

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves as the introduction to this study. The chapter consists of research background that also contains previous studies which become references in working on this research, statement of problem, research purpose, research significance, and the definition of key terms.

1.1 Research Background

The unique human ability to express thoughts, emotions, and intentions, while also engaging in interactions with others to share information, underscores the profound significance of language. Language can be defined as a system of communication that uses symbols, such as words and gestures, to convey meaning (Marrone, 2013). Language serves as the primary medium through which communication occurs, encompassing both verbal and non-verbal forms of expression. However, according to Grice (1975), during communication, language often fails to incorporate all the necessary information for a complete understanding of meaning, thereby necessitating an understanding of pragmatics.

Initially, Pragmatics is one of the branches of linguistics that emerges from Morris (1938) perspective on semiotics, the study of sign or symbol systems moreover that perspective divided semiotics into three branches: syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. This classification laid the foundation for the development of pragmatic thought. Pragmatics has since evolved, with modern linguists interpreting the term in various ways.

Yule (1996) succinctly outlines four scopes within pragmatics, including the study of speaker intention, contextual meaning, implicit communication, and the influence of social distance. A clearer explanation of the scope in relation to contextual meaning, Yule (1996:3-4) further

states that in the study of contextual meaning pragmatic is a type of research necessarily that involves interpreting what people mean in a particular context and how that context influences what is said. It also considers who they talk to, where, when and under what circumstances.

In pragmatic discourse, utterances (or texts) become meaningless without context, context pertains to the contextual and environmental aspects that impact the understanding and significance of linguistic expressions. It involves multiple components, including the physical environment, the individuals participating, their collective knowledge, social and cultural standards, and the preceding conversation (Andreas and Jucker, 2012). Furthermore, in pragmatic studies, there are several other crucial aspects related to the context, such as speech acts, cooperative principles, politeness principles, and irony. All these aspects are interconnected and influence the meaning conveyed in a speech (Christina, 2001).

An essential aspect of investigation is related to the theoretical framework advanced by Grice (1975) concerning the Cooperative Principle, a conceptual foundation that substantively contributes to the formation of implicatures. In agreement with Luna (2024) the Cooperative Principle theory in pragmatics, as articulated by Paul Grice, asserts that in communication, speakers are expected to converse in a cooperative, truthful, and relevant manner. This Cooperative Principle consists of four maxims: the Maxim of Quantity, the Maxim of Quality, the Maxim of Relevance, and the Maxim of Manner. These maxims serve as guidelines for communicators to achieve optimal understanding in a conversation. When these principles are violated in a conversation, it can lead to the occurrence of implicatures.

Levinson (1983) states that implicature is an additional meaning arising from a violation of the Cooperative Principle in a conversation. Implicature can occur when the speaker does not follow to the principles of cooperation, requiring the listener to rely on assumptions and context to

comprehend the additional meaning. Implicature can be explained as hidden desires, intentions, and expressions Brown and Yale (1996:3) as cited in (Izah, 2019).

The type of implicature which only known by particular people who understand the context of the utterance is called conversational implicature (Yuniarti, 2014). A conversational implicature refers to something that is implied but not explicitly stated during a conversation. In other words, implicature explains how it is possible to convey more meaning than what is directly expressed in the language used (Igwedibia, 2017).

There are two categories of conversational implicature: particularized implicature and generalized implicature. If no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional meaning, that is when generalized conversational implicature occurs (Yule, 1996 as cited in Martini, 2018). Particularized implicature is constrained by the context in which it is used. It involves drawing inferences that are necessary to understand how an utterance is relevant in a particular context (Anggrarini, 2017).

The phenomenon of communicating with implicature is also frequently found in YouTube programs, such as interviews. YouTube provides a platform that empowers individuals to produce and distribute content, fostering a participatory environment for social interaction. Serving as a significant hub for social networking, YouTube stands as a prime example of social media. Beyond being classified solely as social media, YouTube holds the distinction of being the most widely utilized social media platform globally. Hence, the use of language containing implicature can present challenges for viewers if they lack sufficient knowledge to interpret such language. Relying solely on verbal context is not enough for viewers to grasp the intended meaning of language forms containing implicature. Interviews conducted on YouTube offer unique insights into how to communicate. These interviews, often featuring

various figures, experts or influencers, are prime examples of how implicatures arise in spoken discourse. As Aslinda (2021) said, implicatures occur in speech between two or more people to exchange ideas or thoughts. Unlike scripted content, interviews are typically spontaneous exchanges in which participants rely heavily on implicature to convey subtle nuances, emotions, and meanings.

One of the widely popular interviews on Youtube that has garnered widespread interest among audiences is hosted by Piers Morgan, a distinguished British journalist and television figure. Piers Morgan's YouTube channel boasts an impressive count of 2.29 million subscribers, drawing an average viewership of 556,715,738 views per video. The YouTube video subject to analysis pertains to the interview featuring Piers Morgan and Andrew Tate, which has garnered a substantial 7.1 million views. Andrew Tate, an American-British social media personality, businessman, and former professional kickboxer, engages in this conversation with Morgan.

An interview program typically presents a formal and rigid impression, occasionally leading to boredom for the audience. This is what sets apart the Piers Morgan episode of the interview with Andrew Tate, as the show not only offers information on trending topics but also presents critical elements in Andrew Tate's responses. Therefore, a good collaboration between Andrew Tate and Piers Morgan is necessary to achieve the intended communication goals. In this conversation, both parties respect each other, ensuring that no one feels disadvantaged, thereby creating an effective communication objective as expected. This topic is interesting to research since it will investigate the prevalence of implicatures in various forms of communication, as exemplified in YouTube programs such as interviews.

Some previous research was used in this study to show the gap between this present study and the previous ones. A study conducted by Yanling (2023) examined the conversational implicature of dialogues in

Before Sunrise from the perspective of violation of the cooperative principle. The research explores the cooperative principle (CP) serves as a fundamental guideline for effective verbal communication, not all conversations strictly adhere to it. Instances exist where participants intentionally breach the CP for specific purposes, such as avoiding embarrassment. This deliberate violation leads to conversational implicature, where the true meaning of the dialogue becomes implicit. When a participant deviates from the cooperative principle, posing a scenario where *"the answer is not what is asked,"* the other party must rely on unique contextual cues to infer the implied information in the discourse (Z. R. He and Y. P., Ran 2010).

Then, research by Elmahady and Sarvanan (2022) which analyzes the Conversational Implicature (CI) as the inherent intention behind a speaker's speech, assuming mutual understanding and observance to communication rules by both the speaker and the receiver. Focusing on the violation of Grice's theory in daily conversations, the research addresses a literature gap in the investigation of CI in everyday contexts. Analyzing 77 daily conversations, the study underscores the critical role of context in determining the meaning of thoughts and highlights the prevalence of particularized CI in daily communication compared to generalized and scalar implicatures. The findings emphasize the context-dependent nature of conversational implicatures, with a significant reliance on context for both particularized and scalar implicatures. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of conversational implicatures in various settings, shedding light on the violation of the Cooperative Principle.

Following that, the research by Astrid and Jumharia (2021) which studied about the various forms of conversational implicature and their functions in the interview "SuperSoul Sunday" on the Oprah Winfrey Network (OWN). The data were analyzed descriptively and qualitatively, revealing three types of generalized conversational implicature and eleven types of particularized conversational implicature based on utterances.

Each host, with a unique personality and circumstance, contributed to the deviation from the dictum. By deviating from maxims, speakers inferred meaning through brief or detailed justifications, resulting in irrelevant and ambiguous responses. The data were analyzed descriptively and qualitatively, revealing three types of generalized conversational implicature and eleven types of particularized conversational implicature based on utterances.

This research expanded on what previous studies on conversational implicature had examined. Specifically, the research focused on analyzing maxim violations that produced implicatures. Grice had introduced the concept of implicature as a result of violations of Maxims, namely additional meanings that could be inferred by the listener. Furthermore, in terms of its research object, while YouTube had become the primary platform for sharing information and perspectives, explicit research on how violations of communication principles, such as Grice's maxims, might have led to the formation of implicatures in content discussing current issues was still limited.

1.2 Research Questions

Based on the research background above, the writer proposed two questions in this research as follows:

- 1) What types of maxims are violated in Piers Morgan's interview with Andrew Tate?
- 2) What implicatures arise as a result of violation of the Maxim in Piers Morgan's interview with Andrew Tate?

1.3 Research Objectives

After seeing the problem statement, the researcher decided that the objectives of this study are as follows:

- 1) To identify the types of Maxims violated in Piers Morgan's interview with Andrew Tate.
- 2) To analyze the implicatures that emerge as a result of violation of the

Maxims in Piers Morgan's interview with Andrew Tate.

1.4 Research significance

This research can be useful for those who want to study the use of language and how meaning is being delivered. This research can also be used to enrich the knowledge of pragmatics, specifically on conversational implicature. This research is expected to become an empirical source for those who are interested in studying pragmatic specifically in conversational implicature.

a) English Literature Students

This research can be used by English literature students as a reference in understanding pragmatics especially in understanding the theory of conversational implicature and how it leads to disobeying the rules of communication which also known as maxims by Herbert Paul Grice (1975). This research can be useful for them which may inspire them in analyzing phenomenon using the same theory but with different point of view.

b) Future Researcher

For future researchers, this research can be used as an example on how to analyze a phenomenon using the theory of conversational implicature and the rules of maxims by Herbert Paul Grice. Future researchers are also expected to be capable in finding the gaps in this research so then they could do better in the upcoming study.

1.5 Definition of key terms

To formulate and explain the terms of the title to avoid ambiguity in this research. The definition is as below:

1. *Implicature* is a meaning conveyed indirectly through conversation, which can be inferred from what the speaker actually says. Implicature is

often important in understanding the true meaning of a conversation (Grice, 1975).

2. *Conversational Implicature* is one of Pragmatics studies which analyze the implicit meaning of an utterance (Levinson, 1983).
3. *Generalized Implicature* is a kind of implicature that does not require special context to understand the meaning (Yule, 1996).
4. *Particularized Implicature* is a kind of implicature that requires special context to understand the meaning (Yule, 1996).
5. *Cooperative Principle* describes how people achieve effective conversational communication in common social situations—that is, how listeners and speakers act cooperatively and mutually accept one another to be understood in a particular way (Grice, 1975).
6. *Interview* is a conversation between two or more people, between a source and an interviewer to obtain information verbally with the aim of obtaining data that can explain the problems of the research (Kvale, 1996).