalah mempertahankan teritori. Dari sini yang disebut teritori itu apa. Ya, Poleksosbudhankam. Tidak sekedar batas kewilayahan saja...* 10
 (If you ask the Representative Board, it's surely the government's fault. Because we are paid to criticize the government. So it's like this, the first, in my opinion, duty of the government is to protect the territory. Here what is called territory. It is *poleksosbudhankam* (politics, economy, social, cultural, defense and security fields). Not just the territory boundaries....). 20

FL gave a question to HM—a Representative Board. Nevertheless, she did not briefly give him the question. Instead, she told AM that she would be asking HM. Thus, she introduced him to the

audience briefly, which had been already done. The violation can be found in lines highlighted (1) to (2) or (4) to (5).

Still in this dialogue, it can be seen that HM did not contribute his answer briefly to FL's question. Moreover, he informed the participants and viewers about duty of the Committee 1 of the House of Representatives, which is to criticize the government and the definition of territory. The additional information he added was essentially not required. Those violations can be seen in lines (7) to (12) or (13) to (20).

9. FL : ...*dulu kan Indonesia dengan Malaysia bisa dibilang tidak ada batas wilayahnya, tidak ada juga sistem keimigrasian antara dua Negara, karena kita memang satu rumpun...Jadi kalau mau dibilang membatasi keberadaan Negara antara Indonesia dengan Malaysia, itu bagaimana menyurinya, Bung HM?* 1
 (...there was no territory boundaries between Indonesia and Malaysia, there was no immigration system between the two Nations, too, because we indeed belong to an ethnic...So if we want to say it's drawing nation boundaries between Indonesia and Malaysia, how can we trace it, Mr. HM?) 10
- HM : *Ya,begini, ini kan ada dua sebab. Sebab pertama, secara eksternal kita dengan Malaysia. Yang kedua internal sendiri. Internal ini, kita ada masalah dengan pemerintah yang lamban...* 15
 (Well, it is like this, there are two causes. The first cause, externally we and Malaysia. The second, our own internally. This internal reason we have a problem with the tardy government...) 20

FL questioned HM how to trace Indonesian and Malaysian borders. Nevertheless, before directly giving the question, she talked about the history about Indonesia and Malaysia borders. She talked

more than was required. The violation she made can be found in lines highlighted (1) to (4) or (8) to (11).

Still in the dialogue above, HM gave unclear answer to FL's question. Instead of answering how to trace the borders, he gave two reason of the occurrence of the problem. The information he added was not required. The violations can be found in lines (14) to (17) to (18) to (21).

10. FL : *Mungkin dari lokal menjadi nasional?* 1
 (Perhaps from local to national?)
- HM : *Ya, setelah itu di inventarisasi, didaftarkan. Yang kedua, segi politik. Saya akan menginisiasi apa namanya memanggil Pak Menteri luar negeri, kemudian menteri kebudayaan segala macam itu, untuk mendorong perjanjian dulu.* 5
 (Right, then be inventoried, registered. The second is the political aspect. I will initiate, such as, calling the Minister of Foreign Affair, then the Minister of Culture, and so on, to promote an agreement first.) 10

The kind of question given by FL was a 'yes' or 'no' question. HM did say 'yes', but, he added more information, which actually was not required, about next step to solve the problem. It can be viewed in lines (3) to (7) or (8) to (11).

11. FL : *Lalu seefektif apa yang sudah terjadi, penandatanganan kerja sama antara Departemen Hukum dan HAM bersama dengan Departemen Kebudayaan dan Pariwisata?* 1
 (Then, how effective is what has happened, the agreement of cooperation between the Ministry of Law and Human Right and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism?) 5

HM : *Tapi kita jangan kayak kebakaran, ada api baru kita siram.* 10
 (But we should not act like a fire accident, wait till the fire burn, then we begin to extinguish it instead of prevent it.)

In this dialogue, HM irrelevantly answered that Indonesia should not be late in solving the problem, while FL's question was about the effectiveness of cooperation between Department of Law and Human Right and Department of Culture and Tourism. The violation he made can be found in lines (9) to (10) or (11) to (13).

12. FL : *Tapi timnasnya sebesar apa sih?* 1
 (But how big is the team?)
 AR : *Timnas ini namanya Timnas Penanggulangan Pelanggaran HaKI. Tapi tugas timnas ini bukan hanya terbatas masalah penanggulangan pelanggaran, tapi termasuk juga menyusun kebijakan, strategi di dalam bagaimana pengembangan daripada HaKI dan perlindungannya.* 5
 (This national team is called the National Team to Cope with the HaKI violation. But its duty is not limited only to cope with the violation, but also to develop policies, strategy of how to develop HaKI and its protection.) 10

AR stated unclearly how big the national team was, which was the question given by FL. He talked about the name of the team and its duties. Therefore, it was not clear how big the team is. He also stated unrequired information about the team—that was its name and duties. The violation can be found in lines (3) to (9) or (10) to (14).

13. FL : *Proaktif lagi dong Bung AM, ada yang kebakaran jenggot, baru betindak?* 1
 (Be proactive again, Mr. AM; someone's frantic, then we begin to act.)
- AM : *Ga, begini, tugas pemerintah untuk melakukan apa...saya juga belum tahu itu ternyata Reog Ponorogo. Orang Ponorogo lapor pada pemerintah begini, begini... Rame-rame yang selama ini terjadi, hikmah yang bisa kita ambil, yang pertama bahwa masyarakat mulai sadar dengan HaKI, sudah mulai ada sense of belonging.* 5
 (No, it's like this. The government duty is to do what...I also don't know it is Reog Ponorogo. The Ponorogo people reported to the government this and this...The troop happens all this time, the wisdom we can extract, the first is that [Indonesia] people begin to aware of HaKI, there has been the sense of belonging.) 10
 15

AM responded to FL's question more than was required. Although he said 'no' as the answer to FL's question, he added information about Ponorogo people and the Indonesian who started having the sense of belonging toward their culture. It can be viewed in highlighted lines (5) to (11) or (12) to (18).

14. FL : *Pemirsa kita kembali dalam dialog round table yang membahas tentang menyelamatkan karya budaya bangsa melalui hak atas kekayaan intelektual. Pak AL, belum lama ini menteri pelancongan Malaysia menyatakan untuk menghentikan semua promosi yang menggunakan unsur kebudayaan Indonesia. Apakah ini suatu tanda bahwa Malaysia sudah menyerah begitu?* 1
 (Viewers, we're back on The Round Table Dialogue discussing about saving national cultural creations using the right of intellectual property. Mr. AL, recently the minister of tourism of Malaysia made a statement to stop all promotions using Indonesian cultural elements. Is it a signal that Malaysia has surrendered?) 10
 15

AL : *Begini, saya kira dalam hak paten itu ada tiga unsur yah. Yang pertama adalah penemuan, kedua adalah mungkin aspek kebaruan, yang ketiga mungkin hak monopoli yah. Saya melihat yang dipersoalkan Indonesia itu hak monopolinya.* 20
 (Look, I think in the patent right; there are three elements of right. The first is invention, the second is perhaps the novelty aspect, the third perhaps is the monopoly right. I see that Indonesia questioned about the monopoly right.) 25

FL's main purpose was to deliver the question to AL about whether Malaysia had been given up or not, but before asking that, she reintroduced the show to the audience. In other words, she did not deliver the question briefly and straightforwardly. The violation she made can be found in lines (1) to (4) or (9) to (12).

Still in this dialogue, it was found that AL irrelevantly answered FL's question by saying three elements in the copyright, while the question was whether Malaysia had been given up or not. The violation can be found in lines (16) to (20) or (21) to (25).

15. FL : *Apa pemerintah Indonesia sudah mengambil suatu tindakan seperti yang dilakukan pemerintah Malaysia, bagaimana Bung HM?* 1
 (Has Indonesia government taken an action as being taken by Malaysia government, what do you say, Mr. HM?) 5
- HM : *Kita ga boleh terlena. Ini harus dijadikan pintu masuk mendorong pemerintah kita untuk melakukan yang saya sebutkan tiga T itu. Tapi ujungnya bisa buat undang-undang, mba. Kita bisa kerja sama pertahanan segala macam.* 10
 (We must not be hammock. It has to be made a gateway to support our government to do what I call the Three T. But in the end we can make regulation, mbak. We can do defense cooperation in any field.) 15

In this dialogue, HM responded to the question given vaguely. He did not mention whether the government has taken action to solve the problem or not. Moreover, the question required ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. However, he only suggested that Indonesia should not be too relaxed in facing the occurred problem. He also predicted some ways that government would take to solve this problem. He informed the participants more than was required. The violations can be found in lines (7) to (11) or (12) to (15).

16. FL : *Ini tadi ada pertanyaan dari bapak AB tentang bayar atau tidak?* 1
 (There’s a question from Mr. AB about should they pay or not?)
- AR : *Kalo berbicara soal bayar atau tidak, itu undang-undang Hak Cipta mengatakan, ciptaan yang tidak mengetahui siapapun penciptanya termasuk Reog Ponorogo, itu Hak Ciptanya dikuasai oleh Negara untuk dilindungi terhadap eksploitasi pihak asing. Jadi itu tidak bayar. Apapun kebudayaan Indonesia yang ratusan, jutaan ini, kalau itu memang kebudayaan asli sejak yang diperihara turun menurun dimiliki oleh masyarakat Indonesia, maka itu dikuasai oleh Negara..* 5
 (If we talk about having pay or not, the Copyright Law stated, the creations without no knowing of the creator, including Reog Ponorogo, the Copyright is of the nation’s to be protected from foreign exploitation. So, it’s free. 10
 Whatever the Indonesian, then it’s owned by nation...). 20

In the conversation above, AR was being verbose in answering the question given. The question needed a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. Although AR did answer ‘no’, he did not answer it briefly. Instead, he

beat around the bush in replying to the question. He also added some other information about content of law of copyright, which actually was not asked. The violations can be found in his above utterances in lines (5) to (9) and (10) to (14) or (15) to (19) and (20) to (21).

17. FL : *Jadi sampai berapa tahun kalau tidak diurus, Pak?* 1
 (So up to how many years if no one takes care of it, Sir?)
 AR : *Tidak ada jangka waktu. Selama itu dipelihara. Oleh sebab itu kita wajib memeliharanya.* 5
 (There is no time limitation. As long as it's taken care of. That's why we have to take care of it.)

AR, in the dialogue above, answered FL's question more than what was needed. He mentioned that there was no time limit—which was the only answer required; nevertheless, he made a suggestion that Indonesia had to maintain its culture—which was actually not being asked. It can be found in lines (4) to (5) or (6) to (7).

18. FL : *Misal saya mendaftarkan peuyeum gitu, bayar tidak?* 1
 (If I register *peuyeum*, should I pay or not?)
 AM : *Peuyeum itu bukan punya Anda.*
Tapi kalau Anda desain sebuah baju, baju itu mau
Anda daftarkan ke situ. Harus bayar dong! Anda kan 5
mendapatkan keuntungan ekonomi dari situ.
(Peuyeum is not yours.
But if you designed a cloth, and you want to register
it, you need to pay! You get economic advantages
from it, right?) 10

AM stated vaguely whether FL had to pay her inventory or not. He just mentioned that *Peuyeum* did not belong to FL. It can be found in line (3) or (7).

He also added unrequired information to FL and other participants that if FL designed a cloth, and she wanted to list it, then she had to pay. Lines (4) to (6) or (8) to (10) show the violation.

19. FL : *Jadi kita bisa ga percaya dengan pemerintah? Bung* 1
 HM? (So can we trust the government, Mr. HM?)
- HM : *Begini, saya kira kalau kita menyalahkan pemerintah* 5
itu konteksnya konteks bahwa kita cinta tanah air.
Saya kira ini hikmahnya adalah kita harus sama-
sama untuk saling kroscek, saling melakukan tugas-
tugas yang bersinergi dengan pemerintah.
 (Look, I think if we blame the government, the 10
 context is that we love our motherland.
 I think its lesson is that we have to crosscheck to
 each other, do works that's aligned with the
 government).

HM stated unclearly whether Indonesian government could be trusted or not in solving the occurred problem. It can be found in lines (4) to (5) or (9) to (10).

He also added that Indonesian and the government should be more cooperative in solving the entire problems faced by them all. The additional information was actually not needed. The violation can be seen in lines (6) to (8) or (11) to (13).

20. FL : *Selamat datang kembali pemirsa. Masih bersama* 1
kami di Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue.
Pak AR, nanti sanksi hukumnya bagaimana kalau
kita sudah daftarkan ke Geneva, terus ada Negara
lain yang mengklaim bahwa itu punya kita bukan 5
punya bangsa Indonesia?
 (Welcome back, viewers. Still with us on Save Our
 Heritage Round Table Dialogue. Mr. AR, how's the
 legal sanction if we have registered to Geneva, and

- there's other country claiming that it's theirs, not Indonesian's?) 10
- AR : *Sanksi hukum itu memang itu kembali ke peraturan perundang-undangan yang ada di Negara tersebut.*
(The legal sanction will be referred back to the regulations in that particular country). 15

FL did not give the question directly to AR. She welcomed the audience back to the show before asking Ansory about the main question. It can be found in highlighted lines (1) to (2) or (7) to (8).

Still in this dialogue, AR responded vaguely to FL's question. He was supposed to say what kind of punishment that a country would get if it claimed Indonesian registered culture. In contrast, he only answered that the punishment depended on the laws of the related country itself. The violation can be seen in lines (12) to (13) or (14) to (15).

21. FL : *Baik, Pak AL, tadi ada 15 departemen untuk menjadi anggota timnas. Apakah sudah cukup?* 1
(Alright, Mr. AL, there are 15 departments to be members of the national team. Is that enough?)
- AL : *Saya kira itu kan persoalannya banyak sekali. Berikan ke daerah lah, walaupun departemen itu adalah wewenang pusat! Tapi kalau bisa diberikan wewenang ke Kanwil-kanwil. Yang kedua, khususnya untuk menghadapi Malaysia, saya kira kita perlu kampanye internasional bahwa itu adalah milik Indonesia...Yang ketiga, pemerintah harus lebih serius lah, terutama banyak regulasi-regulasi yang belum selesai sampai sekarang.* 5
(I guess there are a lot of problems to take care of. Just give it to regions, although the department is central government's responsibility! But if it's possible, give the authority to the regional offices. The second, especially to face Malaysia, I think we need to campaign it internationally that it is 10
15

Indonesian's...The third, the government has to be more serious, especially with many regulations that haven't been completed up to know). 20

AL stated unclearly whether those 15 national team are enough or not—as FL asked. Instead of giving the exact answer, he stated that there were too many problems. It can be seen in line (5) or (14).

AL also violated maxim of quantity by giving unwanted information of how to solve the problem faced by Indonesia. It can be viewed in lines (6) to (13) or (15) to (22).

Discussion on “Save Our Heritage Roud Table Dialogue”

As examined above, it was found violation to three of conversational maxims. As found in the previous talk show—“Padamu Negeri”, those maxims were manner, quantity, and relevance.

1. Maxim of Quantity

In this talk show, the maxim of quantity was violated as the speakers gave redundant response to their interlocutors. According Grice (1975), the rule of this maxim is to provide the right amount of information. A speaker cannot provide more or less informative contribution in communication.

A sample of the violation to this maxim in the talk show can be observed in context below taken from situation (13, p.77) below:

FL	: <i>Proaktif lagi dong Bung AM, ada yang kebakaran jenggot, baru betindak?</i> (Be proactive again, Mr. AM; someone's frantic, then we begin to act.)	1
AM	: <i>Ga, begini, tugas pemerintah untuk melakukan apa...saya juga belum tahu itu ternyata Reog Ponorogo. Orang Ponorogo lapor pada pemerintah begini, begini... Rame-rame yang selama ini terjadi, hikmah yang bisa kita ambil, yang pertama bahwa masyarakat mulai sadar dengan HaKI, sudah mulai ada sense of belonging.</i> (No, it's like this. The government duty is to do what...I also don't know it is Reog Ponorogo. The Ponorogo people reported to the government this and this...The troop happens all this time, the wisdom we can extract, the first is that [Indonesia] people begin to aware of HaKI, there has been the sense of belonging).	5 10 15

AM responded to FL's question much more than was required.

Although he said 'no' as the answer to FL's question, he added information about Ponorogo people and the Indonesian who started having the sense of belonging toward their culture. Consequently, he violated the maxim of quantity. It can be viewed in highlighted lines (5) to (10) or (11) to (16).

The other violated utterances in the talk show can be observed in contexts (1, pp. 67-68), (2, pp. 68-69), (3, pp. 69-70), (4, pp. 70-71), (5, p. 71), (8, p. 73), (9, p. 74), (10, p. 45), (12, p.76), (15, p.78), (16, p. 79), (17, p. 80), (18, p. 80), (19, p. 81), and (21, pp. 82-83).

2. Maxim of Relevance

In "Save Our Heritage Round Tale Dialogue", this maxim was found violated by some speakers who did not answer the question given irrelevantly. Thomas (1995) discusses that this maxim requires a

speaker to be relevant in communicating. An example of the violation to this maxim in the talk show can be examined in the dialogue below taken from context (7, p. 72):

- FL : *Itu tandanya bangsa Indonesia kan manusia juga ya pak,* 1
belum menyadari itu hilang?
 (It shows that Indonesians are human, right? Unaware of losing it?)
- AL : *Daftar inventarisasi itu sudah lama dilakukan. Kenapa* 5
kita tidak daftarkan sendiri?
 (The inventory list has been done for a long time. Why don't we list them ourselves?)

AL explained inventory and suggested Indonesia to register its heritage. It was irrelevant to what FL stated. She stated that Indonesian citizens are also humans who did not realize that they missed something. The violation to the maxim of relevance made by AL can be seen in lines (5) to (6) or (7) to (8). The other violation to this maxim can be observed in contexts (11, pp.75-76) and (14, pp. 77-78).

3. Maxim of Manner

In "Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue", it was found that some speakers did not follow the requirements of this maxim. Hence, they violated maxim of manner.

In accordance with Grice (1975), this maxim requires brief, clear, and orderly answer to a question or situation in communication (as cited from Thomas: 1995). It also demands a speaker to avoid prolixity and vagueness in conversing. A sample of a violated utterance can be viewed in context below taken from situation (6, p. 72):

- FL : *Kita juga kehilangan dua pulau karena terlambat yah?* 1
 (We're losing two islands because we're tardy, aren't we?)
- AM : *Ini bukan soal terlambat tidak terlambat. Kini persoalannya kita tidak tahu orang mana, orang mengambil hak kita. Kita tidak tahu di dunia ini berapa miliar orang yang bisa saja mengambil hak cipta kita atau mengakui hak cipta kita. Kita tidak bisa...kita bisa melarangnya, tapi tidak bisa mengontrolnya.* 5
 (It's not about tardiness or not. Now the problem is we do not know which people, people take our right. We do not know how many billion people can take or claim our copyright. We cannot...we can prohibit it, but we cannot control it.) 10

Here AM did not provide a clear answer to FL's question. The question required 'yes' or 'no' answer. However, he did not mention one between the two answers. He stated that the problem was not about tardiness. Moreover, his response was not brief. It can be seen in lines (4) to (9) or (11) to (14).

The other violations to this maxim in this talk show can be seen in contexts (1, pp. 67-68), (2, pp. 68-69), (3, pp. 69-70), (4, pp. 70-71), (8, p. 73), (12, p. 76), (14, pp. 77-78), (15, p. 78), (16, p. 79), (18, p. 80), (19, p. 81), (20, pp.81-82), and (21, pp. 82-83).

After examining the amount of three violated maxims, which was 37, it can be concluded that maxims of quantity and manner equally gained 17 violations (45.9%). They were followed by maxim of relevance with three violations (8.2%).

c. Today's Dialogue

Today's Dialogue discusses many current issues in various topics. This show holds tense debate involving pro and contra sides of a discussed topic. It is broadcasted from Monday to Wednesday at 22.05 and hosted by MH.

Broadcasted on Monday, November 12, 2007, "Temasek Terkena Penalti" was the randomly chosen topic of the show to be analyzed in this study. The analysis of the conversational maxims in Today's Dialogue is presented below:

1. MH : *Pak MI...Temasek melakukan penyimpangan terhadap kepemilikan saham di dua perusahaan Telkomsel dan Indosat. Apa indikator yang Anda temukan sehingga sepertinya keputusan Anda—walaupun belum resmi diputuskan—akan mengarah ke arah sana?* 1
5
- (Mr. MI...Temasek did violate the ownership of stocks in the two companies, Telkomsel and Indosat. What indicator did you find that makes it seems as if your decision—though it yet to be decided—will indicate the same?) 10
- MI : *Jadi proses perkara yang ditangani oleh KPPU mengenai Temasek sudah berjalan kurang lebih enam bulan, sejak April 2007.* 15
Dimulai dengan adanya suatu dugaan pelanggaran terhadap pasal 27 UU No. 5 th.1999. Di dalam pemeriksaan pendahuluan inilah KPPU menyimpulkan bahwa bukti awal yang cukup terhadap adanya pelanggaran ini ditemukan. 20
- (So, the case being taken of KPPU concerning Temasek has run for about six months, since April 2007. 20
- It was begun with a suspicion of violation of clause of Law 27 No. 5 year 1999. On this preliminary court, KPPU concluded that the preliminary evidences sufficient for this accusation of violation are found).* 25

In dialogue above, MI—the chief of KPPU—answered that this case had been going on for six months. That information was essentially not asked. It can be seen in lines (12) to (14) or (20) to (22).

Moreover, he also answered the question given—which was about indicator found of the violation Temasek had done—vaguely. He did not mention what indicator had been found about the violation. He mentioned that there is an assumption that a law had been broken by Temasek. It can be seen lines (15) to (19) or (23) to (27).

2. MH : *Boleh kita tahu bukti-bukti, indikatornya apa saja yang sudah ditemukan?* 1
(Can we know what evidences, indicators were found?)
- MI : *Pada waktu itu ada beberapa bukti awal yang ditemukan oleh KPPU pada pemeriksaan pendahuluan, diantaranya adalah memang ada bukti kepemilikan silang.* 5
(At that time there were some preliminary evidences found by KPPU on the preliminary court, such as the evidence of cross-ownership). 10

MI stated that some evidence had been found in the early investigation. Subsequently, he mentioned the evidence concluding that Temasek had done a violation. In this case, he did not mention directly the evidence that was being asked. It can be seen in highlighted lines (5) to (7) or (9) to (10).

3. MH : *Apa yang salah dengan kepemilikan silang?* 1
 (What's wrong with the cross-ownership?)
 MI : *Nanti ada bukti lain yang ditemukan adalah bentuk tidak terjadinya persaingan di antara dua perusahaan ini.* 5
 (Later, there's an evidence confirmed that there was no competition between these two companies).

MI answered the question irrelevantly. MH—the hostess of the show—asked him if it was wrong to have cross ownership, whereas he answered that later there were other evidence of the case. His utterances in lines (3) to (5) or (6) to (7) show the violation.

4. MH : *Apakah temuan yang sama juga ditemukan oleh LPM UI?* 1
 (Is the same evidence found by the LPM UI, too?)
 NA : *Perlu disampaikan bu MH bahwa UI berbicara tentang metodologi, juga perspektif akademik.* 5
 (We have to say that, Ms. MH, UI talks about methodology, and also academic perspective).

NA—an economy observer of University of Indonesia—was asked whether University of Indonesia had found the same thing too, whereas he answered that the university discussed about academic methodology and perspective. It can be viewed in lines (4) to (5) or (6) to (7).

5. MH : *Tapi ada indikasi penemuan yang sama?* 1
 (But is there indication of the same finding?)
 NA : *Intinya adalah kita menggunakan metodologi kira-kira kalau ada indikasi fix pricing ada upaya untuk menyamakan tarif, kita analisis secara statistik, ada indikasi seperti itu. Sebenarnya klo kita lihat secara keseluruhan, ada tiga pendekatan, pertama adalah kita lihat struktur daripada industri komunikasi, bagaimana kepemilikan saham oleh operator termasuk Indosat dan anak-anak perusahaannya.* 5
 10

(The point is, we use methodology if we assume that there are indications of fix pricing, there are attempts to unify the price, we analyze statistically, [and] there are indications as such. In fact, if we see thoroughly, there are three approaches; the first is, we look at the structure of the communication industry, how the stock ownership is of the operators, including Indosat and its branches).

In the dialogue above, NA explained his answer unclearly. He did not mention whether the university had found the same indicator or not as KKPU had. He explained that the university applied methods to find if there was a fix pricing.

Moreover, he added information about the method, fix pricing, and three approaches in indicating the problem when actually he needed only to answer 'yes' or 'no.' The violations to those maxims could be viewed from his statement from line (3) to (10) or (11) to (18).

6. MH : *Tapi banyak juga yang mengkritisi bahwa pasal-pasal yang digunakan oleh KPPU adalah pasal yang tidak kuat...
Sepertinya KPPU kalau biasanya keputusan mudah diterima kali ini berbeda, kontroversi, DPR juga terbelah, ada tekanan dibalik keputusan KPPU nanti, apakah betul seperti itu, pak MI?*
(But many people also criticized that the clauses used by KPPU are weak articles...
It seems that KPPU, usually its decisions are easy to accept, this time is different, controversial, the Representative Board is also divided, there's pressure behind the KPPU decision. Is that so, Mr. MI?)
- MI : *Sampai saat ini kita tidak merasa ada yang menekan. Dan apa yang dilakukan KPPU ini adalah murni kasus persaingan usaha. Oleh karenanya, saya tadi mengatakan kasus ini dimulai dengan adanya dugaan terhadap pasal 27 UU No. 5 th 1999. Itu*

*jelas dugaannya seperti apa...Tapi ini harus
dibuktikan lebih lanjut melalui pemeriksaan
lanjutan...* 20

*(Up to this moment, we don't feel something
suppress us.*

*And what KPPU does is a pure case of business
competition. That's why I said that this case begun
with a suspicion of violation of the clause of Law 27
no. 5 1999. It's clear what kind of suspicion...But it
has to be confirmed by further examination...).* 25

MH stated her statement verbosely before she got to the point of what she tried to say—which was asking whether KPPU would be under the pressure in taking a decision for Temasek. Instead of asking it directly, she pointed out first that many people criticized the article that KPPU used. It can be seen in lines (1) to (3) or (8) to (9).

She also did not state her statement orderly. She talked about KPPU, but in the middle of her statement, she talked about the House of Representatives, then she continued talking about KPPU. Those things could be seen from her utterance. The violation can be found in lines highlighted (4) to (6) or (10) to (12).

Still in the same dialogue, MI was being vagues in answering whether KKPI was under the pressure or not. It could be implied from his answer that KPPU was not under the pressure, but the way he answered the question was not clear. It can be found in line (15) or (23) to (24).

He also added unrequired information about the article used in the case and about how to investigate it. He said more than was required. Lines (16) to (22) or (25) to (29) show the violation.

7. MH : *Kepemilikan silang tidak hanya terjadi dalam hal ini dalam sektor komunikasi, penerbangan juga banyak perusahaan yang memiliki kepemilikan silang. Dalam hal ini kemudian kenapa Temasek yang kemudian diperiksa? Sehingga kemudian banyak yang mengatakan KPPU jangan diskriminatif.* 1
 (The cross ownership happens not just in the communication sector but also in the flight sector. Why then Temasek is examined? Which caused many people ask KPPU not to be discriminative). 5
 MI : *Ini kan bermula dari kita menemukan bukti, tapi sampai proses sekarang ini, setelah ada tim menemukan bukti, KPPU tidak langsung mengambil keputusan.* 10
 (It began from our finding of evidences, but up to the process now, after the team fund evidences, KPPU not directly made decisions). 15

MH added more information than was required. The point of the question was why KPPU only investigated Temasek in the case of cross ownership industry. Nevertheless, she also informed that the public judge KPPU discriminative in investigating cross-ownershiped industry. It can be seen in highlighted lines (5) to (6) or (9) to (10).

Another similar violation also occurred as MI did mention the reason of investigating Temasek in the cross ownership case. The answer was actually enough to reply to the question. However, MI added that KPPU did not make a decision directly toward cross ownership case, although facts are found. The additional information

that he added was actually not required in answering the question given.

It can be viewed in highlighted lines (11) to (14) or (15) to (17).

8. MH : *Tapi kepemilikan silang yang lainnya diperlakukan seperti ini tidak?* 1
(But are the other cross ownerships treated like this or not?)
- MI : *Sekarang saya contoh di perbankan itu Bank Indonesia memberlakukan satu peraturan tidak adanya bukti kepemilikan silang dalam bentuk single present, itu satu. Di luar negeri yang namanya industri telekomunikasi, baik itu di Eropa maupun Amerika itu juga dilarang itu cross ownership.* 5
(Let me take example of banking field, Bank Indonesia set a regulation that there's no evidence of cross ownership in the form of single present, that's one thing. In the foreign countries, the communication industry, whether it's in Europe or America, is forbidden of cross ownership). 10
- MI stated vaguely whether other case of cross ownership was treated as the same just like what KPPU had done to Temasek. Instead of giving a clear answer, he mentioned that Bank of Indonesia prohibited the cross ownership. He mentioned also that it was also forbidden in the United States and European countries. The violation MI made can be found in his above statements from line (5) to (10) or (11) to (16).
9. MH : *...kepemilikan saham yang lebih dari mayoritas dalam perusahaan yang sejenis atau bidang yang sama, itu kan tidak dilanggar...Apa yang dilanggar di sini pak MI?* 1
(...the stock ownership more than majority in the same company or field, it is not violated ...What's being violated here, Mr. MI?) 5

MI : *Jadi, yang dicantumkan dalam UU itu adalah struktur daripada kepemilikan silang. Yang kita lihat di KPPU dalam perkara ini adalah perilaku. Apakah ada perilaku yang menyebabkan persaingan tidak sehat dengan adanya kepemilikan silang ini.* 10

Itulah yang kita lihat, oleh karena, tim pemeriksaan lanjutan ini memeriksa berbagai macam...mengkaji secara ekonomis daripada perilaku cross ownership. (Well, what's included in the regulation is the structure of cross ownership. What we see in KPPU in this case is the behaviour, whether there is any behaviour causing unfair competition in this cross ownership. That's what we look at, because, the further examination team examines many things...reviewing economically the cross ownership behaviour). 15 20

MH asked MI what violated by Temasek was. Nevertheless, MI explained what the content of the law is. Moreover, he also explained the advanced investigation that KPPU done in this case. Actually, the information was not required. It can be seen in lines (8) to (9) and (14) to (16), or in (17) to (18) and (22) to (24).

On the other hand, he did not answer clearly what the violation Temasek done. Instead, he stated what KPPU investigated in the case. It can be seen in lines (10) to (13) or (19) to (21).

10. MH : *Apa sih dampaknya, pak, dari yang Anda katakan tadi?* 1
(What's the effect, sir, of what you just said?)
- MI : *sebenarnya kerugian oleh konsumen. Banyak dari kita yang tidak merasa bahwa apa yang terjadi pada saat ini tarif telepon kita nih masih tinggi.* 5

(actually, it is the loss of the consumers. Many of us do not realize that what happens now is our telephone fare is still expensive).

MI added information more than was required. He did provide the required answer of the question; nonetheless, he included that there were many people did not know that the telephone fare is high in Indonesia. Essentially, that information was not needed. It can be viewed in highlighted lines (4) to (6) or (7) to (9).

11. MH : *Walaupun kita lihat ada kok semacam iklan perang tarif. Apakah itu iklan belaka ataukah Anda atau LPM UI tidak melihat ada persaingan yang betul-betul sehat atau ketat diantara keduanya?* 1
 (Although we see there is, indeed, some kind of fares competition. Is it just advertisement or is it just you and LPM UI did not see the fair or tight competition between them?) 5
- NA : *Itu sisi lain. Yang bersaing itu siapa sih, Telkomsel dan Indosat, untuk GSM, Kita lihat kenapa ada cross ownership. Kita lihat dari agresifitas dari pemberian persediaan infrastruktur. Telkomsel sangat agresif.* 10
 (It's other thing. Who are, actually, the competing parties? Telkomsel and Indosat, for GSM, We see why there is the cross ownership. We look at the aggressiveness of the supply of the infrastructure. Telkomsel is so aggressive). 15

NA answered unclearly the questions given. Instead of answering 'yes' or 'no', he mentioned the competing parties. It can be seen in lines (9) to (10) or (14) to (15).

Furthermore, he explained about agresivity between Telkomsel and Indosat. The information was not required, essentially. It can be observed in lines (11) to (13) or (16) to (18).

12. MH : *Walaupun sebenarnya banyak juga yang menilai 1*
persaingan dua perusahaan ini lebih sehat setelah
masuknya kepemilikan Temasek?
 (Although, in fact, there are many people think that
 the two companies' competition is fairer after 5
 Temasek has its ownership?)
- NA : *Belum tentu.*
Karena persoalannya adalah berapa tax yang
dibayarkan oleh mereka. Cenderung menurun kan?
Ingat, perguruan tinggi tidak berhak mengatakan itu 10
melanggar UU tapi kok ada indikasi penurunan
kinerja!
 (We can't be sure.
 Because the problem is how much the amount of tax
 they pay. It tends to decrease, right? Remember that 15
 university has no right to say that it violates
 regulations; however, how come there is the
 indication of performance decline.)

In the dialogue above, NA unclearly answered whether competition between these two companies was fairer after Temasek got involved. He neither said 'yes' nor 'no'. Instead, he was not sure about the fairness of the competition. It can be seen in line (7) or (13).

Furthermore, he mentioned what the problem actually was and that university had no right to judge whether Temasek had violated the law. The further information he stated was actually not required. The violation he made can be observed in lines (8) to (12) or (14) to (18).

13. MH : *“Temasek Terancam Penalti”, itulah topik kita dalam Today’s Dialogue malam ini. Pak MI, ada perusahaan asing yang sudah menunggu untuk masuk, perusahaan Rusia bernama Ultimo, betul seperti itu? Sehingga sepertinya ada desakan untuk Temasek untuk segera keluar?* 1
 (“Temasek is Warned of Penalty”, it’s our topic in Today’s Dialogue tonight. Mr. MI, there is a foreign company waiting to get in, a Russia company named Ultimo, is that true, so it seems that there is a demand for Temasek to get out immediately?) 5
 10
 MI : *KPPU tidak masuk ke dalam wilayah tersebut. (KPPU does not get involved with that field).*

MH did not ask the question briefly to MI. She reintroduced the topic to the viewers after having break before giving the question to MI. It can be observed in highlighted lines (1) to (2) or (7) to (8).

Still in the context above, it can be seen that MI answered unclearly whether such rumor was true or not. He did not answer ‘yes’ or even ‘no’. He only mentioned that KPPU did not get involved in that matter. It can be viewed in line (12) or (13).

14. MH : *Kalau begitu saya beralih nih. Pak MI, Kalau nanti terbukti bersalah, apa sanksi yang bisa dikenakan?* 1
(Then, I’ll change the topic. If Temasek is proven to be guilty, what sanction can be put against it?)
 MI : *Menurut UU No. 5 th. 1999, kewenangan KPPU kalau untuk memberikan sanksi kepada perusahaan yang bersalah melanggar UU No.5 adalah pertama perintah. Kalau dalam kasus cross ownership ini adalah perintah untuk tidak melakukan cross ownership, ya sanksinya adalah melepas salah satu sahamnya.* 5
(Referring to Law no. 5 1999, KPPU’s authority to give sanction against a company violates UU no. 5 is order, firstly. In this case of cross ownership is an order not to have cross ownership, well, one of the sanctions is to let go one of its stocks. 10
 15

MH did not straightforwardly give the question to MI. Before asking him, she stated first that she would change the previous discussed question, which was about the Russian company, to a new question. It can be examined in highlighted line (1) or (3).

Still in the dialogue above, it can be observed that MI did not straightforwardly answer what the punishment was; nevertheless, he explained first about the Law no.5 1999. The information he added was also much more than was required. It can be seen in highlighted lines (5) to (10) or (12) to (15).

15. MH : *Dilepas ke mana sahamnya?* (Where?) 1
- MI : *Itu terserah. Kalau pemerintah ada uang, silakan pemerintah beli. Kalau tidak punya uang, mungkin swasta yang bisa beli.* 5
(It's up to them. If the government has money, it can buy the stock. If it cannot afford it, perhaps private party can buy it.)

MI did not state clearly and briefly which party that deserves to buy the sold stock of Temasek. He mentioned that it could be government, if they could afford it it, or maybe private party. The violation can be observed in lines (3) to (5) or (6) to (8).

16. MH : *“Temasek Terancam Penalti”, itulah topik kita dalam Today’s Dialogue malam ini. Pak NA...apa atau mana opsi yang lebih kemudian menguntungkan bagi warga Indonesia, apakah dibeli kembali oleh pemerintah ataukah dibeli oleh pihak asing yang sudah menunggu?* 1
 (“Temasek is Warned of Penalty”, it’s our topic in Today’s Dialogue tonight. Mr. NA...what or which 5

- option give more advantage to Indonesian, is it to be bought by the government or by the waiting foreign party?) 10
- NA : *Ya pemerintah! Kan intinya bagaimana penguasaan Indosat itu sebesarnya untuk kemakmuran rakyat.* (The government, of course! The point is how to make the Indosat acquisition can optimally be used for Indonesian prosperity). 15

In the dialogue above, MH did not ask NA directly. Instead, she welcomed the audience back to the show before delivering the question. It can be examined in highlighted lines (1) to (2) or (7) to (8).

Still in the same dialogue, NA gave redundant answer to MH. He did state that the government should be the party that buys the stock of Temasek. However, after answering the question with that reply, he stated that the use of authority of Indosat was dedicated to all people of Indonesia. The additional information was actually not needed. It can be observed in lines (12) to (13) or (14) to (16).

Discussion on “Today’s Dialogue”

As violated in two previous talk shows, maxim of quantity, relevance, and manner were violated also in the last analyzed talk show—“Today’s Dialogue”.

1. Maxim of Quantity

Many utterances in the talk show violated maxim of quantity as the speakers provided more informative answers than was required. In accordance with Grice (1975), in following the rule of this maxim, a speaker has to be as informative as required in communicating. He

cannot provide more or less informative contribution (as cited from Thomas: 1995).

A sample of a violated utterance can be viewed in the dialogue below taken from context (10, pp. 94-95):

- MH : *Apa sih dampaknya, pak, dari yang Anda katakan tadi?* 1
 (What's the effect, sir, of what you just said?)
- MI : *Yang paling mudah adalah sebenarnya kerugian oleh konsumen. Banyak dari kita yang tidak merasa bahwa apa yang terjadi pada saat ini tarif telepon kita nih masih tinggi.* 5
 (The easiest is, in fact, the loss of the consumers. Many of us do not realize that what happens now is our telephone fare is still expensive).

MI violated maxim of quantity as he added information more than was required. He did provide the required answer of the question; nonetheless, he added that there were many people did not know that the telephone fare is high in Indonesia. Essentially, that information was not needed. It can be viewed in lines (4) to (6) or (7) to (9).

The other violated utterances in "Today's Dialogue" can be seen in contexts (1, p. 87), (5, pp. 89-90), (6, pp. 90-91), (7, p. 92), (9, pp. 93-94), (11, p. 95), (12, p. 96), (14, p. 97), and (16, pp. 98-99).

2. Maxim of Relevance

Grice (1975) points out that this maxim is a matter of giving relevant responses to topic of discussion. Therefore, when a speaker's reply is not relevant to the discussed topic, he will violate the maxim of relevance (as cited from Thomas: 1995)

That was what happened in some utterances in “Today’s Dialogue”. An example of the violation to this maxim can be observed in the dialogue below taken from context (3, p. 89):

- MH : *Apa yang salah dengan kepemilikan silang?* 1
 (What’s wrong with the cross-ownership?)
- MI : *Nanti ada bukti lain yang ditemukan adalah bentuk tidak terjadinya persaingan di antara dua perusahaan ini.*
 (Later, there’s an evidence confirmed that there was no 5
 competition between these two companies).

MI violated the maxim of relevant by answering the question irrelevantly. MH asked him if it was wrong to have cross ownership, whereas he answered that later there were other evidence of the case. His utterances in lines (3) to (5) or (6) to (7) show the violation. Another violation to this maxim can be found in context (4, p. 89).

3. Maxim of Manner

As stated above, this maxim demands a speaker to avoid ambiguity or obscurity. The information he deliver should be direct and straightforward.

In “Today’s Dialogue”, this maxim was violated many times as the speakers did not follow the stated rules of the maxim. They tend to beat around the bush in putting forward their minds. A sample of the violation to this maxim can be examined in context below taken from situation (13, p. 97)

- MH : *“Temasek Terancam Penalti”, itulah topik kita dalam Today’s Dialogue malam ini. Pak MI, ada perusahaan asing yang sudah menunggu untuk masuk, perusahaan Rusia bernama Ultimo, betul seperti itu? Sehingga sepertinya ada desakan untuk Temasek untuk segera keluar?* 1
 (“Temasek is Warned of Penalty”, it’s our topic in Today’s Dialogue tonight. Mr. MI, there is a foreign company waiting to get in, a Russia company named Ultimo, is that true, so it seems that there is a demand for Temasek to get out immediately?) 5
 10
- MI : *KPPU tidak masuk ke dalam wilayah tersebut. (KPPU does not dwell in that field).*

In the situation above, MH did not ask the question briefly to MI. She reintroduced the topic to the viewers after having break before giving the question to MI. It can be observed in highlighted lines (1) to (2) or (7) to (8).

Still in the context above, it can be seen that MI answered unclearly whether such rumor was true or not. He did not answer ‘yes’ or even ‘no’. He only mentioned that KPPU did not get involved in that matter. It can be viewed in line (12) or (13). The other violated utterances in the talk show can be seen in contexts (1, p. 87), (2, p. 88), (5, pp. 89-90), (6, pp. 90-91), (8, p. 93), (9, pp. 93-94), (11, p. 95), (12, p. 96), (14, p. 97), (15, p. 98), and (16, pp. 98-99).

After analyzing the three violated maxims in “Today’s Dialogue”, it can be concluded that from total amount of all violations that occurred, which was 28, maxim of quantity occupied 12 cases (42.9%). On the other hand, the violations to the maxim of relevance

occurred twice (7.1%). The maxim of manner became the most violated maxim with 14 violations (50%).

4.2 Violations to the Conversational Maxims in All Talk Shows

In agreement with Grice (1975), there are times when people fail to observe a maxim in communication. People, intentionally or not, tend not to observe a maxim or more in conversing. Violating a maxim is one of five ways of not observing a maxim. In the violation to the conversational maxims, a speaker is liable to mislead the hearer.

In the three talk shows, it was found that all the participants were likely to violate maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principle. It is a principle that speakers and hearers need to obey in communication to make an efficient and effective one. The violated maxims were maxim of manner, of quantity, and of relevance. It was not found a violation to maxim of quality.

The three maxims were violated as the speakers failed to fulfill the requirements of those maxims in communicating. In other words, the violations occurred when a speaker did not observe those maxims.

To reveal the most violated maxim in each and all talk shows, the tables below are presented:

Table 4.1
The Sum of Violations to the Conversational Maxims

No.	Talk Shows	Violation to Maxim				Σ Violation to All Maxims per Talk Show
		Quality	Quantity	Relevance	Manner	
1	Padamu Negeri	0	25	1	24	50
2	Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue	0	17	3	17	37
3	Today's Dialogue	0	12	2	14	28
	Σ Violation to Each Maxim in All Talk Shows	0	54	6	55	115

The table above shows the sum of the violations to the conversational maxims in each and all talk shows. Based on the table 4.1, the violations to the maxim of quantity were mostly found in “Padamu Negeri”, while the violations to the maxim of relevance were mostly found in “Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue”. On the other hand, the violations to the maxim of manner were mostly found in “Today’s Dialogue”.

After being accumulated, the greatest number of violation in all talk shows could be found in the maxim of manner. In other words, this maxim was the most violated maxim in debates.

The table above determines the percentage of occurrence of the violations to each maxim in the talk shows. The percentage can be seen in tabel 4.2.

Table 4.2
The percentage of the Violations to the Conversational Maxims

No.	Talk Shows	Violation to Maxim (%)			
		Quality	Quantity	Relevance	Manner
1	Padamu Negeri	0	50	2	48
2	Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue	0	45.9	8.2	45.9
3	Today's Dialogue	0	42.9	7.1	50
	% Violation to Each Maxim in All Talk Shows	0	46.9	5.3	47.8

The table above shows that the violation to the maxim of manner occupies the biggest percentage. It is followed by the violation to the maxim of quantity and relevance. On the other hand, the violation of maxim of quality was not found in all utterances in those three talk shows.

Viewed from each talk show, the violation to maxim of quantity was mostly found in “Padamu Negeri” (50%). Meanwhile, the violation to the maxim of relevance was mostly found in “Save Our Heritage Round Table Dialogue Heritage Round Table Dialogue” (8.2%). On the other hand, the violation to maxim of manner was mostly found in “Padamu Negeri” (50%).

The maxim of manner was the most violated maxims that occurred in debate—in this case the three talk shows—as the participants were likely to deliver their utterances wordily, vaguely, and disorderly. In other words, they failed to fulfil the requirements of the maxim of manner. They were more likely to provide vague and verbose information for all participants in debate they were involved in. They did so as they defended their opinion from others.

In other words, they delivered their best thought by putting forward much more detail—that sometimes turned into verbose and vague—answers as an effort to make sure everyone that their opinion was the true one.

In this research, the violations to maxim of manner and of quantity gained almost equal percentage due to the character of the maxims; those maxims overlapped. For example, when a speaker provided much more informative answer than a question required, he would be likely to beat around the bush or to be vague and verbose. It is in line with Thomas (1995:92). He states that it is not easy to determine which maxim is being invoked. Particularly, the maxims of quantity and of manner seem to overlap. Nevertheless, still the maxim of manner was the most violated maxim in the debates.

In addition, since debate is a formal argument or discussion of a question, e.g. at a public meeting or in Parliament or Congress, with two or more opposing speakers, and often ending in a vote (Oxford: 1995), it requires a detail, complete, and clear contribution. Sometimes, to deliver that kind of answer, a speaker is more likely to speak verbosely, vaguely, and disorderly.

4.3 Concluding Remark

This chapter discussed the findings and discussion of the research. It pointed out the analysis of the collected data. The result of the the research, which answered the three questions of it, was also presented in this chapter. Subsequently, the conclusion of the study and recommendation for the further study will be presented in the next chapter.

