

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the background of the study, the research questions, the aims of the study, the scope of the study, the significance of the study, the clarification of related terms, and the organization of the paper.

1.1 Background

Conversation is a type of communication which is done by people in their daily lives to share ideas and feelings with others. In a conversation, people use language as the main tool. The use of the language itself is a dynamic process accommodating both speaker's intention and hearer's interpretation (Marmaridou, 2000). When people converse or talk, they sometimes produce direct or indirect meaning of utterances. When the speech has direct meaning, the hearer can easily understand the message through the conveyed speech. In contrast, when the speech has indirect meaning, the hearer needs to examine the context of the conversation in order to understand the intended meaning.

In real life, sometimes the conversations among people do not run as smoothly as it is expected. As stated by Thomas (1995: 56), "there are times when people say or write exactly what they mean, but generally they are not totally explicit". They might not say the truth, be relevant, give information as is required, nor say something as clear as he/she can. These may result in misunderstanding between speaker and hearer which is called conversational implicature. According to Paltridge (2006: 70), conversational implicature refers to "the inference that a hearer makes about a speaker's intended meaning that arises from their use of the literal meaning of what the speaker said." In other words, conversational implicature refers to a situation when the intended meaning and literal meaning of an utterance are different.

In addition, Grice (1975) proposes that in daily conversation, speakers and hearers share a cooperative principle. Cooperative principle is a principle of conversation in which each participant makes a conversational contribution as is required. In his theory about speech act, Grice (1975) introduces four maxims of conversation as guidelines for efficiency of the language use in conversation which are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. The maxim of quality is when the speaker tells the truth or provable by adequate evidence. Meanwhile, the maxim of quantity is when the speaker is as informative as required. When the speaker's response is relevant to the topic of discussion, it is considered as maxim of relevant. Maxim of manner, however, occurs when the speaker avoids ambiguity or obscurity, direct and straight forward.

When people failed to observe all four maxim of conversation, it resulted implicature. Implicature will give effect such as laughing, misunderstanding, or even confusing. Comedy is one form of humor that people employ in daily interaction. Khosravizadeh & Sadehvandi (2011) propose that in daily conversation, a comedy uses implicature to reach certain purposes such as humors/jokes.

Thomas (1995) further states that there are five ways of failing to observe the maxim, which are flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending maxim. All of them are also known as non-observance (Dornerus, 2005; Paakinen, 2010). In terms of non-observance, nowadays, there are comedy shows and sitcoms which entertain audiences by flouting the maxims. Characters in comedy shows or sitcoms might tell irrelevant things from the topic or tell a lie in order to make the audiences laugh. Yet, even if flouting can be used for humoristic purpose, the humor effect itself is not always understood by hearer. As Thomas (1995: 58) says "an implicature is generated intentionally by the speaker and may or may not be understood by the hearer".

Some studies have been conducted by using Grice's framework of conversational implicature (Juez, 1995; Dornerus, 2005; Chuandy, 2007;

Paakinen, 2010; Pakpahan, 2010; Victory, 2010; Fergina, 2011, Khosravizadeh & Sadehvandi, 2011; Sheila, 2012). Three studies from Chuandy (2007), Pakpahan (2010), and Sheila (2012) reveal that generalized conversational implicature (henceforth G.C.I) mostly occur in conversation to make both speaker and hearer understand the meaning of utterances. In a comedy movie *Taxi* for instance, Chuandy (2007) finds that from 70 implicatures, 36 of them are G.C.I. He defines that G.C.I is easier to be understood by the hearer. So, there will not be miscommunication in conversation. Pakpahan (2010) proves Chuandy's finding by stating that G.C.I gives strong and clear meaning. So, both speaker and hearer will understand each other's utterances. In contrast, previous studies from Victory (2010) resulted particularized conversational implicature (henceforth P.C.I). Through P.C.I in a comedy movie *Yes, Man*, the characters are able to generate humorous effect and involve in humorous situation. Meanwhile, the rest of five studies (Juez, 1995; Dornerus, 2005; Paakinen, 2010; Fergina, 2011; Khosravizadeh & Sadehvandi, 2011) revealed that both generalized and particularized implicature appear in comedy series and movies through the failure in observing maxims.

Unlike those previous studies which focused on types of conversational implicature, hidden meaning and the way implicatures generated in humor which involve adults, the present study deals with types of conversational implicature, hidden meaning and the ways the implicatures are generated in humors which involve children. In doing so, the present study employs the theory of conversational implicature proposed by Grice (1975). In addition, the present study also deals with audience's understanding of humor through implicature which are analyzed by using humor support strategy theory by Hay (2003).

1.2 Research Question

This study is conducted to answer problems formulated in the following questions:

1. What types of implicature are generated in short humor dialogues?

Nesya Juliana, 2015

GRICE'S CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN WRITTEN SHORT HUMOR DIALOGUES

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

2. How are the messages generated in the implicatures?
3. What are audience's responses to the implicatures?

1.3 Aims of the Study

This study is conducted to discover types of conversational implicature which are identified in short humor dialogue which is taken from humor sites in the internet, the ways the messages are generated in the implicatures, and the audience's responses to the implicatures in order to reveal their strategies to understand the humor.

1.4 Scope of the Study

This study focuses on short humor dialogues which are taken from humor sites in the internet. It includes the types, hidden meaning, and the way implicatures are generated as well as the audience's response to understand the humor. It mainly uses Grice's theory of conversational implicature (1975) and Hay's theory of humor support strategies (2003). The data source is based on written short humor dialogues which are performed by children during home and school activities. The data are taken from the following sites: www.squackle.com, www.lotsofjokes.com, www.englishindo.com, and www.jokes4u.com. Those sites are humor sites where the readers all over the world are able to submit and share their own humors in which the actors involve children.

The audiences are students from the Department of English Education at a university in Bandung. Since the present study uses group of students in collecting the data, it employs ten female and male students. It is in line with Nastasi (2001) who states that in data collection method, each group should at least consist of five to ten persons.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Theoretically, it is hoped that the result of this study will contribute to the development of Pragmatic analysis in Grice's theory of conversational implicature and its relation to humor. Practically, this study also helps people to understand

Nesya Juliana, 2015

GRICE'S CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN WRITTEN SHORT HUMOR DIALOGUES

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

the ways implicatures are produced in a comedy show through the five types of Non-observance proposed by Grice (1975), the hidden messages which are generated in implicatures and audience's response to implicatures relate to humor.

1.6 Clarification of Related Terms

In order to avoid ambiguity or confusion, there are related terms that should be clarified as follows:

Conversational implicature is the situation where there is difference between what the words in an utterance means and what the speaker intended meaning. (Davies, 2010)

Generalized implicature is type of conversational implicature which has no special knowledge require in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning (Yule, 1996).

Particularized implicature is type of conversational implicature which requires special/specific knowledge in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. (Yule, 1996).

Cooperative Principle is a principle where both speaker and hearer contribute meaningful and productive utterance during conversation. So, they will build a meaningful conversation. (Grice, 1975)

Humor is a general term which refers to something intended that caused amusement or to whatever quality makes something amusing (Badron, 2005).

1.7 Organization of the Paper

This paper is presented in five chapters. Chapter one contains background of the research, research questions, aims of the research, scope of the research, significance of the research, and organization of the paper. Chapter two presents relevant theoretical background to support the study. It covers theoretical foundation and reviews previous studies which are related to the issue discussed

in present study. Chapter three describes methodology used in conducting the present study, including the problem of the present study which is explained in form of research questions, research design, data collection, collection procedures and data analysis. Next chapter is chapter four which focuses on the result of the study. It reveals types of implicature identified in short humor dialogues, the hidden messages generated in the implicatures, and find out the audience's response towards implicatures. The last chapter is chapter five which contains a new interpretation towards the result of the study. The interpretation is in the form of conclusion and suggestion.