

The Phenomena of Public Debates on Television as Indication of Changes in Language Behavior: A Pragmatic-Semantic Analysis

Sri Handayani¹, Aceng Ruhendi Saefullah²

^{1,2} Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Email: ¹ handayani.uk@gmail.com, ² acengruhendisaefullah@upi.edu

Abstract: Public debates frequently happen in television talk shows taking political issues have been negatively responded by people. This research aims at describing the indication of the changes of language behavior of the resource persons in talk shows live broadcasted on television with a topic in politics. The research was focused on identifying the changes of the language behavior and meanings of speech acts of resource persons through analyzing their linguistic evidences. This research applied descriptive qualitative method by implementing a case study as its research design. The data were taken from the phenomena of public debates in a television program named Indonesia Lawyers Club tvOne inviting Rocky Gerung as one of resource persons taking a political topic entitled “*Perlukah Ibu Kota Dipindahkan?*” (Is it necessary to move a capital city?). The speech acts were analyzed by using theory of maxim by Grice and Leech and relevance theory by Wilson and Sperber. The results showed that there is a tendency of changes of language behavior of the resource persons in the public media which is characterized by changes of the communication patterns among the resource persons from multi-face to face-to-face, violation of politeness, effectiveness and clarity in communicating their opinions, and dictions used by the resource persons containing multiple meanings to express their ideas.

Keywords: *public debates, media, changes of language behavior*

Introduction

The development of technology in Indonesia has given an impact on the development of public communication media which is considered as an easy and fast communication tool for people in a society. The impact of the development can be viewed from the growth of online media and television programs shown in more various and attractive ways. The rise of online media and television programs has made it easy for the people to access information and share the information to others. This phenomenon is considered to give a big influence to the increasing use of a language as a means of communication. Therefore, communication and language have a very close relationship.

The development of language in media communication can be identified from the complexity of sentence structures in the texts and utterances spoken through oral languages. The complexity of the textual structures can be found in online media or in conversations in television programs, i.e. public debate and talkshow. The public debate and talkshow shown in Indonesian television program are usually managed by inviting one or several resource persons having different educational backgrounds. The resource persons invited to the talkshows, for instance, are considered to have relevant backgrounds with the selected themes and topics of the discussion. Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC) is an example of the talkshows which are considered to have high popularity in Indonesia.

ILC is a talkshow program broadcasted live on tvOne, a Jakarta-based private television, at 8 p.m. Jakarta time in which it lasts much longer than those of other television talkshow programs. The program was chaired by Karni Ilyas (KI) with a method of dialogue inviting several resource persons discussing current issues happening in public discussion. The number

of the invited resource persons is more than five public figures coming from different backgrounds, i.e. community leaders, practitioners, observers, and government officials. The audience attending this event is mostly lawyers, political analysts, experts in public communication, and college students coming from various universities in Indonesia. The audience of this program is, therefore, considered to have higher level of education background and social status compared to those of the audience of the other talkshow programs. As the consequence, ILC has a high broadcasting rate (<https://www.tabloidbintang.com>) and it always gets awards from the Panasonic Award for nine consecutive years from 2010 to 2018 (<https://id.wikipedia.org>).

The increase of the broadcasting rate and image of ILC, therefore, this program is given more attention from the Indonesian people. In addition to the good management of its program, ILC also receives many attentions from various public viewers and from the government since the issues raised are interesting ranging from politics, law, and crimes. Among the three issues, political issue is given more attention from public viewers and the government since it presents political figures from the government side, opposition parties, and political observers who are considered to have a high level of independency. Often times, this program has raised serious conflicts and debates among the invited resource persons. The language used in their speeches has been identified to be very sensitive triggering the conflicts and debates.

Many linguistic researchers are interested in the speech acts used by the resource persons as a topic for their research trying to find out the language phenomena that occur in the media. For example, Ulasma and Samhati (2017) study the variance of language in a talkshow program, Islam (2017) discusses critical discourse analysis of political TV Talkshows of Bangladesh, Setiawati (2018), discusses assertive speech acts in ILC, Astuti, Asharina, and Permana (2018) review the logic in Rocky Gerung's controversial expressions entitled "*Kitab Suci adalah Fiksi* (The Holly Qur'an is a Fiction)", and Wakaimbang, Rusminto and Ariyani (2019) discuss the politeness of speech in the Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC) program. The results of these studies indicate that there is a phenomenon indicating the changes in the language function, language is not only considered as a communication tool (Allan, 2001), but also has broader functions such as function of protection (Runblad and Chen, 2015) and imaging tool (Runblad and Chen, 2015), and an instrument of power (Foucault, 2010).

Language as a communication tool is expected to be an effective tool in conveying information intended by the speaker. In order to make the communication successful, then, the clarity, the effectiveness, and the appropriateness of manner to deliver information are needed. Wardhaugh (1986) states that an effective communication has to meet the clarity of what is spoken, to whom and in what manner the utterances will be delivered. Therefore, a public communication, i.e. a talkshow has to meet these elements of communication. Therefore, when public debates among resource persons happen in talkshow in television programs, there is a possibility that one of the elements of the communication is missing or there are no relevance between the response and the intention of the speaker (Wilson and Sperber, 2012).

With regard to the above phenomena, this research is intended to examine the indications of changes of language behavior through the phenomena of public debates shown in a talkshow program, Indonesia Lawyers Club, inviting Rocky Gerung as one of the resource persons with a topic entitled '*Perluakah Ibu Kota Dipindahkan?*' (Is it necessary to move a capital city?). The focus of the research is in its speech acts in the debates of the talkshow program. Through pragmatic and semantic analyses this research aims to see indications of changes in language behavior viewed from their communication patterns in the talkshows, its effectiveness and clarity and the dictions used in expressing opinions.

Method

This research aims at describing the indication of the changes of language behavior of the resource persons in talkshows live broadcasted on television with a topic in politics. The research was focused on identifying the changes of the language behavior and meanings of speech acts of resource persons through analyzing their linguistic evidences. This research applied descriptive qualitative method by implementing a case study as its research design. The data were taken from the phenomena of public debates in a television program named Indonesia Lawyers Club tvOne inviting Rocky Gerung as one of the resource persons taking a political topic entitled “*Perlukah Ibu Kota Dipindahkan?*” (Is it necessary to move a capital city?). The speech acts were analyzed by using theory of maxim by Grice, relevance theory by Wilson and Sperber and politeness theory by Brown and Levinson.

Results and Discussion

The results of this research are that there are tendencies of changes of the language behavior of the resource persons in television program marked by the patterns of communication in the talkshows in which the debates are tended to be face-to-face among resource persons, there are violations of politeness strategy, speech effectiveness and clarity in expressing opinions in their language, and the use of certain dictions which contains multiple meanings. The elaboration of the results is described in the following discussion.

Indications of Changes in Communication Patterns

The Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC) program is broadcasted at 8 p.m. Jakarta time with a duration of four hours. The rules of the talkshow are managed through opinion sharing done by one speaker to another in turn and they are guided by a moderator. The communication principle used is public communication tended to use face-to-multi-face patterns. Questions and answers among fellow resource persons are allowed with the permission of the moderator and there is no debate session. In the ILC themed “*Perlukah Ibu Kota Dipindahkan?*” (Is it necessary to move a capital city?) which was broadcasted on August 20, 2019 attended by 13 invited presenters. Data from the talkshow indicated that there were 26 moments of debates that have been built in the communication sessions. The interesting point here is that there were three debating moments, namely in the MS, ES and RG sessions. The following is the pattern of communication among the resource persons in the debate. This debate changed the communication patterns that should have been multi-face to face-to-face and tended to create reciprocal responses.

Violation of politeness, effectiveness and clarity in expressing opinions

The violation of the effectiveness and clarity in expressing opinions in the case of the debate, two resource persons, RG and MS, and a moderator, KI, were analyzed by using Gricean maxim analysis viewed from the relevance of maxims and maxim violations by Grice and Leech, the relevance by Wilson and Sperber, and politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson. The results of the analysis are presented in the following tables.

Table 1. Greeting Used in the Debates between Rocky Gerung (RG), Maruarar Sirait (MS) and Karni Ilyas (KI) referring to the Theory of Kridalaksana (1982)

No.	Types of Greeting	Frequency	Percentage
1	Pronoun	79	59.81
2	Name of person	21	15.92
3	Relative terms	19	14.41
4	Degree and title	10	7.58
5	Zero type	3	2.28
Total		132	100

Table 1 shows that there are five types of Greetings that are emerged in the debate between Rocky Gerung (RG), Maruarar Sirait (MS), and Karni Ilyas (KI): pronoun (59.81%), namely, names of person (15.92%), relative terms (14.41%), degree and title (7.58%) and zero type (2.28%). The types of greetings appeared from their debates, from the highest to the lowest, were: pronoun mostly used by resource persons in greeting or calling other resource persons followed by greeting for the names of person. Greetings used by the resource persons had different references, they could refer to other people or to the speaker. The difference of greeting words used by the speaker was usually influenced at least by two factors, i.e. power and solidarity (Fasold, 1994). The following table shows the greeting words that appeared in the RG, MS, and KI debates in the talkshow program.

Table 2. Greeting Used in the Debates between Rocky Gerung (RG), Maruarar Sirait (MS) and Karni Ilyas (KI) referring to the Theory of Kridalaksana (1982)

No.	Types of Greeting	Greeting
1	Pronoun	<i>Saya, anda, kita, dia, ia</i>
2	Name of person	<i>Rocky Gerung, Rocky, Ara, Jokowi</i>
3	Relative term	<i>Bang, Bung, Bang Rocky, Bung Rocky, Pa Jokowi, Pa Fadli, saudara, Pa Karni, Babe Ridwan</i>
4	Degree and title	<i>Presiden, Ketua Bappenas,</i>
5	Zero	<i>Yang senior, milenial, kolonial</i>

The greeting *saya* (I) in the debate was mostly used by RG, MS, and KI (42%). In the use of the word 'I', RG and KI consistently referred to themselves, while MS was inconsistent. MS used the words *saya* (I) and *Ara* to call himself. *Ara* was actually the nickname of MS. This case can be seen in the examples of Greeting 1 [G1] and Greeting 2 [G2] as follows:

[G1] MS: “*Presiden ini dekat, ...tapi sama Ara...saya juga gak setuju Bang kalau Presiden itu feodal.*”

[G2] MS: “*Saya yang penting adalah saya bisa menyampaikan apa yang benar, apa yang saya dengar, apa yang saya lihat, dan apa yang saya yakini benar.*”

[G1] MS: "This president is close, but with Ara ... I also don't agree with that, Sir, if the President is feudal."

[G2] MS: “The important thing is that I can convey what is true, what I hear, what I see, and what I believe to be true.”

The greeting of 'kita' (we) was the second most frequently used greeting (8.33%), then 'Saudara' (you) (6.82%) and then followed by 'dia' (he/she) (1.52%) and 'ia' (he/she) (0.76%) respectively.

The inconsistency in the use of greetings was also seen in MS speechacts to RG and KI and President Joko Widodo. The inconsistency of MS greetings to GM can be seen in the following speech acts:

[G3] MS: "*Presiden ini dekat, ..tapi sama Ara...saya juga ga setuju **Bang** kalau Presiden itu feudal.*"

[G4] MS: "*Rocky, boleh, boleh saya juga ikut bicara.*"

[G5] MS: "*Tapi sering saya katakana juga sama Bung Rocky mengkritisi dari dalem itu juga tidak mudah juga*"

[G6] MS: "*Kalau berbicara soal itu, tentu dengan proses yang lima tahun ini Bung,*

[G7] MS: "*Saya tahu dengan kerendahan hati ya Bang Rocky ya, Pa Jokowi mempersiapkan betul secara detail secara komprehensif...*"

[G3] MS: "This president is close, but with **Ara** ... **I** also don't agree with that, sir, if the president is feudal."

[G4] MS: "Rocky, may **I**, may **I** also speak?"

[G5] MS: "But often **I** say also the same Bung Rocky criticizing from inside is not easy either"

[G6] MS: "When talking about that, of course with this five-year process, man,

[G7] MS: "I know with humility, Bang Rocky, right, Pa Jokowi prepares it in more details comprehensively ..."

Inconsistency of MS's greetings to KI:

[G8] MS: "*Jangan, Pa Karni jangan coba menjelaskan pikiran dia*".

[G9] MS: "***Bang**, gini, **Bang**, Interupsi dikit **Bang***"

[G8] MS: "Don't, **Pa Karni**, don't try to explain his thoughts".

[G9] MS: "**Bang, like this, Bang, Interrupt a moment Bang**"

Inconsistency of MS's greetings to President Joko Widodo:

[G10] MS: "*Pa Jokowi mempersiapkan betul secara detail secara komprehensif*"

[G11] MS: "*Presiden ini dekat ... tapi sama Ara, saya juga ga setuju Bang kalau Presiden ini feudal.*"

[G12] MS: "*Saya juga berusaha memahami Anda, tapi jangan usaha-usaha Jokowi ini semua salah di mata Anda gitu.*"

[G10] MS: "**Pa Jokowi** prepares it in more details, comprehensively."

[G11] MS: "This **president** is close ... but with Ara, I also don't agree, sir, if this president is feudal."

[G12] MS: "I am also trying to understand you, but don't make **Jokowi's** efforts all is wrong in your point of view."

Likewise, RG to President Joko Widodo, there are two differences in greeting him.

[G13] RG: “*Tapi Presiden Jokowi ngibul karena ga terjadi padahal, public opinion dibangun demikian rupa*”

[G14] RG: “*Kan saya mulai dengan mengatakan, bab pertama dari Jokowi*”.

[G15] RG: “*Itu soalnya tu, dan kekurangan oksigen berbahasa untuk kecerdasan Presiden.*”

[G13] RG: "But **President Jokowi** blurted out because it didn't happen even though public opinion was built in such a way"

[G14] RG: "I started by saying, the first chapter of **Jokowi**".

[G15] RG: "That's the problem, and lack of oxygen to speak for the **President's** intelligence."

This inconsistency also occurs when RG greeted MS.

[G16] RG: “Ok ...e... e... nama saya banyak disebut tadi oleh Ara”

[G17] RG; “Bener..saya tahu itu, saya tahu Saudara dangan geng Saudara ingin membuktikan itu berhasil.”

[G16] RG: "Ok ... e... e ... my name was mentioned a lot by **Ara** just now"

[G17] RG; “ Really ... I know that, I know that you and your friends wanted to prove it worked. ”

According to the case of inconsistencies, it showed that there was a decline in politeness in the speech during the public debate between RG and MS. The decrease of politeness can be identified due to a sense of having a higher power as in the cases of [G3], [G4], [G9], [G11], and [G12], [G14], and [G15]. In this case, MS considered that he himself was younger than GM and he felt to be close to him. Whereas in the cases of [G5], [G7], [G8], [G13], and [G16], MS felt that the person in question has a higher power viewed from the age and position as a moderator, so the names *Pa*, *Bung*, and *Bang* were attached to the names followed to give a respect. In addition, the designation of President Jokowi was still considered to be more polite than that of the Jokowi's designation [G13] since in ‘Presiden Jokowi’ greeting showed that Jokowi was viewed to have a high position in the country, however, in ‘Jokowi’ was viewed to have a lower status. Jokowi was the nick name of President Joko Widodo.

The decrease of politeness was seen from the greetings which could also be influenced by a sense of solidarity as in the cases of [G3], [G4], [G14], [G16], and [G17], so that the nickname appeared since it was considered to be normal. This can be considered impolite because the event of speech acts occurred in the official situation and broadcasted on television programs viewed by public.

The Effectiveness and Clarity in Expressing Opinions

The effectiveness of communication in the public space requires the effectiveness of the language used and the clarity of information conveyed by the speaker. This effectiveness can be seen from the speech acts of the speakers involved in the speech. The following is a speech acts analysis based on Grice that occurred in the debate between RG, MS and KI.

Table 3. Maxims Appeared in the Debates between Rocky Gerung (RG), Maruarar Sirait (MS) and Karni Ilyas (KI) Based on the Theory of Gricean Maxims

No.	Type of Maxim	Frequency	Percentage
1	Quantity	16	29.09
2	Quality	11	20.00
3	Relation	4	7.3
4	Manner	4	7.3
5	Flouting of Maxim	20	36.4
Total		55	100

Table 3 shows that the frequency of speech acts that emerged in the debates between Rocky Gerung and Maruarar Sirait seen from the Gricean maxim phenomenon. The data showed that the debates between the two resource persons gave rise to varied speech acts as indicated by 55 events of the speech acts. Judging from the frequency of maxim that appears from the most frequently appear to the least, the maxim of quality was seen the most frequently used in the debate (29.09%) followed by the maxim of quantity (20.00%). Whereas maxim of relation and manner were ordered after the maxim of quality with the same frequency, that is 7.3%. Whereas when seen from the frequency, the maxim violations that emerge, the tendency of maxim violation showed that there were 20 times (36.4%) violations.

Maxim of Quantity

The examples of the maxim of quantity are indicated in the following:

[1] MS: *"Rocky, boleh, ... boleh... saya juga ikut bicara?"*

RG: *"Ya, silakan."*

[1] MS: *"Rocky, may I ... may ... I also speak?"*

RG: *"Yes, please."*

In this context, MS interrupted the explanation from RG. MS's request was answered firmly by RG with the expression "yes, please". In this case, RG wanted that the communication was run effectively. Another example shows a longer conversation.

[2] MS: *"Ya, saya senang ya ...diskusi yang ber... ini ya ... yang berkualitas. Ya, saya senang ya tadi kita punya posisi dan saya kita memerlukan betul baik dari dalam dan dari luar ya, Bung Rocky?"*

RG: *"Yes..."*

[2] MS: *"Yes ... I am happy, yes ... this discussion ... this is quality discussion. Yes, I'm happy, yes, we have a position, and I need to be well, inside and outside, Mr. Rocky?"*

RG: *"Yes ..."*

In the speech, RG gave a very declarative answer with the word "yes ...". This can be interpreted that the GM wanted to show that he agreed with the statement and wanted to make it clear too even though MS submitted its statement in a less structured manner. Judging from the data showing maxim of quantity, it was found out that the answers showed a clarity mostly found in the GE answers to MS questions but not the other way around. This was shown from 16 times (29.09%) of the maxim of quantity, 50% of them were responses from RG, 24% were

responses from MS, and 25% were responses from KI. One response given by MS can be seen as follows:

[3] RG: "...*Pertanyaan saya, seberapa dekat Anda dengan Presiden?*"

MS: "*Oh ...iya...dekat*"

[3] RG: "... My question, how close are you to the President?"

MS: "Oh ... yes ... close"

In contrast, with RG, MS gave a response to RG with the additional expression "oh, yeah ..." which means the answer was not as sure as the RG's answer.

Maxim of Quality

Maxims of quality focus their responses based on the correctness of information and were usually characterized by evidence that follows. In the case of RG, MS and KI debates, it could be seen that 20.00% of debate responses could be classified as maxims of quality. Here are the forms of speech acts that are classified as maxims of quality:

[4] MS: "*Rocky, boleh, boleh saya juga ikut bicara?*"

RG: "*Ya, ...silakan*"

KI: "*Iya, tapi jangan diambil semua ya waktunya karena sudah malam, sudah mau jam 12.*"

[4] MS: "Rocky, may I, may I also speak?"

RG: "Yes, ... please"

KI: "Yes, but don't take all the time, because it's late, it's already 12 o'clock."

In contrast to the GE response showing the answer in accordance with the information requested, KI provided a more complex answer by including reasons. In this case, KI wanted to show evidence that the time had shown late at night and the event ought to have finished.

[5] KI; "*Jangan, jangan ...menggunakan diksi yang kasarlah ... diksi yang ...*"

RG: "*Ya ga kasar, saya pakai diksi itu supaya ketahuan bener apa maksud pikiran saya itu. Esemka itu kan bab pertama. Yang pada waktu itu seluruh keterangan pers, sama seperti optimisme Ara dan gagalkan?*"

[5] KI; "No, don't ... use a rough diction, the diction ..."

RG: "Yes, it's not rude, I used the diction so that it was discovered what my mind meant. Esemka is the first chapter. Which at that time all the press statements, the same as Ara's optimism and it failed? "

In this speech acts, KI forbid RG not to use a rude diction in conveying ideas. RG answered, "It's not rude" and it was followed by reasons using the dictions used in expressing ideas shared in the previous session.

Maxim of Relation

Many strategies were used by resource persons in asking or presenting their ideas. However, under certain conditions and with certain goals, the resource person responded them differently or they did not relate them to what the other person asked or stated. Take a look at the utterance from the following sources.

[6] RG: “*Bener..saya tahu itu, saya tau saudara dangan geng saudara ingin membuktikan itu berhasil*”

MS: “*Saya tidak punya geng*”

RG: “*Saya tidak punya geng? Saya buatn geng yang baru nanti*”

RG: "Really ... I know that, I know you are with your *geng* trying to prove it worked"

MS: "I don't have a *geng*"

RG: "I don't have a *geng*? I will make a new *geng* later "

Referring to [6], the GE response from the statement "I have no *geng*" correlated with the MS's statement. RG wanted to build communication effectively which was to convey the message that if you did not have a *geng*, he would make a *geng* for MS. The emergence of maxim of relation in the case of this debate was not much. But it could be seen that the speech from the three informants showed that both of them wanted to convey information that was relevant to what was said.

Maxim of Manner

The responses given in maxim of manner tended to be clear, concise and well-arranged, so as not to cause ambiguity and multiple meanings. Examples of maxim of manner that appeared in the RG, MS and KI debates can be seen below.

[7] MS: “*Bang, gini, Bang, interupsi dikit Bang, Bang Rocky tolong jelaskan soal KKN tadi, tolong sampaikan ke wilayah publik. Jadi kita meski terbuka, Anda jangan menuduh dan memfitnah aja.*

RG: “*Ok...saya akan terangkan ...begini ...tadi saya bilang mau uji idenya tu, kalau tingkat korupsi kita, persepsi korupsi kita masih tinggi, maka berhak orang untuk mempersepsikan banyak privat jet pergi ke ibu kota baru untuk KKN...*”

MS: "Bang, like this, Bang, Interrupt a little Bang, Bang Rocky, please explain about the Community Service Program (KKN) earlier, please convey it to the public area. So even though we are open, you should not accuse and just slander.

RG: "Ok ... I will explain ... this ... I said that I want to test the idea, if our level of corruption, our perception of corruption is still high, then people have the right to perceive many private jets going to the new capital for KKN ..."

Referring to [7], the response given by RG to MS speech was very clear and represented the answer of what MS asked by referring to the previous explanation and using straightforward words. With regard to the speech in the RG, MS, and KI debates, it can be seen that each resource person wanted to convey a message clearly and concisely in certain sections such as when they asked for an explanation, defended an opinion or denied the opinion of the interlocutor.

However, when viewed from the number of maxim violations that occur in the debate (36.4%), then there was a speech act from the resource person who was not in accordance with what was asked or said, then there was a tendency of the speakers to do different communication strategies for certain purposes such as covering up real information, defending arguments, disagreeing with other people's arguments, or the influence of uncontrolled emotions so that the speech delivered was not controlled. The following was the table of “flouting maxim” of the speech in the RG, MS, and KI debates in the talkshow.

Table 4. Flouting of Maxim in the Debates between Rocky Gerung, Maruarar Sirait and Karni Ilyas

No.	Types of Flouting of Maxim	Frequency	Percentage
1	Quantity	2	10
2	Quality	1	5
3	Relation	1	5
4	Manner	0	0
5	Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner	6	30
6	Relation, Manner	4	20
7	Relation Quality	2	10
8	Relation Quantity	1	5
9	Quantity, Manner	1	5
10	Quantity, Quality	2	10
Total		20	100

Table 4 shows that the flouting of maxim that occurred in the RG, MS, and KI debates looked quite high in frequency and varies. The frequency level of the flouting of maxim, the flouting of maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner occurred most often (30%) and was followed by the Flouting of maxim of relation and manner. This showed that the debate has changed the way the resource person presented the argument, refused the argument or maintained the argument. This phenomenon can be spurred by the existence of an increasingly broad topic of conversation or topics that begin to touch on sensitive matters or the desires of resource persons who feel they have more power. Here are examples of flouting of maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner and flouting of maxims of relation and manner.

[8] RG: *“Seberapa dekat Anda dengan Presiden, Ara?”*

MS: *“Presiden ini dekat ...tapi sama Ara... saya juga ga setuju Bang kalau Presiden ini feodal. Presiden juga bisa ngomong terima kritik dan saran.”*

[8] RG: "How close are you to the President, Ara?"

MS: "This president is close ... but with Ara, I also don't agree, Sir, if this president is feudal. The president can also say, accept criticism and advice. "

In the case of [8], GE's questions only required clear responses such as close, close enough, very close, or not close. But MS responded it with complex answers. When viewed from this response, the answer "The President is close ... but the same as Ara ..." indicated that the MS might not wanted his closeness to the President to be revealed. There was a culprit's error in the response. So, MS did not provide truth in its response. The next statement stated that "I do not agree, Bang, if the President is feudal. The President can also say that he accepts criticism and suggestions." This statement was not asked by RG in its question. The MS's response was triggered by statements from other sources before the GM. So, when viewed from the relationship between questions and answers, the answers given by MS did not relate to questions from RG. So, it can be said that MS gave answers that were not clear, not concise and unrelated and tended to provide excessive information. Flouting maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner that occurred in the debate was a statement and answer from MS in response to the questions from RG and KI.

[9] RG: *“Nanti minta Ara kasih pengantar buku itu”*

MS: *“Yaaaa...Dan saya sudah lihat Pak Karni, saya sudah datang lihat mana progress daripada pabrik itu. Belum selesai. Jadi ya... kita juga boleh masuk ke wilayah-wilayah ...gak bisa dong dia ngomong seenaknya saja menghujat tanpa ada konten dari kita.”*

[9] RG: "Later, I will ask Ara to introduce the book"

MS: "Yes ... And I have seen Pak Karni, I have come to see how the progress of the factory is. Not finished yet. So yeah ... we can also go into the regions ... we can't just say whatever we like without any counter from us. "

Referring to case [9], the purpose of the RG's statement is to ask the MS to provide an introduction to the RG's book. This refers to the previous RG's statement. The answer "yes ..." in the MS's statement, it is not an answer providing an introduction to the RG's book but rather showing a murmur in conversation that tended to show thoughtful expression. The next utterance was the information that was not actually needed in answering GE's questions. So, the speech did not show relevance to the questions.

Multiple Meaning of Dictions Used by Resource Persons

In the case of the RG, MG and KI debates, many words, phrases, or sentences appeared to have multiple meanings. To see the accuracy of the meaning, the listeners ought to follow the flow of the event and the topic being debated. The words used were not always in accordance with the standard language that should be used in formal situations. Words like *ngibul* (tell lies), *asbun* (speaking without any facts), close, begging for a project, no burden, no clown (Table 5) indicates that there was a shift in the language behavior from the resource persons because there are indications that the resource persons were more willing to express their thoughts with a choice of words that were considered to be capable to arouse listener's curiosity. The followings are words, phrases and sentences that are considered to have an ambiguity or ambiguous meanings in the debates.

Table 5. Multiple meaning of words, Phrases, and sentences

No.	Words	Phrases	Sentences
1	<i>Dekat</i>	<i>Tidak bisa menerima kritik</i>	<i>Presiden ini dekat ... tapi sama Ara</i>
2	<i>Merampok</i>	<i>apa yang benar,</i>	<i>Presiden juga bisa ngomong terima kritik dan saran</i>
3	<i>Kekacauan</i>	<i>apa yang saya dengar</i>	<i>Jaman modern pusat pemerintahan itu bukan di istana tetapi di otak, di kepala tuh.</i>
4	<i>Ngibul</i>	<i>apa yang saya liat</i>	<i>Kalau otaknya kosong pusat pemerintahan itu ga ada gunanya tu.</i>
5	<i>Asbun</i>	<i>apa yang saya yakini benar.</i>	<i>Jangan diambil semua waktunya</i>
6	<i>Geng</i>	<i>Meminta-minta proyek</i>	<i>Kita punya posisi</i>
7	<i>Cebong</i>	<i>Cukup dekat</i>	<i>Memerlukan betul dari dalem dan dari luar</i>
8	<i>Kampret</i>	<i>Ga ada beban</i>	<i>Memerlukan betul dari dalem dan dari luar</i>
9	<i>Wilayah public</i>	<i>Ga ada badut</i>	<i>dia janjikan sesuatu yang lebih dramatis</i>
10	<i>Kolonial</i>	<i>Muter-muter</i>	<i>orang akan pergi pada psikologi pertama</i>
11		<i>Ulas abis-habisan</i>	<i>Kekurangan oksigen</i>
12		<i>butuh oksigen</i>	<i>berbahaya untuk kecerdasan Presiden</i>
13		<i>Diinfus pake oksigen</i>	<i>agak sedikitlah Bung Rocky untuk bisa</i>
14		<i>Yang senior</i>	<i>Anda juga alami kekurangan oksigen</i>
15		<i>Yang milineal</i>	
Total	10	15	13

Conclusion

Public debates frequently happen in television talkshows taking political issues have been negatively responded by people. Phenomena of public debates in a television program named Indonesia Lawyers Club tvOne inviting Rocky Gerung as one of resource persons taking a political topic entitled “*Perluakah Ibu Kota Dipindahkan?*” (Is it necessary to move a capital city?) shows the phenomena of changes of language behavior. The speech acts that were uttered by the resource persons indicated that there is a tendency of changes of language behavior of the resource persons in the public media which is characterized by the changes of communication patterns among the resource persons from multi-face to face-to-face, violation of politeness, effectiveness and clarity in communicating their opinions, and dictions used by the resource persons containing multiple meanings to express their ideas.

References

- Allan, K. (2001). *Natural Language Semantics*. Blackwell Publisher.
- Astuti, S., Asharia, N., & Permana, I. (2018). Telaah Mantik Dalam Ungkapan Kontroversial Rocky Gerung “Kitab Suci Itu Fiksi”. *Parole (Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia)*, 1(4), 481-488. E-ISSN 2614-6231.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S., (1987). *Pliteness: Some Universal in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, P. (1975). in Allan, K. (2001). *Natural Language Semantics*. Blackwell Publisher.
- Islam, S.(2017). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Political TV Talk Shows of Bangladesh. A Theses*. BRAC University. Retrieved from: dspace.bracu.ac.bg.
- Kridalaksana, H. (1982). *Dinamika tutur sapa dalam bahasa indonesia*. Bhratara.
- Rundblad, G., & Chen.H. (2015). *Advice Giving in Newspaper Weather Commentaries*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 89, 14-30. 78216615002532
- Setiawaty, R. (2018). *Analisis Tindak Tutur Asertid dalam ILC Episode Kembali Mega Versus SBY: Kajian Pragmatik*. *The 8th University Research Colloquium 2018*, 8, 283-289. Retrieved from: repository.urecol.org.
- Ulasma, L., & Samhati, S. (2017) *Variasi Bahasa Dalam Acara Talk Show Mata Najwa Maret 2016 dan Implikasinya*. *Jurnal Kata (Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pembelajarannya)*. 1-9. Available at: jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id
- Wardhoagh, R. (2012). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 5th Edition. Blackwell Publisher.
- Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2012). *Meaning and Relevance*. Cambridge University Press.
- <https://www.tabloidbintang.com/film-tv-musik/kabar/read/52657/rating-report-indonesia-lawyers-club-tvone-setelah-411-tembus-5-besar>
- https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indonesia_Lawyers_Club.