

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Research

In society, language is used to communicate ideas, information and feelings toward each other. In a conversation, people use words and sentences that contain meaning. The meaning will be determined from the context of the conversation itself. It can be said that the language context has an important role in conversation. Thus, in order to know the context, both speaker and hearer need to know the background knowledge of the interlocutor and the situation which will affect the conversation.

Background knowledge and situation are important for both speaker and listener to build a good conversation. The first is background knowledge that related with what both speaker and hearer understanding. It concerned to the speaker's and listener's background knowledge. Second, the situation connected to setting where discussion take place. Here, both of them related each other in creating a context. Therefore, the information or idea that the speaker delivers to a hearer will be understood if these two elements are applied in a conversation.

In the relation with conversation, linguistics study which concerned with the context and speaker's meaning in a conversation is known as pragmatics. Pragmatics has many branches, such as; presupposition, speech act, deixis, and implicature. Yule, (1996) defined pragmatics as the study of meaning in context. It concerns with how the context influences speaker's utterance. In other words, it

concerned about how a certain speaker's intention, how they use language, and how the hearer interprets the utterance.

Implicature is the branch of pragmatics which is chosen by the researcher. Grice (1975) divided implicature into two categories based on the implied meaning, those are: conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Here, conversational implicature involves cooperative principles but conventional implicature does not involve cooperative principles. Moreover, Grice (1975) stated that speakers intend to be cooperative in conversation which means that both speaker and hearer need to say the truth or the fact, be relevant and try to be clear as possible in order to make a cooperative conversation.

In relation with the explanation above, there is an example of phenomenon in daily life where people misunderstand when they do not know the context of the conversation. It can be seen below:

Lecturer : *What time is it?*
Student : It is 9 o'clock.

The context is when a student comes late to the class. Here, the lecturer's utterance has an implied meaning which warn the student because he or she comes late or simply means *you are coming late*. Then, another problem is the student does not understand and gives irrelevant answer because she or he does not understand the context or what the lecturer's saying. Therefore, it can be said that this conversation is not cooperative.

The irrelevant answer from the student in the example above is one of the example of violating a maxim of relevant. According to Brown & Levinson (1978) and Yule (1996), conversational implicature is derived from a common principle of

conversation and maxims which speaker normally obeys. This comes from the common 'Cooperative Principle' which is outlined in four sub-principles called maxims by Grice (1975). Within this cooperative principle, he suggested four maxims: quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. In short, a conversation will be said cooperative if the four maxims are applied. In contrast, a conversation will not be cooperative if the maxims is violated like the example above.

Related to the discussion above, the maxim of relevant which violated from the conversation above leads to an implicit meaning from the lecturer in the conversation. The implied meaning related to conversational implicature. It relates with implicit or indirect meaning of utterances produced by the speaker. Here, it can be said the lecturer's utterance has indirect meaning or implied meaning which is indirectly said '*you're coming late*' to the student. Therefore, the violated maxim that found in the conversation above has an implied meaning that can be categorized as one of the types of conversational implicature.

Grice (1975) divided conversational implicature into two types, those are: generalized implicature and particularized implicature. Generalized conversational implicature does not need specific knowledge to identify the utterance from the speaker or loosely context-bound. Meanwhile, particularized conversational implicature concern with the speaker utterance based on context which means that it strongly depends on the context and also need specific knowledge to identify the utterance from the speaker. In this case, the implied meaning in the conversation above is categorized as particularized conversational implicature. Hence, the lecturer's utterance above is categorized as particularized conversational

implicature because it based on the context or need specific knowledge to identify the implied meaning.

Moreover, there are some functions of conversational implicature used to convey implied meaning in the utterance. Brown & Levinson (1978) described politeness as the way to show awareness of another person's face which relates to public self-image or prestige in social context. Here, they distinguished politeness into four categories, those are: positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record, and bald-on record. From the four strategy, off-record is politeness strategy that strongly relates with hidden meaning. It can be said that off-record is the strategy where the speaker convey a message by violating the maxims in order to give implicit meaning from the utterance. Based on the explanation above, it can be said that in the conversation above the lecturer showed off-record strategy to the student.

Afterwards, the existence of conversational implicature can be found in every kind of conversation or media communication. One of them is talk-show. A real conversation represent in a talk-show. More specifically, the conversation in a talk-show is more contextual. This relates to a conversation or dialogue between two or more people convey meanings and interpretations of the hearer. Therefore, the speaker's meaning found in the talk-show will be understood if there is a context.

In this research, researcher was interested to analyze conversational implicature in Dr. Phil talk-show. This was an American tabloid talk show debuted on September 16, 2002 and gained highest ratings from syndicated show ("Dr. Phil," n.d.). The show embraced a wide types of topics including depression, child abuse, racism, health issues that were prevalent in society, etc. Here, McGraw as

the presenter offers advice to solve their problem as forensic psychologist. Thus, this talk-show received a lot of attention across the nation which discussed unusual content and concerned about the problems of today's society.

There were some previous studies which related to the topic of this research. First, *Conversational Implicature of Indonesian Students in Daily Conversation* by Martini (2018). She purposed to solve the problem of people that frequently produce utterances which were not informative or provide less or too much information as required in daily conversation. As the result, she found the dominant of particularized conversational implicature used by the students.

Next, *Grice's Conversational Implicature: A pragmatics Analysis of Selected Poems of Audre Lorde* by Igwedibia (2017). The aims of this research were to give possible interpretation of selected poems based on the violation of Grice's Cooperative principle and found the degree to which Lorde's selected poems adhere or violate to the maxims. As the result, she found that some of Audre Lorde's poems violated the maxims and three stages of pragmatics interpretation in Lorde's poetry.

From the two previous studies, researcher concluded that the two previous researchers had different purposes, method of collecting data and object of the research with what researcher used. Thus, the researcher did this research because (1) this research is the requirement for Degree of English Literature (2) researcher found there were different contexts in the talk-show that were interesting to analyze using conversational implicature theory by Grice (1975) and proved the relation of implicature theory and politeness strategy by Brown & Levinson (1978) used as the function of the implicit meaning in the utterance.

1.2 Identification of The Problem

As explained in the background of problem above, researcher found some problems that could be analyzed. These problems can be identified such as:

1. Types of conversational implicature found in *Dr.Phil* talk-show.
2. The form of conventional implicature found *Dr.Phil* talk-show.
3. Functions of conversational implicature used in *Dr.Phil* talk-show.

1.3 Limitation of The Problem

Based on the identifications of the problem, there were three problems found. But, researcher confined this research into two categories that could be identified such as:

1. The types of conversational implicature found in *Dr.Phil* talk-show.
2. The functions of conversational implicature used in *Dr.Phil* talk-show.

1.4 Formulation of The Problem

From the limitation above, researcher formulated the problem. As formulation of the problem would be answered in following questions:

1. What are the types of conversational implicature found in *Dr.Phil* talk-show?
2. What are the functions of conversational implicature used in *Dr.Phil* talk-show?

1.5 Objectives of The Research

After formulating the problem, there are some objectives why the researcher does this research below:

1. To analyze types of conversational implicature used *Dr.Phil* talk-show.
2. To analyze the functions of conversational implicature used in *Dr.Phil* talk-show.

1.6 Significance of The Research

1.6.1 Theoretically

Theoretically, there are some aims in this research. First, the research is supposed to give brief information for the readers about types of conversational implicature and the functions of conversational implicature used in *Dr.Phil* talk-show. Second, to enhance our experience, perception, knowledge regarding to our knowing of conversational implicature. The last, this will be a comparison for future observation or research.

1.6.2 Practically

Practically, first, this research expected to enrich knowledge in pragmatics field especially in conversational implicature, kinds of conversational implicatures and the functions of conversational implicature used in *Dr.Phil* talk-show. Then, to give more useful contribution for the researcher by describing the occurrence of conversational implicatures in conversation between speakers in *Dr.Phil* Talk-show.

1.7 Definition Key Term

Pragmatics	: The study of contextual meaning communicated by a speaker or writer, and interpreted by listener or hearer (Yule, 1996).
Conversational Implicature	: Conversational implicature is the basic assumption in conversation in which the participants are adhering to the cooperative principle and the maxims (Grice, 1975).
Generalized Implicature	: Generalized conversational implicature is when no special knowledge needed to calculate the additional conveyed meaning in the context (Grice, 1975).
Particularized Implicature	: Particularized conversational implicature occurs in very specific context where the conclusions are assumed by the hearer Yule (1996).
Talk-show	: A television or radio programme in which a presenter introduces a particular topic which is then discussed by the audience. ("Talk Show," n.d.)