

A Pragmatic Analysis of Cooperative Principle and Implicature Concerning Cultural Backgrounds in Showkesmas' Podcast

Deasy Febrina Tampubolon

Universitas HKBP Nommensen

deasy.tampubolon@uhn.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the application of Grice's Cooperative Principle and conversational implicature within the cultural context of the Showkesmas Podcast, featuring speakers from diverse Indonesian ethnic backgrounds—Sundanese, Javanese, and Batak. Using a qualitative discourse analysis approach, the research investigates how speakers adhere to or flout the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, and how these deviations generate implicatures influenced by cultural norms. The findings reveal that humor, indirectness, and pragmatic strategies differ across cultural groups and affect how meaning is constructed and interpreted. The study highlights the importance of cultural background in shaping pragmatic competence and provides insights into intercultural communication within multilingual and multiethnic societies. These results contribute to the broader understanding of intercultural pragmatics and underscore the relevance of cultural awareness in communication analysis.

Keywords: cooperative principle, obeying, maxims, manner, quality, quantity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is a complicated system influenced by context, intention, and cultural background; it is more than just a tool for communicating information. An important area of linguistics called pragmatics studies how meaning is understood in contexts other than the speaker's actual words, taking into account the listener's comprehension and the speaker's intent.

A key to pragmatics is the Cooperative Principle, introduced by Grice (1975), which suggests that effective communication is maintained when speakers adhere to four conversational maxims: quantity (providing the right amount of information), quality (ensuring truthfulness), relation (being relevant), and manner (being clear and orderly). However, in real-life conversations, these maxims are often flouted, leading to implicature—where meaning is implied rather than explicitly stated. Levinson (1983) says that implicature is an important part of human communication because it let people say things with hidden meanings that others can figure out from the context. Understanding these pragmatic elements is essential for analyzing how people communicate efficiently and interpret messages beyond their explicit content.

Pragmatic behavior, however, is not universal; it is highly influenced by cultural backgrounds. Different cultures develop distinct norms and expectations regarding communication, affecting how individuals adhere to or deviate from Grice's maxims. As Thomas (1983) explains, pragmatic failure often arises when speakers from different cultural backgrounds misinterpret conversational implicatures, leading to misunderstandings. For instance, while some cultures value directness and explicitness in communication, others may prefer indirectness and politeness strategies to maintain social harmony. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) further argue that speech acts, implicatures, and politeness strategies vary cross-culturally, impacting the way individuals interact and interpret messages. Consequently, studying how culture shapes pragmatic behavior provides valuable insights into fields such as sociolinguistics, cross-cultural communication, and second language acquisition.

This research seeks to explore how cultural backgrounds influence the application of cooperative principles and implicature in conversations. Specifically, it examines interactions among speakers in "Showkesmas Podcast". There are 5 speakers with different cultural backgrounds to determine how they observe, flout, or modify Grice's maxims. By analyzing their conversational patterns, the study aims to uncover the extent to which culture impacts pragmatic competence and how cultural differences shape communication strategies. The findings of this study will contribute to a deeper understanding of intercultural pragmatics, offering practical insights into improving cross-cultural communication and minimizing misunderstandings in diverse social contexts.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Pragmatics and the Cooperative Principle

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies how context contributes to meaning. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is concerned with "the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)." It explores how language users understand and produce utterances in different contexts, considering factors such as shared knowledge, speaker intentions, and cultural norms (Levinson, 1983). Pragmatics plays a crucial role in effective communication, as it involves understanding not only what is explicitly stated but also what is implied.

2.1.1 Cooperative Principle

The Cooperative Principle, introduced by Grice (1975), is a fundamental concept in pragmatics that explains how effective communication is achieved through cooperation between speakers and listeners. Grice posited that speakers and listeners adhere to a set of conversational maxims to ensure successful exchanges of information. Grice introduced four maxims that guide interaction:

- a) Maxim of Quantity: This maxim states that speakers should provide the right amount of information, neither too much nor too little. In everyday communication, this ensures efficiency and prevents confusion.
- b) Maxim of Quality: This maxim requires speakers to be truthful and provide information supported by evidence. In conversations, adhering to this maxim builds trust.
- c) Maxim of Relation: This maxim emphasizes relevance in conversation. Speakers should contribute information that is pertinent to the topic. However, in some cases, deliberate flouting of this maxim, such as in humor or sarcasm, can create implicatures that require interpretation.
- d) Maxim of Manner: This maxim encourages clarity, orderliness, and avoidance of ambiguity in communication. Effective communication requires speakers to be concise and structured. Ambiguous statements or vague expressions can hinder comprehension and violate this maxim.

Speakers may follow, violate, or flout these maxims to create implicature, where the intended meaning goes beyond the literal words spoken (Grice, 1975). Below are examples illustrating each maxim in practice.

Examples of Grice's Maxims in Daily Conversations

a) Maxim of Quantity

- Obeyed: A: "Where is the nearest ATM?"

B: "There's one at the corner of this street." (Provides sufficient but concise information.)

- Violated: A: "Where is the nearest ATM?"

B: "Well, first you walk down the street, then take a left, then another left, and there's a bank that might have an ATM, but I'm not sure if it's working." (Gives excessive information, making it harder to understand.)

b) Maxim of Quality

- Obeyed: A: "Did you finish the assignment?"

B: "Yes, I submitted it this morning." (A truthful statement.)

- Violated: A: "Did you finish the assignment?"

B: "Of course, I even submitted it last week!" (When in reality, they have not done it, violating truthfulness.)

c) Maxim of Relation

- Obeyed: A: "How was the exam?"

B: "It was really difficult, but I managed to answer all questions." (Relevant response.)

- Violated: A: "How was the exam?"

B: "By the way, did you watch the football match last night?" (Changes the subject, making the response irrelevant.)

- Maxim of Manner

- Obeyed: A: "How do I turn on this machine?"

B: "Press the green button, then wait for the light to turn on." (Clear and straightforward instruction.)

- Violated: A: "How do I turn on this machine?"

B: "Well, first you must understand the principles of electricity and power sources..." (Overly complicated response, making it confusing.)

These maxims help structure conversations, but speakers sometimes deliberately break them to imply additional meaning—which is where implicature comes in.

Grice's maxims serve as guidelines for smooth and effective interaction in daily conversations. When speakers adhere to these maxims, communication flows naturally, and messages are easily understood. However, speakers often flout these maxims to convey implicit meanings, leading to conversational implicatures. For example:

- A person who does not want to directly say "No" to an invitation might respond, "I have a lot of work to do," indirectly signaling refusal (flouting the Maxim of Relation).

- In sarcasm, a speaker may say, "Oh, great job!" when someone makes a mistake, violating the Maxim of Quality to convey the opposite meaning.

These deviations from the maxims do not necessarily result in communication breakdowns; rather, they enrich communication by allowing for subtlety, humor, and indirectness.

Implicature: Definition and Types

Implicature is a crucial concept in pragmatics that refers to meanings implied by a speaker that are not explicitly stated. Grice (1975) distinguishes between two main types of implicature: conventional implicature and conversational implicature.

Deasy Febrina Tampubolon

- **Conventional Implicature:** This type of implicature is independent of conversational context and is instead tied to specific words or phrases that inherently carry additional meaning.

Example:

In the sentence "She is poor but happy," the word "but" implies a contrast between poverty and happiness, even though the speaker does not explicitly state this contrast.

- **Conversational Implicature:** This occurs when a speaker implies something based on context and the Cooperative Principle. It often arises when a speaker flouts one of Grice's maxims.

Example:

If someone asks, "Do you want to go out for dinner?" and the response is, "I have a lot of work to do," the speaker is implying refusal without explicitly stating it.

Implicatures are essential in communication because they allow speakers to convey meaning subtly and efficiently. In many cases, direct statements may be seen as impolite or inappropriate, so implicatures enable speakers to express themselves indirectly. They also contribute to humor, sarcasm, and deeper social interactions. Implicatures are also highly influenced by cultural norms. While some cultures prioritize direct communication (e.g., many Western cultures), others rely on indirectness and shared contextual knowledge (e.g., many Eastern cultures). In many Asian societies, including Indonesia, indirect communication is common as it is considered more polite and socially harmonious. Thomas (1983) notes that pragmatic failure often occurs when individuals from different cultural backgrounds misinterpret implicatures due to differing communicative expectations. Similarly, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) argue that cross-cultural variations in politeness strategies affect how implicatures are interpreted and produced.

2.2 Cultural Differences in Pragmatics

Different cultures exhibit variations in how they interpret and implement Grice's maxims. Research suggests that Western societies, particularly English-speaking countries, emphasize directness and clarity, often adhering to explicit communication norms (Thomas, 1983). In contrast, Asian cultures, including Indonesia, tend to value indirectness and politeness, which can sometimes result in misunderstandings when engaging in cross-cultural conversations (Sukarno, 2010).

Indonesia is a diverse nation with over 1,300 ethnic groups and more than 700 languages (Sneddon, 2003). Each group has distinct communicative styles that shape their use of Bahasa Indonesia, the national language. Some prominent ethnic groups include:

- **Javanese** – Known for their indirect and polite speech, Javanese speakers often avoid direct refusals and instead use soft expressions, frequently flouting the Maxim of Quantity and Manner to maintain social harmony. For instance, rather than saying "No," a Javanese person might say "Nanti dulu" (Maybe later).

- **Batak** – Speakers from North Sumatra, particularly Batak communities, tend to be straightforward and expressive. Their communication style aligns with the Maxim of Quantity and Quality, as they often speak in a detailed and honest manner, which may sometimes be perceived as blunt by others.

- **Minangkabau** – The Minangkabau people are known for their use of proverbs and indirect speech, which sometimes violates the Maxim of Manner, making their messages more metaphorical rather than straightforward.

When Indonesians from different ethnic groups interact, their communication styles reflect their cultural backgrounds. Consider the following exchange among a Javanese, Batak, and Minangkabau speaker:

- **Batak speaker:** "Besok kita rapat jam 10, jangan telat ya!" (We have a meeting tomorrow at 10. Don't be late!) → Direct, aligns with the Maxim of Quantity and Quality.

- **Javanese speaker:** "Jam 10 ya, kalau bisa saya usahakan datang tepat waktu." (At 10? I'll try my best to be on time.) → Indirect, slightly flouts the Maxim of Quantity.

- Minangkabau speaker: "Kita seperti air mengalir, ada waktunya kita sampai." (We are like flowing water; we will arrive when the time is right.) → Metaphorical, flouts the Maxim of Manner.

These examples illustrate how cultural background influences conversational implicatures and adherence to Grice's maxims, affecting the way Indonesians communicate in daily life.

2.3 Role of Context in Pragmatics

Context plays a crucial role in how individuals interpret meaning in conversation. Social norms, cultural knowledge, and shared experiences influence how messages are understood. According to Hall (1976), cultures can be categorized as:

- High-context cultures (e.g., Indonesia, Japan) – Communication is often implicit, relying on shared knowledge, indirect speech, and non-verbal cues.
- Low-context cultures (e.g., the United States, Germany) – Messages are generally explicit, with less reliance on context or background knowledge.

In high-context cultures like Indonesia, the interpretation of implicature depends on familiarity with social norms. For example, the common Javanese greeting "Sudah makan?" (Have you eaten?) is often meant as a polite expression rather than a literal inquiry about food. This differs from Western cultures, where questions tend to be interpreted more directly. Thomas (1983) explains that pragmatic failure—the misinterpretation of implied meanings—often occurs in intercultural settings when individuals fail to recognize the cultural and contextual influences behind communication patterns. In multilingual and multiethnic societies like Indonesia, understanding these nuances is essential for fostering effective cross-cultural communication.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

The Research Methods section describes in detail how the study was conducted. A complete description of the methods used enables the reader to evaluate the appropriateness of the research methodology.

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a qualitative research method to analyze the use of the Cooperative Principle and Implicature in the Showkesmas Podcast. Qualitative research is appropriate for this study because it focuses on the interpretation of language in context, allowing for a detailed analysis of conversational strategies, implicit meanings, and cultural influences on communication.

3.2 Participants

There are 5 participants of this research. They are 4 hosts of Showkesmas Podcast namely Surya, Omesh, Imam and Angga and also 1 guest star, Gita Bebhita. They come from different cultural backgrounds. Surya and Omesh are of Sundanese ethnicity, Angga and Imam are Javanese, while Gita is Batakese. The research follows a discourse analysis approach, which examines naturally occurring conversations to identify patterns in communication, particularly how speakers adhere to or flout Grice's maxims and create implicatures. This method enables an in-depth exploration of meaning beyond literal expressions, making it ideal for studying pragmatic features in real-life discourse.

3.3 Instruments

The data consists of selected episodes from the Showkesmas Podcast, a popular Indonesian talk show that blends humor, storytelling, and discussion. The conversations will be transcribed, and instances of adherence to or violation of Grice's maxims, along with implicature use, will be identified and categorized.

3.4 Data Analysis

By employing a qualitative approach, this study provides a nuanced understanding of how pragmatic principles operate in everyday communication, particularly in an Indonesian media context. This research also highlights how humor and indirectness play a role in meaning-making, contributing to the broader study of pragmatics and discourse analysis.

4. RESULTS

Language in conversation is not always straightforward; speakers may follow or intentionally deviate from conversational norms to create specific effects. In this section, the analysis focuses on how selected dialogues from the **Showkesmas Podcast** illustrate both adherence to and flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four maxims—Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner.

First, this study examines dialogues in which speakers adhere to the maxims, ensuring clear, relevant, truthful, and well-structured communication. These instances demonstrate how effective cooperation between speakers leads to smooth and meaningful exchanges. Second, the study explores instances where speakers deliberately flout the maxims, resulting in implicature—hidden meanings that listeners must infer from the context. Flouting often occurs in humor, sarcasm, or indirect communication, reflecting cultural and contextual influences on pragmatic behavior.

1. Maxim of Quantity

This maxim states that speakers should provide the right amount of information, neither too much nor too little. In everyday communication, this ensures efficiency and prevents confusion.

a. Obeying the Maxim of Quantity

Surya: *Gita ini anak ketiga dari tiga bersaudara* (Gita is the third child of three siblings.)
Imam: *Oh gitu. (Oh, I see.)*

In the above example, Surya provides just the right amount of information—it is clear, concise, and directly relevant to the conversation.

Surya : *Lu ke Jakarta umur berapa sih Git?* (How old were you when you moved to Jakarta, Git?)
Gita : *Umur 27.* (Twenty-seven).
Surya : *27?* (Twenty-seven?)
Gita : *27. Baru aku di Jakarta.* (Twenty-seven; that was when I first came to Jakarta.)

In the above example, Surya gives a clear and concise question, providing the right amount of information for a relevant response. Gita also gives a direct answer, giving just enough information without unnecessary details.

Surya : *Terus terus berhenti Stand Up?* (And then you stopped doing stand-up?)
Gita : *Jadi berhenti Stand Up gara-gara 2014 itu aku ikutan kompetisi yang di Kompas terus aku ikutan karantina. (I quit stand-up because in 2014 I joined a competition at Kompas and then took part in a boot camp.)*

In the above example, Gita provides a detailed explanation about why she stopped Stand Up, which follows the Maxim of Quantity as she gives enough information for listeners to understand.

Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

Omesh: *Artinya apa emang? (So what does it mean?)*
Gita : Anggita, Anggi ni Hita. Anggi itu adik Bahasa Bataknya. Ni itu nya. Jadi Gita adiknya kita, gitu. Yang terakhir adiknya kita-kita gitu. Si bungsu yang enggak diharapkan. (*Anggita, Anggi ni Hita. Anggi* means 'younger sibling' in Batak. **Ni** means 'our'. So, **Gita** means 'our little sister', the youngest child, the one nobody expected.)

In the example above, Omesh asks about the meaning of Gita's name. In addition to giving a detailed answer, Gita also includes unnecessary extra information in the part "the youngest child who was not expected." Gita's purpose in saying this is to make a joke for the others.

Gita : *Iya. Tapi Surya ini tipikal yang kayak e dia Enggak, Maksudnya enggak yang low low maintenance apa lo apa low maintenance relationship friendship itu. Tapi dia ketika aku sesuatu terjadi sama aku, dia termasuk orang yang pertama eh reach, japri gitu loh. Kayak e ketika Mamaku ngedrop gitu ya zaman-zaman Mama nge-drop. Terus ketika orang yang kami benci sama-sama ngeposting apapun, Nah itu dia muncul Tuh. Des....* (Yes. But Surya is the type who isn't, like, low-maintenance—whatever you call a low-maintenance friendship. Yet when something happens to me, he's one of the first who reaches out, sends a private message. Like when my mom's health dropped back then. And whenever the person we both hate posts anything, Des,) *he shows up.*
Imam : *Siapa sih siapa sih? Ayo dong, Git? Siapa sih? Siapa tuh?* (*Who is it, who is it? Come on, Git, who? Who is it?*)
Gita: Adalah (*There is [someone].*)

In the example above, Imam tries to find out who the person Surya and Gita dislike. However, Gita responds with "Adalah." Gita's answer contains too little information, making it unclear for the listeners to understand her meaning. In this case, Gita is trying to hide the person's name.

Imam : *Bule mana? Bule mana sih, Git?* (Which foreigner? Which foreigner, Git?)
Gita : *Hah?* (Huh?)
Imam : *Bule mana?* (Suriname? From where? Suriname?)
Angga : *Peru Peru (Peru, Peru.)*
Gita : *Bisa bahasa Jawa dong kalau gitu. Peru, enggak, Prancis.* (Then they'd speak Javanese if that were the case. Peru—no, France.)

In the example above, instead of directly answering the question, Gita gives an indirect and playful response, which does not provide enough information. This flouts the Maxim of Quantity.

2. Maxim of Quality: This maxim requires speakers to be truthful and provide information supported by evidence. In conversations, adhering to this maxim builds trust.
 - a. Obeying the Maxim of Quality

Omesh : Tapi gua sebagai yang dengar lu di radio juga ya kirain gua tuh benar-benar lahir, gede di Jakarta loh. Cuman orang Batak yang lahir gede di Jakarta.

Omesh: As someone who listened to you on the radio, I honestly thought you were born and raised in Jakarta—just a Batak person who grew up there.

Gita : Oh, enggak. Tapi memang benar-benar aku dari Medan. 2014 baru for good di Jakarta gitu.

Gita: Oh, no. I'm truly from Medan. I only moved permanently to Jakarta in 2014.

Angga : Coba terakhir kapan lu Stand Up Fest?

Angga: When was the last time you did Stand Up Fest?

Gita : 2022, ehh Berani di Manapun Medannya itu setelah 8 tahun vakum enggak Stand Up.

Gita: 2022—the show Berani di Manapun Medannya—after eight years of not performing stand-up.

- b. Flouting the Maxim of Quality

Omesh : Artinya apa emang?

Omesh: So what does it mean?

Gita : Anggita, Anggi ni Hita. Anggi itu adik Bahasa Bataknya...

Gita: (See earlier translation—humorous exaggeration).

Surya : Lu ke Jakarta umur berapa sih Git? ...

Surya : Terus, terus. Berhenti Stand Up?

Surya : And then, then—you quit stand-up?

Gita : ... Jadi aku berpikir karena aku Stand Up, enggak lucu, keluar, bapakku meninggal.

Gita : ... So, I thought that because I did stand-up and wasn't funny and got eliminated, my dad died.

3. Maxim of Relation: This maxim emphasizes relevance in conversation. Speakers should contribute information that is pertinent to the topic. However, in some cases, deliberate flouting of this maxim, such as in humor or sarcasm, can create implicatures that require interpretation.

- a. Obeying the Maxim of Relation

Angga: *Ehhh. Apa namanya artinya apa? Kan katanya orang kalau orang Batak itu nama tuh punya arti.* (Ehhh. What does the name mean? People say Batak names have meanings.)

Gita: Betul (That's right)

Angga: Iya kan. (Right?)

Gita: *Kayaknya enggak cuma orang Batak sih. Kayaknya semua orang.* (I think it's not just Batak people. I think everyone's names have meanings.)

Imam: *Iya. Semua namanya juga punya* (Yes. All names have meanings too.)

Surya: Sekarang lu (Now you)

Gita: Sekarang 21 (Now 21)

Surya: Lho kok mundur? Kok mundur? (Wait, how come it goes backward? Backward?)

Imam: Pertama kali ke Jakarta tahun 27? Hahahahaha (sadar salah ngomong) umur umur umur. Ngantuk ngantuk. (First time in Jakarta in the year 27? Hahahaha (realizes mistake) age age age. I'm sleepy, sleepy.)

Omesh: Kalau datang tahun 27, kamu datang sama pedagang Melayu. (If you came in the year 27, you must've come with Malay traders.)

b. Flouting the Maxim of Relation

Angga: Gua baru tahu namanya Gita Anggita (I just found out her name is Gita Anggita)

Gita: Iya (Yes)

Angga: Serius (Seriously)

Gita: Iya diulang kan. Gita Anggita. (Yes, it's repeated. Gita Anggita.)

Omesh: Lebih kayak orang Sunda Iya benar (More like a Sundanese name, right?)

Imam: Kayak orang ini dong. (Like this kind of person then.)

Surya: Kayak orang Sunda. (Like a Sundanese person.)

Gita: Sunda (Sundanese)

Angga: Sunda Bolong (Sunda Bolong [a ghost in folklore])

Angga: Lu tuh maunya di apa... di bionya tuh apa? Gita bebita aktris, eh penyiar, MC, comedian, montir. (What do you want in your bio? Gita Bebhita – actress, um... announcer, MC, comedian, mechanic.)

Surya: Ah kok montir sih? (Why mechanic?)

Gita: Montir montir. Oh Ayu Azhari, Sarah Azhari, montir-montir cantik.

(Mechanics, mechanics. Oh, Ayu Azhari, Sarah Azhari – beautiful mechanics.)

Imam: Oh montir-montir cantik. (Oh, beautiful mechanics.)

The speakers in both cases deliberately flout the Maxim of Relation by introducing irrelevant but humorous content into the conversation. These utterances are not intended to be taken literally;

Deasy Febrina Tampubolon

rather, they reflect a shared joking culture among the participants. According to Grice's theory, such flouting prompts the listener to seek additional meaning, or implicature, which in this context reveals a playful tone and a means of reinforcing social bonds through humor. The flouting serves important social functions—such as joking, teasing, and building solidarity—demonstrating that conversation is not solely about exchanging information but also about maintaining interpersonal relationships. The irrelevance is intentional and mutually understood, highlighting shared cultural references and strengthening group rapport.

b. Flouting Maxim of Manner

Gita: Gita Anggita. Udah gitu margaku diulang lagi, Butarbutar (Gita Anggita. And then my surname is repeated too, Butarbutar)

Angga: Iya ngulang-ulang lagi. (Yeah, repeating again)

Omesh: Ngulang-ulang Gita Anggita Butarbutar (Repeating Gita Anggita Butarbutar)

Imam: Madura juga ngulang. (Madura also repeats)

Omesh: Enggak (No)

Imam: Tabebita (Tabebita)

Surya: Kalau capek gak usah ikut syuting. (If you're tired, no need to join the shoot.)

Surya: Serius? Lu bikinnya dancer? (Seriously? You put "dancer" there?)

Gita: Dancer (Dancer)

Surya: Jadi lu berharap apa lu naruh dancer? Apa yang kau harapkan dari orang ngeklik Gita Bebhita dancer nih (So what do you expect by putting "dancer"? What do you expect people to think when they click "Gita Bebhita dancer")

Gita: Iya kan aku dancer tapi untuk orang tertentu (Yeah I'm a dancer but for certain people)

Surya: In occasion tertentu ya. (On certain occasions, right?)

Gita: Stand Up. Jadi awalnya Heeh Berani di Manapun Medannya itu aku cuma host. Tadinya host. Deal-dealan kita host. Bikin grup. "Host ya Kak Gita ya?" "Iya, aku kalau Stand Up aku nggak mau." "Iya, kami ngerti kok Kak. Host saja. Terus tiba-tiba sebulan kemudian "ini poster udah jadi ya, Guys." Gitu muka aku di Tengah, Host mana yang di tengah? Kan Anjing. (Stand Up. So at first in "Heeh Berani di Manapun Medannya," I was just the host. That was the deal. We made a group. "Just host, right Kak Gita?" "Yes, I don't want to do Stand Up." "Yes, we understand, Kak. Just host." Then suddenly a month later: "This poster is ready, guys." And my face is in the center. Since when does the host go in the center? That's so messed up.)

Omesh: Benar juga ya (You're right though)

Gita: Kan Anjing. Aku telepon Bene yang paling waras kan. "Ben, Ben, ini kenapa mukaku di Tengah, Ben?" Bene dengan manisnya Dia berkata "Kak, kami sudah musyawarah dan menurut musyawarah kita, kita mufakat Kakak eee ikutan Stand Up." "Kok

musyawarah kau yang kupikirkan?" Kubilang "Kenapa aku ngikutin kalian? Kok Kalian musyawarah kok enggak ada aku?" kayak gitu. Kayak gitu dia. Ih setan enggak ada ngomong-ngomong tiba-tiba di tengah udah. Mereka udah posting semua. Aku telat ngelihat grupnya. (Seriously messed up. I called Bene, the most sane one. "Ben, Ben, why is my face in the center?" Bene sweetly said, "Kak, we had a discussion, and by consensus, we decided you'd do Stand Up." "Discussion that I wasn't even part of?" I said, "Why am I following you guys? How did you have a consensus without me?" Just like that. Just like that, they didn't even tell me and suddenly I'm in the middle. They had already posted everything. I was late seeing the group chat.)

In the example above, the statement "Kan Anjing" is not explicitly clear at first because it is phrased in a rhetorical and humorous way rather than directly saying, *"I was supposed to be the host, but they put me as the main act instead."* This flouts the Maxim of Manner by making the information less straightforward. There are numerous instances of implicature in daily conversations, especially in a multicultural society like Indonesia. The same applies to the *Showkesmas* Podcast. There are many implicatures embedded in the participants' conversations. Within these implicatures, we can also observe the influence of personal cultural backgrounds that affect how the participants speak and convey their intentions. So, beside analyzing the Grice's maxim of conversation (obeying and flouting), this study also analyzes implicature and cultural connections happen in the podcast.

4.1 Implicature (Implied Meaning)

Implicature occurs when the meaning of a statement is not directly stated but can be inferred from the context. Here are some examples in the dialogue:

- Angga: "Gua baru tahu namanya Gita Anggita"
→ Angga expresses surprise that Gita's name is "Gita Anggita," implying that the repetition sounds unusual or unexpected.
- Omesh: "Lebih kayak orang Sunda"
→ Omesh implies that the name "Gita Anggita" sounds more like a Sundanese name, even though Gita is Batak.
- Imam: "Madura juga ngulang"
→ Imam implies that some Madurese names also involve repetition, making a cross-cultural comparison.
- Surya: "Kalau capek gak usah ikut syuting"
→ Surya indirectly tells Imam that if he is too tired to focus (after Imam randomly says "Tabebita"), he shouldn't participate in the shoot.

4.2 Cultural Connections

The conversation reflects cultural aspects of naming traditions in Indonesia, specifically:

Deasy Febrina Tampubolon

- Batak culture: Gita mentions her Batak surname, "Butarbutar," which is a common Batak family name.
- Sundanese culture: Omesh and Surya associate Gita's name with Sundanese naming patterns, possibly because of its repeated syllables.
- Madurese culture: Imam adds that Madurese names also have repetition, showing a cultural comparison.

This dialogue highlights how different ethnic groups in Indonesia recognize and compare their naming conventions in a lighthearted way.

4.3 Cross-Cultural Understanding

The dialogue showcases an awareness of different Indonesian cultures, where the speakers identify and compare Batak, Sundanese, and Madurese naming patterns. Despite the playful teasing, the conversation demonstrates cultural curiosity and shared understanding, rather than judgment or exclusion. The mention of "Sunda Bolong" (a ghost from Indonesian folklore) adds a humorous cultural reference, reinforcing how language and culture are intertwined in daily conversations.

Anggi: Lu tuh maunya di apa... di bionya tuh apa? Gita Bebhita aktris, eh penyiar, MC, comedian, montir. (What do you want it to be... what's in your bio? Gita Bebhita actress, um announcer, MC, comedian, mechanic.)

Surya: Ah kok montir sih? (Why mechanic?)

Gita: Montir montir. Oh Ayu Azhari, Sarah Azhari, montir-montir cantik. (Mechanic, mechanic. Oh Ayu Azhari, Sarah Azhari — beautiful mechanics.)

Imam: Oh montir-montir cantik. (Oh, beautiful mechanics.)

Gita: Dancer sih. Karena di Instagram aku aja Gita Bebhita dancer aku bikin. (Actually dancer. Because on my Instagram I made it Gita Bebhita dancer.)

Surya: Serius? Lu bikinnya dancer? (Seriously? You put dancer?)

Gita: Dancer (Dancer)

Surya: Jadi lu berharap apa lu naruh dancer? Apa yang kau harapkan dari orang ngeklik Gita Bebhita dancer nih (So what are you hoping for by putting dancer? What do you expect people to think when they click Gita Bebhita dancer?)

Gita: Iya kan aku dancer tapi untuk orang tertentu (Yeah, I am a dancer but only for certain people)

Surya: In occasion tertentu ya. (On certain occasions, right?)

Several instances of implicature and cultural habit occur when speakers imply meanings that are not explicitly stated:

- *Gita: "Montir montir. Oh Ayu Azhari, Sarah Azhari, montir-montir cantik."*
→ Gita makes a sarcastic joke by referencing Ayu Azhari and Sarah Azhari, Indonesian

actresses who have glamorous images. She humorously implies that calling her a "montir" is as absurd as calling them mechanics.

- Surya: "*Jadi lu berharap apa lu naruh dancer? Apa yang kau harapkan dari orang ngeklik Gita Bebhita dancer nih?*"
→ Surya questions Gita's choice of "dancer" in her Instagram bio, subtly implying that the term might lead to certain expectations from viewers. This also involves cultural background. Surya, who is of Sundanese ethnicity, uses indirect language when asking Gita a question. Simply put, Surya could have asked, "*Why did you put 'Dancer' in your Instagram bio?*" However, instead, he used a longer sentence to convey his question. This aligns with the habits of Sundanese and Javanese people, who tend to use indirect speech to maintain politeness and courtesy in conversation.
- Gita: "*Iya kan aku dancer tapi untuk orang tertentu.*"
→ This statement is ambiguous and playful. She could mean that she dances only for special audiences (perhaps close friends or private events), leaving room for interpretation.
- Surya: "*In occasion tertentu ya.*"
→ Surya picks up on the ambiguity and clarifies it humorously, reinforcing that she means she dances in specific situations, not as a profession.

5. DISCUSSION

From the analysis of Showkesmas Podcast, several key findings emerged regarding the interplay between pragmatics, particularly Grice's cooperative principle and implicature, and cultural background:

1. Obedience and Flouting of Grice's Maxims – The speakers in the podcast both follow and violate Grice's maxims in various ways. While maxims of quantity and relevance are often maintained, there are instances where maxims of manner and quality are flouted, leading to humor or indirectness in communication.
2. Cultural Influence on Speaking Styles – The participants' speech patterns align with their cultural norms. The Sundanese and Javanese speakers frequently use implicit language to maintain politeness, while the Batak speaker tends to be more direct and assertive.
3. Adaptation and Mutual Understanding – Despite cultural differences, the speakers in the podcast demonstrate adaptability. They accommodate each other's speaking styles, reducing the likelihood of misunderstandings.
4. Potential for Miscommunication in Everyday Life – While the podcast shows effective communication, in real-life situations, similar conversations between individuals from different cultural backgrounds may lead to misunderstandings, particularly when one party is unfamiliar with the indirect or direct speech patterns of another.

Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four maxims—Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner—play a crucial role in facilitating effective communication. Implicatures, whether conversational or conventional, allow speakers to communicate beyond explicit content, adding layers of meaning. Understanding these pragmatic elements, including cultural influences on implicature, is essential for effective communication and cross-cultural interactions. By implementing these solutions, we can enhance intercultural communication and minimize the risks of miscommunication in diverse societies.

6. CONCLUSION (Tahoma; Bold; Capitalized; 10pt; Single Space)

This study explored how the Cooperative Principle and conversational implicature function within the culturally diverse context of the Showkesmas Podcast. By analyzing the discourse among speakers from different Indonesian ethnic backgrounds—Sundanese, Javanese, and Batak—it became evident that pragmatic behavior is deeply influenced by cultural norms and communication styles.

The findings show that while speakers often observe Grice's maxims (quantity, quality, relation, and manner), they also frequently flout them to achieve specific communicative purposes such as humor, politeness, indirectness, or emphasis. These floutings generate conversational implicatures that rely heavily on shared cultural knowledge and contextual interpretation. For example, Batak speakers tend to be more direct and expressive, aligning with the maxims of quantity and quality, while Javanese and Sundanese speakers often prioritize politeness and indirectness, occasionally flouting the maxims to preserve social harmony.

Moreover, the study highlights that cultural background not only affects how meaning is conveyed but also how it is interpreted by listeners. Misunderstandings and pragmatic failure can occur when cultural norms and expectations differ. Therefore, recognizing the cultural dimension of pragmatics is essential for improving cross-cultural communication, especially in multilingual and multiethnic societies like Indonesia.

In conclusion, this research emphasizes the importance of intercultural pragmatics in understanding real-life communication. It encourages further exploration of how language, context, and culture intersect in everyday discourse, particularly in media and informal conversational settings. Future studies may expand on these findings by including more diverse participants and different platforms to enrich the understanding of cultural pragmatics in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1986). *Too Many Words: Length of Utterance and Pragmatic Failure. Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8(2), 165–179.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 3. Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1983). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure. Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91–112.
- Sneddon, J. (2003). *The Indonesian Language: Its History and Role in Modern Society*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Sukarno. (2010). Politeness strategies in Javanese and English: A comparative study. *Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra*, 5(1), 61-69.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- <https://youtu.be/ghjVUm0xL9Q?si=nGPccz-teQHFNZk5> retrieved on March 2025
- https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PGxvWAVb5frOKu1KJf-DBGzdGtNtJ9kR/edit?usp=drive_link&ouid=101197026666901093428&rtpof=true&sd=true retrieved on March 2025