

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter presents the methodology used in the present study to investigate the types of implicature generated in short humor dialogue, the ways the messages are generated in the implicatures, and the audience's responses toward the implicature. It includes research design, data collection and data analysis.

#### **3.1 Research Direction**

The present study deals with the theory of Grice's conversational implicature in written short humor dialogues. It is conducted to examine (1) the types of conversational implicature in written short humor dialogue, (2) hidden messages which are generated in implicature, and (3) audience's responses to implicature.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

This study employs a descriptive qualitative method to achieve the aims of the study, i.e to describe and interpret the types of implicature, the ways the implicatures are generated and the audience's responses toward the implicatures in written short humor dialogue. The data are in the form of conversational exchange. Therefore, a qualitative method is suitable to be applied in present study. This is in line with Silverman (1993, cited in *Metodos*, 2011), who states that a qualitative method is a method for analyzing talk, text and interaction rather than number. It is expected to reveal audience's understanding of humors in implicatures and the strategies used by them in supporting humors.

### 3.3 Data Collection

There are two types of data in the present study. The first type of data is 45 written short humor dialogues about children's life at school and home. The written short humor dialogues are obtained from the following sites: [www.squackle.com](http://www.squackle.com), [www.lotsofjokes.com](http://www.lotsofjokes.com), [www.englishindo.com](http://www.englishindo.com), and [www.jokes4u.com](http://www.jokes4u.com). The data is used to explore research question 1 (what types of implicature are generated in short humor dialogues?) and 2 (how are the messages generated in the implicatures?).

The second type of data which is used in the present study is audience's responses obtained from the short interview. The data are used to explore research question 3 (what are audience's responses to implicature?). The audiences are asked to read five different short humor dialogues which represent each types of maxim that failed to be observed (including 1 maxim mixed) and asked to give their understanding about the joke lies in each dialogue. If the audiences do not get the joke in a dialogue, they will get an explanation about where the joke lies and will be asked again whether the joke is funny or not.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

As mentioned above, there are two types of data, i.e written short humor dialogues and audience's responses. In terms of written short humor dialogues, they are analyzed by using conversational implicature framework proposed by Grice (1975). There are steps in analyzing the data. Firstly, the study identifies conversational exchanges which potentially generate implicatures by noting the setting, situation which is aimed to support the analysis. Secondly, categorizes the exchanges based on the types of implicature by using Grice's theory of implicature (1975) as explained in chapter II and identifies the hidden meaning. Following the step is the investigation of the ways the implicatures are generated by using Grice's theory of conversational maxims. The data analysis is presented in table 3.1 in the following page.

For interview data, they are analyzed by using understanding humor framework proposed by Hay (2003). The analysis is conducted by interpreting the audience's responses by using humor support strategy framework proposed by Hay (2003). Afterwards, the final step is analyzing and interpreting all the data. The analysis is presented in table 3.2. on the next page.

**Table 3.1 Sample Analysis of Types of Conversational Implicature and Non-Observance**

No.	Utterances	Maxim		Implicature	Hiddeng Meaning
		Types	Non-Observance		
1.	<p>Teacher: "Conjugate the verb 'to walk' in simple present.</p> <p>Student: "I walk. You walk ..."</p> <p>Teacher: "Quicker please."</p> <p>Student: "<u>I run.</u> <u>You run ...</u>"</p>	<p>Relation</p> <p>(Student gives irrelevant answer to what the teacher asked. The answer should be about the verb 'to walk' and the teacher asked the student to answer it quickly.)</p>	Flouting	P.C.L	<p>The writer of the text wants to explore child's innocence in order to create a joke. The joke that the writer wants to create is the student mismatched teacher's command. So, the student says something quicker than the word 'walk', it is 'run'.</p>
	Total				
	Percentage (%)				

**Table 3.2 Sample Analysis of Audience's Responses**

No.	Audience's gender		Reaction	Humor Understanding	Type of Humor Support Strategy	Response
	Male	Female				
1.		√	The respondent laughs	Understand the humor	Contributing More Humor	The respondent succeed to identify excess of information as the source of humor after a short pause. She identified that the student in the dialogue gives more information than the teacher required.