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ABSTRACT


This research analyzes a conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey in the Late Show with David Letterman aired on 29th October 2014. This research uses qualitative methodology and bibliography technique as the method of collecting data. The main theory used is cooperative principle and conversational implicature of Paul Grice.

The writer finds fourteen selected data from the conversation which contain non-observance of maxim of cooperative principle. The non-observance of maxim which appears in this research is only flouting maxim. In total, Jim Carrey flouts maxim of quantity ten times, four times of maxim of quality, four times of maxim of relation, and three times of maxim of manner. The most flouted maxim which fails to observe is maxim of quantity which occurs by giving more or less information than is required. The non-observance by flouting the maxim generates conversational implicature. In this research, the writer only finds one particularized conversational implicature, and the rest are generalized conversational implicature.

The writer finds that most of conversational implicature is to entertain the audience instead of promoting Jim’s new film Dumb and Dumber to. Jim as a guest star always gives answer that makes the audience laugh. Jim Carrey blatantly fails to observe (flouting) the maxim of cooperative principle to implies his jokes to the audience. Furthermore, the usage of generalized conversational implicature makes the audience easier to understand the jokes itself.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Study

As a means of communicating ideas and feelings is probably the function that the most people would select first as the principal purpose of language. Communication is a two-way process. On the one hand, people need to be able to use language to express themselves to others, and, conversely, the use of language is also to understand what they try to communicate.¹

As well communication as the function of language, pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). The interpretation cannot be separated with the context of the communication itself and how the context influences what is said. It requires a consideration of how speakers arrange what they want to say depend on with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances. On the other hand, this approach also necessarily explores how the listeners interpret the speaker intended meaning. This type of study is dealing with what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated.² In other definition, Bauer argues that pragmatics deals with the way the meaning of an utterance may be influenced by its speakers or hearers interpret it in context. Pragmatics also deals with matters such as what the

difference is between a set of isolated sentences and a text, how a word like *this* is interpreted in context, and how a conversation is managed so that the participants feel comfortable with the interaction.³

Communication, furthermore, requires people to cooperate; the ‘bare facts’ of conversation come alive only in mutually accepted, pragmatically determined context. Cooperation itself has been elevated to the cooperative principle that consist four maxims; maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner, and maxim of relation, a works of the British/American philosopher H. Paul Grice (1975, 1989).⁴ In short, it can be said that there are rules that must be obeyed by the speakers to make conversations run well.⁵

The basic assumption in conversation is that, unless otherwise indicated, the participants are adhering to the cooperative principle and the maxims.⁶ Otherwise, in conversation, people are not always observes the maxims. Non-observance of the maxims also can be given by the interlocutor in order to response the locutor. People may fail to observe a maxim because, for example, they are incapable of speaking clearly, or because they deliberately choose to lie.⁷ Non-observance of the maxim of cooperative principle generates a conversational implicature. When this expectation

---

(observe the maxim) is confounded and the listener is confronted with the blatant non-observance of a maxim (i.e. the listener has discounted the possibility that the speaker may be trying to deceive, or is incapable of speaking more clearly, succinctly, etc.), he or she is again prompted to look for an implicature.\(^8\)

The cooperative principle above will be applied in order to analyze an interview in a talkshow named *Late Show with David Letterman*. This show is an hour-long week-night comedy and talk-show broadcast by CBS from the Ed Sullivan Theatre on Broadway in New York City.\(^9\) The corpus used is the episode aired on 29th October 2014 which presented Jim Carrey as the guest. The conversation talked about Jim Carrey’s latest movie, *Dumb and Dumber to*. Jim Carrey is a comedian who always shows his humorous characteristic in every moment he show up, no exception when he is answering questions in this conversation with David Letterman. Thus, the writer would like to analyze the non-observance of maxim of cooperative principle to find the conversational implicature in the script of conversation between Jim Carrey and David Letterman.

**B. Focus of the Study**

This research is a discourse analysis with pragmatics approach. It focused on non-observance of maxim of cooperative principle that appear in the transcript of

---

conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey in the *Late Show With David Letterman* on 29th October 2015\(^\text{10}\) and finds the conversational implicature.

C. Research Question

Based on the background of study above, this research will try to analyze the following question:

1. What are the types of non-observance and how it generates conversational implicature that appears in the conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey transcript?

2. How the maxims are not observed generates conversational implicature in the conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey transcript?

3. What are the implicatures that occurs as a result of non-observance of the maxims in the conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey transcript?

D. Significance of the Research

This research is expected to be useful in the development of science in the field of pragmatics and cooperative principle theory. In addition, this research is also expected to add useful insights in the linguistics field, especially for UIN Jakarta student in Linguistics and Literature major. Moreover, it is expected to contribute in any research that can develop new ideas towards cooperative principle theory for [\text{\url{https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2TnpdYjLDdA}}]

\(^{10}\) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2TnpdYjLDdA
linguistics studies, and it is projected to present and give new information about related topic.

E. **Research Methodology**

1. **Objectives of the research**

   The objectives of the research are to find out the conversational implicature from the non-observance of the maxims in the conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey in the *Late Show With David Letterman* on 29th October 2014.

2. **Method of the Research**

   The writer applied qualitative methodology as the method of the research. Qualitative research concerns with developing explanations of social phenomena. That is to say, it aims to help to understand the social world in which we live and why things are the way they are.\(^{11}\) In addition, qualitative research focuses on description and interpretation and might lead to development of new concepts or theory, or to an evaluation of an organisational process.\(^{12}\)

3. **Technique of Data Collecting and Data Analysis**

   The writer uses bibliography technique as the technique of data collecting. Bibliography technique is to use the written sources to obtain the data.\(^{13}\) Written source in this research is the transcript of conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey in the *Late Show With David Letterman* on 29th October 2014.


\(^{12}\)[*Ibid.*]

transcript is downloaded from Youtube subtitle page and arranged it in neatly
timeline format by the writer. After collecting the data, then the writer will examine
by watching and examining the video, reading the transcription, identifying the
utterances, analyzing and interpreting the utterances, marking and indexing the data.

4. Instrument of the Research

In the bibliography technique, the main instrument in this research is data card.
Several relevant data is written on the data card in certain in certain format.\textsuperscript{14} The
main problem that being the object of the research is written on the card as an entry.\textsuperscript{15}
The other sources for instance, books, journal, and online media also give important
role as the instrument to strengthen the data.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p.43
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Previous Research

Several studies apply Grice’s cooperative principle and conversational analysis as the theory. Eventhough this study uses the same theory, yet the differences lay on the focus of study, corpus, and how the theory is applied.

First, a thesis titled Conversational Implicature Analysis by Flouting the Maxims in the Transcript of Oliver Twist Movie, by Nishaa Cheiriyah. This thesis uses cooperative principle and the theory of flouting by Peter Grundy which applied Oliver Twist movie as the research. In this research, the writer found all of conversational maxims are flouted by the speakers in dialogue of Oliver Twist movie transcript in different way and motives. As the results of the maxims’s flouting are to draw a conversational implicature.\textsuperscript{16}

Second, a thesis titled An Analysis of Cooperative Principle and Implicature in Rush Hour 3 Movie, by Ridwa Kurniawan. This research uses cooperative principle and conversational implicature as the theory and Rush Hour 3 movie as the corpus. The result of this research are: There are four tyipes of maxim of cooperative principles that found in Rush Hour 3 movie; maxim of quality, maxim of quantity,
maxim of manner and maxim of relation. In addition, there are four types of non-
observance of cooperative principle that found in Rush Hour 3 movie, such as; flouting, violating, opting out, and infringing. Each non-observance of maxim has different implicature, such as; general conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.\textsuperscript{17}

Third, a thesis titled \textit{An Analysis of Implicature in Arthur Bishop’s Utterances in his Conversation with Harry McKenna in the Mechanic Movie} by Badridduja. This research uses implicature to understand the term of implicature itself, Gricean maxim to check the implicature, and the speaker’s task viewed in the means-ends analysis by Leech to check the purpose of the utterance. The result of this research are; Arthur Bishop as the speaker made all of his utterance to Harry McKenna as the hearer with the specific purpose – that is to trap Harry McKenna, by creating the implicatures that are capable of being worked out and understood.\textsuperscript{18}

Fourth, a journal titled \textit{Conversational Implicature of the Presenters in ‘Take Me Out Indonesia’} by Sheila Nanda, Didi Sukyadi, and Sudarsono M.I. This paper is a pragmatic study that aims at investigating conversational implicature that the presenters of ‘Take Me Out Indonesia’ operate within their utterances along with the possible implications that lie behind the implicature. The result shows that the presenters tended to use generalized conversational implicature (59, 8%) rather than

\textsuperscript{17} Ridwan Kurniawan, \textit{An Analysis of Cooperative Principle and Implicature in Rush Hour 3 Movie}. Thesis (Jakarta: Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah, 2012)

\textsuperscript{18} Badridduja, \textit{An Analysis of Implicature in Arthur Bishop’s Utterances in his Conversation with Harry McKenna in the Mechanic Movie}. Thesis (Jakarta: Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah, 2013)
the particularized (40.2%). This study concludes that various types of implicature were used in informal game show conversation to make interaction flows smoothly.\textsuperscript{19}

The difference of this thesis with the previous researches mentioned above is the writer trying to do research using cooperative principle and conversational implicature theory to analyze a talk show conversation as the corpus. Thus, the writer decides to do this research.

B. Theory

1. Discourse Analysis

The word ‘discourse’ is the general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people’s utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life. Besides, discourse analysis is the analysis of these patterns.\textsuperscript{20} According to Hanks, Discourse is language-in-action, and investigating it requires attention both to language and to action.\textsuperscript{21} On the one hand, If anything has become clear, then it must be that the verbal part of communication, discourse, cannot be studied without taking into account the context in which the communicative acts take place.\textsuperscript{22} In addition, Renkema argue that a good framework for studying discourse in the form-function approach is pragmatics. Pragmatics, literally 'the study of acts': is

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{19} Sheila Nanda, Didi Sukyadi, and Sudarsono M.I, “Conversational Implicature of the Presenters in ‘Take Me Out Indonesia’,” Conpalin Journal, 2 (Januari,2012)
\textsuperscript{22} Jan Renkema. 2004. Introduction to Discourse Studies. (Amsterdam and Philedelphia: John Benjamin Pblishing Company) p. 35
\end{flushright}
itself part of a philosophical approach to the phenomenon sign, specifically the question of how signs, and therefore also linguistic signs, function.\textsuperscript{23}

2. Cooperative Principle

From what has been discussed in the background of study is communication as the function of language, and it requires people to be cooperative. Grice might then formulate a rough general principle which participants will be expected (ceteris peribus) to observe, namely: Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. One might label this as Cooperative Principle.\textsuperscript{24} Grice divide the cooperative principle into four maxims, he calls these as Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner.\textsuperscript{25}

The category of Quantity relates to the quantity of the information to be provided, and under it fall the following maxims:

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)

2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.\textsuperscript{26}

Under the category of Quality fall a supermaxim – “Try to make your contribution one that is true” – and two more specific maxims:

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.\textsuperscript{27}

Under the category of Relation Grice place a single maxim, namely, ”Be relevant.” Though the maxim itself is terse, its formulation conceals a number of problems that exercise him a good deal: questions about what different kinds and focuses of relevance there may be, how these shift in the course of the talk exchange, how to allow for the fact that subjects of conversation are legitimately changed, and so on.\textsuperscript{28}

Manner: relating not (like the previous categories) to what is said but, rather, to how what is said to be said, Grice include the supermaxim – “Be perspicuous” – and various maxims such as:

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.\textsuperscript{29}

The writer will gives two examples of cooperative principle by seeng how they are observed, citing from Cutting. First is an example of observing maxim of quality.

A. I will ring you tomorrow afternoon then.

B. Erm, I shall be there as far as I know, and in the meantime have a word with Mum and Dad if they are free. Right, bye-bye then sweetheart.

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p.27
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.
B says ‘as far as I know’ meaning ‘I can’t be totally sure if this is true’, so that if A rings up and finds that B is not there, B is protected from accusations of lying by the fact that she did make it clear that she was uncertain. Most hearers assume that speakers are not lying, and most speakers know that.\(^{30}\)

Second is an example of observing maxim of relation, which says that speakers are assumed to be saying something that is relevant to what has been said before.

A. There is somebody at the door.

B. I am in the bath.

B expect A to understand that his present location is relevant to her comment that there is someone at the door, and that he cannot go and see who it is because he is in the bath.\(^{31}\)

3. Non-observance of Maxim

Cooperative principle assumes that people are normally going to provide an appropriate amount of information; they are telling the truth, being relevant, and trying to be as clear as they can. However, there are certain kind of expression speakers use to mark that they may be in danger of not observing the maxim.\(^{32}\) Conversations have their own rules and maxims for participants to follow. If a conversational exchange is not straightforward, it may be because an implicature is

---


\(^{31}\) Ibid.

needed to understand the exchange. People may fail to observe a maxim because, for example, they are capable of speaking clearly, or because they deliberately choose to lie.

There are five ways of failing to observe a maxim: Flouting a maxim, Violating a maxim, Infringing a maxim, Opting out of a maxim, Suspending a maxim.

3.1 Flouting Maxim

Mey identifies that the cooperation which Grice has formulated will identifying three areas where such problems may arise. First, the cooperation itself, taken as a general, inviolable and indisputable rule of behavior. As has been pointed by many authors e.g. Leech and Thomas for some references, this assumption is simply too broad and sweeping. Second, there are significant intercultural differences in cooperative behaviour. The third issue is rather different, even though it has a superficial similarity to the first two, one cannot help noticing that certain forms of social (including language) behaviour are preferred (and hence regarded), while others are subject to sanction.

---

35 Ibid.
Thomas said in May, When people “blatantly fail to observe one or several maxims”, we speak of ‘flouting’ a maxim, either semantically or pragmatically.\(^{37}\) Pragmatic is kind of flouting a maxim, we must consider the effect people want to obtain by their linguistic behaviour.\(^{38}\) When speaker appear not to follow the maxim but expect hearer to appreciate the meaning implied, they are just ‘flouting’ the maxim. When flouting the maxim, the speaker assumes that the hearer knows that their words should not be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning.\(^{39}\) Cutting gave an example for flouting the Grice’s maxims:

a. Quantity

The speakers who flout the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. In

A. Well, how do I look?

B. Your shoes are nice...

B does not say the sweatshirt and jeans do not look nice, but he knows that A will understand the implication, because A asks about his whole appearance and only gets told about part of it.\(^{40}\)

b. Quality

\(^{37}\) Ibid., p.77
\(^{38}\) Ibid.
\(^{39}\) Joan Cutting, Op.Cit., p.37
\(^{40}\) Ibid.
Speakers may flout the maxim by exaggerating expression. ‘I could eat a horse’, or

Lynn: Yes I’m starving too.

Martin: Hurry up girl.

Lynn: Oh dear, stop eating rubbish. You won’t eat any dinner

In which ‘I’m starving’ is a well-established exaggerating expression. No speaker would expect their hearer to say, ‘What, you could eat a whole horse?’, speaker will expect the hearer catch a simply meant that the speaker was very hungry. Hyperbola is often at the basis of humour.41 Another way to flout the maxim of quality is by using “metaphor”. As in ‘My house is refrigerator in January’, hearers would understand that the house was so cold indeed. “Euphemism” is also can be put into this category i.e. ‘She’s got a bun in the oven’, meaning ‘She’s pregnant’. The last two main ways of flouting the maxim of quality are “irony” and “banter”. Irony is an apparently friendly of being offensive (mock-politeness), and banter is a kind of verbal behaviour which is an offensive way of being friendly (mock-impoliteness).42

Explaining more, Cutting said that irony is a positive sentiment and implies a negative one. If a student comes down to breakfast one morning and says ‘if only you knew how much i love being woken up at 4 AM by a fire alarm’, she is being ironic and expecting the hearer meant the opposite. “Sarcasm” is a form of irony that is not so friendly; in fact it is usually intended to hurt, as in ‘This is a lovely undercooked

41 Ibid.
egg you’ve given me here, as usual. Yum!’ On the other hand, ‘banter’ on the contrary, express a negative sentiment and implies the positive one, as in, ‘You’re nasty, mean, and stingy. How can you only give me one kiss?’ but it is intended to be a friendship expression.\(^{43}\)

c. Relation

If speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and make the connection between their utterance. Thus in

A. So what do you think of Mark?
B. His flatmate’s a wonderful cook

B does not say that she was not very impressing with Mark, but in her irrelevant utterance, she implies it. Grice thought that flouting the maxim of relation was possible, but many people have disagreed since (see the section below on relevance theory). Weather we observe or flout the maxims, our utterance always be taken as relevant to the preceding co-text.\(^{44}\)

d. Manner

Those who flouting maxim of manner, appearing to obscure, are often trine to exclude a third party, as in this short of exchange between husband and wife:

A. Where are you off to?

B. I was thinking to go out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.

---

\(^{44}\) *Ibid.*
A. Ok, but don’t be long – dinner’s nearly ready.

B speaks in ambiguous way, saying ‘funny white stuff’ and ‘somebody’, because he is avoiding saying ‘ice-cream’ and ‘Michelle’, so that his daughter does not become excited and ask for the ice-cream before her meal.45

3.2 Violating

People may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim; if so, in some case they will be liable to mislead.46 A speaker can be said to ‘violate’ a maxim when they know that the hearer will not know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words. They intentionally generate a misleading implicature.47 Cutting gives an example of violating maxim of quantity. He argues that if a speaker violates the maxim of quantity, they do not give the hearer enough information to know what is being talked about, because they do not want the hearer to know the full picture48:

A. Does your dog bite?
B. No.
A. [Bends down to stroke it and gets bitten] Ow! You said your dog does not bite!
B. That is not my dog.

45 Ibid., p.39
47 Jenny A. Thomas, Op.Cit., p.73
The receptionist knew that he was talking about the dog in front of her and not her dog at home, yet she intentionally did not give him enough information, for reasons best known to herself.49

3.3 Infringing

A speaker infringing a maxim fails to observe a maxim because of their imperfect linguistic performance. This can happen if the speaker has an imperfect command of the language (a child or a foreign learner), if their performance is impaired (nervousness, drunkenness, excitement), if they have a cognitive impairment, or if they are simply incapable of speaking clearly.50 On the one hand, Thomas argues that a speaker who with no intention of generating an implicature and with no intention of deceiving, fails to observe a maxim is said to ‘infringe’ the maxim.51 Cutting gives an example about infringing a maxim; there was an advertisement on British television about a woman waiting for her boyfriend Wain to find a way of proposing to her. He was so tongue-tied that she gave up waiting for him to ask her to marry him, desperately exclaiming, ‘Oh Wain!’ Similarly, some writing seems to observe the maxims but their unfortunate choice of words creates unintentional ambiguity.52

49 Ibid.
50 Ibid., p.41
52 Joan Cutting, Op.Cit., p.41
3.4 Opting out

According to Thomas, a speaker opts out of observing a maxim by indicating willingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. Examples of opting out occur frequently in public life, when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reasons, reply in the way normally expected. On the other hand, the speaker wish to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing or uncooperative. Thus, Grice states that people may opt out from the operation both of the maxim and of the cooperative principle; they may say, indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. They may say, for example, I cannot say more; my lips are sealed.

3.5 Suspending

Kenaan has criticized Grice’s conversational implicature by giving the fact that in Malagasy Republic, people regularly provide less information than is required by their conversational partner even though they have access to the necessary information.

Suspensions of the maxims may be culture-specific (as in Keenan's example and in examples 26 and 27) or specific to particular events. For example, in the acting community in Britain (but not among the population at large) people refrain from uttering the name of Shakespeare's play Macbeth because to do so is supposed to

---

53 Jenny A. Thomas, Op.Cit., p.74
54 Ibid., p.77
bring bad luck. They refer instead to 'The Scottish Play', thereby failing to observe the maxim of Quantity.\textsuperscript{55}

4. Conversational Implicature

Implicature is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker’s utterance without being part of what is said. What a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what she directly expresses; linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood.\textsuperscript{56} The cooperative principle explains how people cooperate when they speak: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. When a maxim violated is flouted, a conversational implicature results, i.e., the utterance receives an interpretation that goes beyond the words that are spoken.\textsuperscript{57} Cooperative principle which fails to observe generates implicature. Yule explains it in conversation that Dexter may appear to be violating the requirements of the quantity maxim:

Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.

Dexter: Ah, I brought the bread.

After hearing Dexter’s response, Charlene has to assume that Dexter is cooperating and not totally unaware of the quantity maxim. But he did not mention the cheese. If he had brought the cheese, he would say so, because he would be adhering to the quantity maxim. In this case, Dexter has conveyed more than he said.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{56} Horn and Ward. (2006). Implicature, Laurence R. Horn. (Eds.), The Handbook of Pragmatics. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd) p.3

via conversational implicature. Further, a general pattern for the working out of a conversational implicature might be given as follows:

“He has said that p; there is no reason to suppose that he is not observing the maxims, or at least the cooperative principle; he could not be doing this unless he thought that q; he knows (and knows that I know that he knows) that I can see that supposition that he think that q is required; he has done nothing to stop me thinking that q; he intends me to think, or is at least willing to allow me to think, that q; and so he has implicating that q.”

4.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

When no special knowledge is required in the context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning, it is called a generalized conversational implicature. On the one hand, Grice define it as the use of certain form of words in an utterance would normally (in the absence of special circumstance) carry such-and-such an implicature or type of implicature. Grice give an example in a sentence X is meeting a woman this evening. Grice explains that anyone who use that sentence would normally implicate that the person to be met was someone other than X’s wife, mother, sister, or perhaps even close platonic friend.

4.2 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature is the inverse of generalized conversational implicature. Yule states that most of the time, our conversation take

58 George Yule, Op.Cit., p.40
60 George Yule, Op.Cit., p.41
62 Ibid.
place in very specific context in which locally recognized inference are assumed. Such inference are required to work out the conveyed meaning which result from particularized conversational implicature. Likewise, Grice describes particularized conversational implicature as cases in which implicature is carried on particular occasion in virtue of special features of the context, cases in which there is no room for the idea that an implicature of this sort is normally carried off. Yule gives an example by giving conversation between Ann and Sam:

Ann: Where are you going with the dog?

Sam: To the V-E-T.

From the conversation above, the dog is known to recognize the words ‘vet’, and hate to being taken there, so Sam produces a more elaborate, spelled out version of his message, implicating that he does not want the dog to know the answer to the question just asked.

---

63 George Yule, Op.Cit., p.42
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CHAPTER III
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

A. Data Description

The data will be discussed in this research taken from the transcript of a conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey on the talk show Late Show with David Letterman episode aired on 29th October 2014. Then, the writer identifies some conversation which contains non-observance of maxims of the cooperative principle as the data.

From the selection and identification to the transcript, the writer finds 14 conversations as the data that contains non-observance of maxim. The 14 conversation will be written to the data card for further analysis. After that, the writer analyzes the data by using data card to establish the type of non-observance of maxim of cooperative principle, determining the kind of conversational implicature, and find the implicature itself.

The data are shown below. Afterward, in this chapter, Jim Carrey will be named as Jim, and David Letterman as David:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Non-observance of maxim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | **Jim**: Hi Dave!  
**David**: Hi  
**Jim**: Oh my gosh, I’m so embarrassed, I’m so sorry. | 01:29 – 01:36 | David just starts the show and | Flouting Maxim of quantity and quality.         |
**David:** Forget that are you alright?
**Jim:** yeah it’s good, a lot of air right here.

Presented his guest star Jim Carrey, but he does not appear in the studio. David is looking for him on the back stage, and find him in the claw machine.

2. **David:** No, I can’t believe that, how did this... why are you in there?
   **David:** Well, I was, go on my dressing room, and I saw this, this claw machine, and I just had to have what I saw in here.
   **David:** what was in there that was caught your...
   **Jim:** Check it out!

When David is looking for Jim, he finds Jim in the claw machine on the backstage.

3. **David :** Yes I know, lemme... you want to come out now?
   **Jim :** Yeah, I think I probably should.

After David asks about what has Jim got in the claw machine. He asks Jim to come out from the machine.

4. **David :** I’m so... I feel like this is my fault but if you could just... we should remove the claw machine, it’s not supposed to-
   **Jim :** No, it’s totally me.
   **David :** It’s supposed to be in the commissary, easy...

David feels sorry about the claw machine.

5. **Jim :** Oh, you know

David and Jim

Flouting maxim of quantity and relation.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25 | **what, Dave?**  
**David**: What did you got?  
**Jim**: before we begin, can I, can I just, I just want to take a little bit of a precaution here, could you this... this goes in your ear, in your mouth or anywhere you feel like as a civilian. | 03:40 | come to studio and start the talk show. Suddenly Jim interrupts David while brings out a thermometer and asks him to puts it in the mouth.  
maxim of quantity and relation. |
| 6. | **David**: Are you... because you travel the world promoting the movies and such worried about the diseases coming down?  
**Jim**: Once you’ve done a couple press tours are you welcome death. | 04:54 – 05:01 | Jim Carrey has just released his new movie, *Dumb and Dumber to*, and has done a very tiring tour around the world.  
Flouting maxim of quality and manner |
| 7. | **David**: Really? Really? You welcome death?  
**Jim**: You do... You do... nothing left that’s meaningful. You know I’ve been married a couple of times, it takes a lot to scare me Dave. | 05:06 – 05:17 | David and Jim are talking about Jim’s tiring tours, promoting his newest film.  
Flouting maxim of quantity and manner. |
| 8. | **David**: Alright, well, good to hear that, interesting perspective. Now, hmm... let’s do a little Matthew McConaughey. Because you before, Matt Damon is the only one I knew who did come close on the Matthew McConaughey, did you... is there any secret to do it? | 05:22 – 05:57 | David asks Jim to do a Mathew McConaughey impersonation which is one of games in that talk show for their  
Flouting maxim of relation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jim: Oh no, it’s real simple Dave, all I gonna do is let go the illusion that exist, driver on my liking, role in this burger.</th>
<th>guest star.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9. | David: How many times have you host the show?  
Jim: Three times, yeah... Let’s just enough for anybody. | 06:25 – 06:30 | David asks Jim about his experience as an anchor in *Saturday Night Live*.  
Flouting maxim of quantity. |
| 10. | David: It as a lot of work.  
Jim: Yeah it’s a lot of work. It’s crazy. They’re ripping you out of your shoes, Donna, she’s like a jail guard, she comes up behind and liftshop your feet and “Don’t struggle! Just don’t struggle!”  
David: Hehehe... and she’s with the show?  
Jim: Yeah she’s with the show, fortunately, fortunately. I did matter of her before. | 06:32 – 06:41 | David makes sure about many things to do in his work as an anchor in *Saturday Night Live*.  
Flouting maxim of quality and quantity. |
| 11. | David: Did you do audition for the show?  
Jim: I did and it’s a crazy story, cause you know, I always look for omens of the universe, what’s the universe send to me to any one moment, you can kinda like see what’s gonna go on, and i went over to NBC and Burbank. And I... it was an important day for me I got a car, and I was thinking | 07:22 – 08:13 | David asks Jim about his experience he has on his audition in “Saturday Night Live”.  
Flouting maxim of quantity. |
every hope everything goes well, and the first thing I heard when I’ve closed the door of the car is “don’t do it! Don’t jump!” and I looked up at the top of the NBC building where the logo is NBC page standing on the end for NBC try to get up the nerve to step off, and news crews were finally have the building it was like instant coffee for them, and... This is not gonna go well, not gonna go well.

| 12. | **David:** What was your audition material? do you remember?  
**Jim:** Oh my gosh, a buncha characters and stuff but mostly I couldn't really concentrate because it was like, Is she gone? Is she’s still around? What happen? I hope someone stiff away | 08:16 – 08:35 | David asks Jim’s material in the audition.  
**Flouting maxim of relation** |
| 13. | **David:** Well, that's not my problem. Let’s talk about...  
Jeff Daniels was here not so long ago and we’re talking about the twenty years since the original *Dumb and Dumber* and have you been working on it for twenty years?  
**Jim:** No... no... no... I’ve done some other things. Yeah I feel.. It’s a great position now to be here. Cause.. Cause.. people come up to me, it’s really dear | 10:59 – 11:44 | David asks Jim about his work.  
**Flouting maxim of quantity.** |
movie to them, really they
grow up with it, and I
slipped into this weird I can
figure it out that I really
enjoyed connecting with
people on it. And... and
when I work with people on
Saturday night live in *Dumb
and Dumber* they always
pulling me aside and telling
me this is a thrill you know
I grew up with you, you
know Rachel Melvin who
plays Harry's daughter in
the movie brought me aside
and said this is this is so
such a thrill you know when
the first *Dumb And Dumber*
came out you know I is little
colicky.

| 14. | **David:** What I notice in the
film you look exactly the
same in the film as you did
in the original.  
**Jim:** Well it's all digital
now Dave. You know,
ehmm hmm... the turkey
neck team getting down
here... I mean look at this,
look at me now, “this is the
truth, this is the real truth,
that’s the real deal right
there. I play bass in a
quintet on the weekends. | 12:37 – 13:05 | David asks Jim
about his similarity
between his acting
in the film and in
the original.  
Flouting maxim of
quality and
manner. |
B. Data Analysis

Datum 1 (01:29 – 01:36)

Jim : Hi Dave!
David : Hi
Jim : Oh my gosh, I’m so embarrassed, I’m so sorry.
David : Forget that, are you alright?
Jim : Yeah, it’s good, a lot of air right here.

The context of this data is David opens the show and presents his guest star Jim Carrey, but he does not appear in the studio. David is looking for him on the back stage, and finds him in the claw machine. David is surprised and a little bit confused, yet he greets David first and says sorry because he is in the claw machine instead presents in the show by saying “Hi Dave! Oh my gosh, I’m so embarrassed, I’m so sorry”. On the other hand, David feels worry about him by asking his condition, “Forget that, are you alright?” Jim perceives by saying “Yeah it’s good, a lot of air right here”. Regarding to that answer, David asks by using ‘yes’, ‘no’ question, and does not ask about condition of air inside the machine. Jim answers precisely by saying, “Yeaaah,” but he sarcastically adds information, “it’s a good a lot of air right here”. Finch argues that we have to avoid providing too much information and obscuring the point we are making. The speaker who flouts the maxim of quantity seems to give too little or too much information. The additional information can be appertain as irony. In the genuine assumption, the main problem being trapped in the claw machine is lack of air and hard to breathe, but he says that he gets a lot of air inside. Uttering irony and sarcasm are flouting maxim of quality.

The non-observance by flouting maxim of quantity and maxim of quality generates conversational implicature. The meaning of the implicature is that Jim wants to tell his good condition to David, though the common sense knows that the claw machine contains less air because of the closed space. This kind of implicature appertains into generalized conversational implicature because there is no special knowledge in the context to calculate the implicature.

Datum 2 (01:39 – 01:47)

David : No, I can’t believe that, how did this... why are you in there?
Jim : Well, I was, go on my dressing room, and I saw this, this claw machine and I just had to have what I saw in here.
David : What was in there that is caught your...
Jim : Check it out!^68

The datum 2 is continuance from the conversation in datum 1. After David finds Jim in the claw machine, he asks, “why are you in there?”. Jim answers periphrastically, “Well, I was, go on my dressing room, and I saw this, this claw machine.” Jim just answers the question in the last part of his utterance; “I just had to have what I saw in here.” By that words, Jim flouts maxim of quantity, because it provides too much information from being asked.

Jim can answer directly by uttering his purpose to get the academy award inside the claw machine, but he does not. He chose to flouts the maxim of quantity which generates conversational implicature. By calculating the context, it implicates that Jim want to over-extend the conversation in order to show the academy award that he got in the claw machine. It is kind of joke for American people and movie lovers who

^68 Jim shows an academy award from inside the claw machine.
know Jim Carrey never get the academy award, yet he gets it in the claw machine. Jim wants to make a joke from the implicature. Thus, the conversational implicature included to particularized general implicature, because the context is only can be understood by certain circle such as American people and movie lovers who knows about the academy award.

Datum 3 (01:57 – 02:00)
David : Yes I know, lemme... you want to come out now?
Jim : Yeah, I think I probably should.

After David talks about what Jim has got in the claw machine, he asks Jim to come out from the machine by saying “you want to come out now?”. The sentence is a ‘yes’ no’ question sentence. The answer should be ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Jim answer the question properly with “Yeah,“ but he gives more information by adding “I think I probably should.” This overstatement is flouting maxim of quantity. He gives more information than it should be.

The flouting maxim of quantity above generates an implicature which means he really needs to come out, because he is the guest star of the show. He should be on the studio, not in the claw machine. This implicature is belonging to generalized conversational implicature, because of the common knowledge in the context.
Datum 4 (02:12 – 02:15)

David : I'm so... I feel like this is my fault but if you could just... we should remove the claw machine, it’s not supposed to-

Jim  : No, it’s totally me.

David : It’s supposed to be in the commissary, easy...

David feels sorry about the claw machine. He grogely says “I’m so... I feel like this is my fault but if you could just... we should remove the claw machine, it’s not supposed to-“ because he is the host of the show and as just found his guest star in the claw machine, he feels everything that happens in the show is because of him. Meanwhile, Jim interrupts by saying “No, it’s totally me.” From the view of cooperative principle, he blatantly fails to observe the maxim. He flouts maxim of relation, utterance “No, it’s totally me” is not relevant to the David’s utterance. David does not say anything about Jim, but Jim makes a statement that everything is about him. Moreover, his utterance is also not cooperating by flouting maxim of quantity. He does not make a contribution as informative as is required. He gives an understatement.

The flouting maxim of relation and quantity generate an implicature. He expects David and the audience will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say, and makes the connection between their utterance and the preceding one.\footnote{Joan Cutting, \textit{Op.cit.}, p.39} The implicature’s meaning is that he does not want David feels sorry about the claw machine accident. The context in this implicature does not need special knowledge to calculate, so it is include in generalized conversational implicature.
Datum 5 (03:28 – 03:40)

Jim : Oh, you know what, Dave?

David : What did you got?

Jim : Before we begin, can I, can I just, I just want to take a little bit of a precaution here, could you this... this goes in your ear, in your mouth or anywhere you feel like as a civilian.⁷⁰

The context is David and Jim come to studio and just starts the talk show. Suddenly Jim interrupts David while bringing out a thermometer and asks David to use it in the mouth. After Jim’s interruption, David asks him, “What did you got?” Then Jim answers by giving overstatement, “Before we begin, can i, can I just, I just want to take a little bit of a precaution here, could you this...this goes in your ear, in your mouth or anywhere you feel like as a civilian.” According to the cooperative principle, overstatement above fails blatantly to observe the maxim. He flouts maxim of quantity. He gives contributions more informative than is required. Furthermore, the statement is not related to the David’s question, hence he also flouts maxim of relation.

There is an conversational implicature generated by the flouting maxims in this datum. The true meaning is Jim tries to make a gimmick to entertain the audience, instead of taking care by interrogating David some question by using thermometer. Gimmick is doing something different by using some property.⁷¹ In this datum, he uses the thermometer as property. The context in this conversational implicature is

⁷⁰ Jim asks David to use a thermometer
without any special knowledge, so it is called as generalized conversational implicature.

Datum 6 (04:54 – 05:01)
David : Are you... because you travel the world promoting the movies and such worried about the diseases coming down?
Jim : Once you've done a couple press tours are you welcome death.

David inquires Jim about his recent activity, promoting his film that makes him should travel around the world by using the question, “Are you... Because You travel the world promoting the movies and such worried about the diseases coming down?”

In this question, David asks whether by traveling around the world he is not afraid of diseases. Then Jim answers with “Once you've done a couple of press tours are you welcome death.” Jim as provides other statements that are not related to the question, because David does not ask about the ‘tour’ and ‘death’. From these answers, he blatantly fails to observe the maxim of manner and gives an hyperbola information, hence he flouts maxim of quality.

The flouting maxim of manner above generates an implicature which means that Jim again tries to entertain the audience by giving an hyperbola answer. His answer is kind of a joke. Moreover, he is getting on audience’s laugh after that. Without any special knowledge to calculate the context, this is a generalized conversational implicature.
Datum 7 (05:06 – 05:17)

David : Really? Really? You welcome death?
Jim : You do... You do... nothing left that’s meaningful. You know I’ve been married a couple of times, it takes a lot to scare me Dave.

This conversation is a continuation of a conversation on the previous data. Still with the same context, David asserts Jim's answer to the question, "Really? Really? You welcome death?". This question is poses as previously Jim answered his question with, "you welcome death". Jim confirmed by responding "You do... You do...". But, thereafter he added the information “nothing left that's meaningful. You know I've been married a couple of times, it takes a lot to scare me Dave." Additional information provides Jim flouts the maxim of quantity, because it provides too much information than it should be. Coupled with the words that shaped, "You know I've been married a couple of times," he flouts the maxim of Manner. The sentence above gives obscurity and ambiguity information.

The flouting maxim above generates an implicature. Jim’s answer shows his anxious to the ‘death’ that he said before instead of he wants to jokes David and the audience by giving obscurity and ambiguity information, proving by audience’s laugh then. The context in this conversational implicature is without any special knowledge, so it is called as generalized conversational implicature.
Data 8 (05:22 – 05:57)

David : Alright, well, good to hear that, interesting perspective. Now, hmm... let’s do a little Matthew McConaughey. Because you before, Matt Damon is the only one I knew who did come close on the Matthew McConaughey, did you... is there any secret to do it?

Jim : Oh no, it’s real simple Dave, all I gonna do is let go the illusion that exist, driver on my liking, role in this burger.\(^2\)

In the minute 05:22 David asks Jim to play Matthew McConaughey, which is the guest star need to impersonate Matthew McConaughey. McConaughey is an actor, emerged as a king of romantic comedies and he has a unique style in speaking.\(^3\) David gives the information at the same time equipped Jim as a comedian who is good in impersonate by uttering “Because you before, Matt Damon is the only one I knew who did come close on the Matthew McConaughey”. Then, at the end of his question, David asks Jim sort of ‘yes’ or ‘no’ question, “did you... is there any secret to do it?” Jim directly answers with impersonation as Matthew McConaughey, “Oh no, it’s real simple Dave,” without answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Jim flouts maxim of relation because he gives an irrelevant answer. He continues with his impersonation by saying a few words describing Matthew McConaughey “all I gonna do is let go the illusion that exist, driver on my liking, role in this burger”.

The implicature that generated by the flouting maxim of relation is to show his great capability in impersonation. Impersonate someone is one of technique in stand-

\(^2\) Jim impersonates Matthew McConaughey responding David’s challenge.

\(^3\) http://www.biography.com/people/matthew-mcconaughey-16599996#oscar-winning-role-in-dallas-buyers-club Retrieved on December 17th 2015, 02.01
up comedy by imitating famous figure. In this situation, he tries to entertain the audience. Without any special knowledge to calculate the context, this is a generalized conversational implicature.

Datum 9 (06:25 – 06:30)
David : How many times have you hosted the show?
Jim : Three times, yeah... Let’s just enough for anybody.

Jim David asks Jim about his work as an anchor in Saturday Night Live. Jim originally is an actor, he had been an anchor on Saturday Night Live. David asks “How many times have you hosted the show?” Jim answers, “Three times,” but he gives additional information that is, “Let’s just enough for anybody”. This makes Jim flouts maxim of quantity, by adding excessive information.

The excessive information is not actually meaningful. Yet, the audience responses it by laughing. “Let’s just enough for anybody,” implicates Jim’s nausea of being news anchor in the Saturday Night Live. It is kind of a joke for audience. The context in this conversational implicature is without any special knowledge, so it is called as generalized conversational implicature.

Datum 10 (06:32 – 06:41)
David : It’s a lot of work.
Jim : Yeah it’s a lot of work, it’s crazy. They’re ripping you out of your shoes, Donna, she’s like a jail guard, she comes up behind and liftshp your feet and “Don’t struggle! Just don’t struggle!
David : Hehehe... and she’s with the show?
Jim : Yeah she’s with the show, fortunately, fortunately. I did matter of her before.

---

David makes sure about many things to do in his work as an anchor in *Saturday Night Live* by saying “It is a lot of work”. Jim agrees with the statement by saying, “It is a lot of work”. This statement does not flout any maxims, because it gives the answer as needed. But he adds information by saying “They’re ripping you out of your shoes, Donna, she’s like a jail guard, she comes up behind and liftshop your feet and “Don’t struggle! Just don’t struggle!” by adding that utterance, he just flouts maxim of quantity, because it gives too much information. Afterward, David asks about Donna by saying “and she’s with the show?” then Jim directly responds by saying “Yeah she’s with the show” he gives an answer that observe the cooperative principle maxim, but he adds the answer with, “fortunately, fortunately. I did matter of her before”. By adding this information he flouts maxim of quantity, because it provides more information than is required. Further, phrase, “jail guard” is a metaphor, according to the cooperative principle, it flouts maxim of quality.

The flouting maxim of quantity in the first answer and the second one above generate an implicature. In the first answer, he gives overstatement to tell his story how bad his experience in the *Saturday Night Live* especially his with Donna. Then he adds the metaphor to give a funny sense to the audience. The second answer is also give a joke to the audience by telling his regret for “did matter of Donna”. Without any special knowledge to calculate the context, this is a generalized conversational implicature.
Datum 11 (07:22 – 08:13)

David : Did you do audition for the show?
Jim : I did and it’s a crazy story, cause you know, I always look for omens of the universe, what’s the universe send to me to any one moment, you can kinda like see what’s gonna go on, and I went over to NBC and Burbank. And I... it was a really important day for me I got a car, and I was thinking every hope everything goes well, and the first thing I heard when I’ve closed the door of the car was “don’t do it! Don’t jump!” and I looked up at the top of the NBC building where the logo was NBC page standing on the end for NBC try to get up the nerve to step off, and news crews were finally have the building it was like instant coffee for them, and... this is not gonna go well, not gonna go well.

In this conversation, they are talking about Jim’s audition for the “Saturday Night Live”. David asks Jim by saying “Did you do audition for the show?” Jim replies by giving overstatement. Just “I did” is requisite, but he gives more information than is required. He tells the story before he comes to the audition which is not being asked. The addition, “...and it’s a crazy story, cause you know, I always look for omens of the universe, what’s the universe send to me to any one moment, you can kinda like see what’s gonna go on, and I went over to NBC and Burbank. And I... it is an important day for me I got a car, and I was thinking every hope everything goes well, and the first thing I heard when I’ve closed the door of the car was “don’t do it! Don’t jump!” and I looked up at the top of the NBC building where the logo was NBC page standing on the end for NBC try to get up the nerve to step off, and news crews were finally have the building it was like instant coffee for them, and.. This is not gonna go well, not gonna go well.” is not necessary. According to
the cooperative principle, he should make the contribution as informative as is required. Consequently, Jim flouts the maxim of quantity.

Generalized conversational implicature is generated by Jim who flouts the maxim of quantity. He implies to tell his funny experience before the audition to entertain the audience.

Datum 12 (08:16 – 08:35)
David : What was your audition material? Do you remember?
Jim : Oh my gosh, a buncha characters and stuff but mostly I couldn’t really concentrate because it was like, is she gone? Is she’s still around? What happen? I hope someone stiff away.

This data is a continuation from the previous conversation. Still talking about Jim’s audition for Saturday Night Live. David asks two question to Jim by saying “What was your audition material?” and “do you remember?”. This question is connected each other, but in cooperative principle, every question should answer by proper information. In contrast, Jim response the question by saying “Oh my gosh, a buncha characters and stuff but mostly I couldn’t really concentrate because it was like, is she gone? Is she’s still around? What happen? I hope someone stiff away,” which is not related to the question. David does not mentions anyone in his question, but Jim mentions about “she” in his answer. Jim flouts maxim of relation by giving unrelated information.

Instead of telling his audition experience, he calls back about a woman before the audition who he puts down as a bad omen. “... Is she gone? Is she’s still around?
**What happen? I hope someone stiff away**”. It makes the audience laughing. ‘Call back’ is a technique in stand-up comedy by repeating punchline from the previous one.\(^{75}\) This conversational implicature is counted as generalized conversational implicature.

**Datum 13 (10:59 – 11:44)**

David : Well, that’s not my problem. Let’s talk about... Jeff Daniels was here not so long ago and we’re talking about the twenty years since the original “Dumb and Dumber” and have you been working on it for twenty years?

Jim : No.. no.. no., I’ve done some other things. Yeah I feel.. it’s a great position now to be here, cause.. Cause.. people come up to me, it’s really dear movie to them, really they grow up with it, and I slipped into this weird I can figure it out that I really enjoyed connecting with people on it. And... and when I work with people on “Saturday Night Live,” in “Dumb and Dumber,” they always pulling me aside and telling me this is a thrill you know I grew up with you, you know Rachel Melvin who plays Harry’s daughter in the movie brought me aside and said this is this is so such a thrill you know when the first dumb and dumber came out you know I was little colicky.

This data is talking about the original *Dumb and Dumber* and *Dumb and Dumber to*. The separate time between the original *Dumb and Dumber* and *Dumb and Dumber to* is twenty years, and David asks Jim about the twenty years by saying, “have you been working on it for twenty years?”. Jim answer the question by saying, “No.. no.. no.. I’ve done some other things,” but he gives more information by adding information, “Yeah I feel.. it’s a great position now to be here, cause.. cause.. people come up to me, it’s really dear movie to them, really they grow up with it, and I slipped into this weird I can figure it out that I really enjoyed connecting with people

---

on it. And... and when I work with people on “Saturday Night Live,” in “Dumb and Dumber,” they always pulling me aside and telling me this is a thrill you know I grew up with you, you know Rachel Melvin who plays Harry's daughter in the movie brought me aside and said this is this is so such a thrill you know when the first dumb and dumber came out you know I was little colicky.” The additional information which is saying by Jim fails to observe the maxim. He flouts maxim of quantity by giving too much information.

Generalized conversational implicature is generated by Jim who flouts the maxim of quantity. In his additional information, he tells David and the audience that he is not only working on Dumb and Dumber, but also in other project.

Datum 14 (12:37 – 13:05)

David : What I notice in the film you look exactly the same in the film as you did in the original.

Jim : Well it's all digital now Dave, you know. Ehmm hmm... the turkey neck team getting down here... I mean look at this, look at me now, “this is the truth, this is the real truth, that's the real deal right there. I play bass in a quintet on the weekends.

In this data, David talks about Jim who looks the same in the film and in the original just like his utterance, “What I notice in the film you look exactly the same in the film as you did in the original”. Jim responses it sarcastically by giving ambiguous information, “Well it's all digital now Dave, you know.” Giving ambiguous information is flouting maxim of manner. Moreover, Jim impersonates something which he calls as “the turkey neck” then he says, “This is the truth, this is
"the real truth." He flouts maxim of quality, because he says the truth in his impersonation which is not the real him. He gives untruth information.

The flouting maxims generate an implicature. In this utterance, “Well it's all digital now Dave, you know,” instead of Jim wants to tell that digital era can makes Him looks the same in the film, thus it makes the audience laughing. Moreover the impersonation as a turkey man makes another laugh. The context of this conversation is without any special knowledge to calculate, hence it is called as generalized conversational implicature.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

Referring to the analysis in third chapter, the writer finds fourteen selected data from the conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey which contain non-observance of maxim of cooperative principle. The non-observance of maxim which appear in this research is only flouting maxim, because Jim Carrey as a speaker blatantly fails to observe the maxim without any unostentatious response, imperfect linguistic performance, and willingness to cooperate the maxim. In addition, the writer finds that Jim Carrey six times flouts two maxim in various combination in one answer. In total, he flouts ten times maxim of quantity, four times maxim of quality, four times maxim of relation, and three times maxim of manner. The most maxim which fails to observe is maxim of quantity which occurs by giving more or less information than is requires.

The non-observance by flouting the maxim generates conversational implicature which expect hearer to appreciate the meaning implied. There are two kind of conversational implicature; generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. In this research, the writer only finds one particularized conversational implicature which is in data two, and the rest are includes to generalized conversational implicature. Jim mostly flouts the maxim that
generates conversational implicature with no special knowledge to calculate, hence it can be recognized what the meaning implied by many people.

Conversational implicature that mostly include to generalized conversational implicature generated by flouting maxim has true meaning to imply. The writer finds that mostly of conversational implicature is to entertain the audience instead of promoting his Jim’s new film *Dumb and Dumber to*. Jim as a guest star always gives answer that makes the audience laugh. Moreover, he uses stand-up comedy technique in some of his response to David’s question.

From the findings above, the writer concludes that Jim Carrey blatantly fails to observe (flouting) the maxim of cooperative principle to implies his jokes to the audience. Furthermore, the usage of generalized conversational implicature makes the audience easier to understand the jokes itself.

**B. SUGGESTIONS**

Conversational implicature and cooperative principle are a very extensive theory. For the following research, the writer suggest to use conversational implicature and cooperative principle as an approach for another theory to find the true meaning in many subjects, especially linguistics.

For similar corpuses, the writer suggests that they can be analyzed with another theory or approaches such as, conversational analysis (repair, backchannel, turn taking, overlapping), politeness strategy theory, and relevance theory.
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APPENDIX

Transcript in the conversation between David Letterman and Jim Carrey on the Late Show With David Letterman episode aired on 29th October 2014.

David Letterman: Our first guest, a talented, very funny actor, and his movies generated nearly five billion dollars. Five billion dollars. That, ladies and gentlemen, a lot of ticket. See his newest film, a sequel twenty years in the making, they’ve been, hahaha... they’ve been working for this film day and night for twenty years. It’s entitled Dumb And Dumber to. It’s in theaters on November 14th. Here he is Jim Carrey everybody!

Jim Carrey ladies and gentleman!

Home band: I don’t know. No I don’t know, don’t ask.

David Letterman: Did you see him earlier?

Home band: I think he is in the building.

David Letterman: It must be that time change things who was talking about.
Hi, Have you seen a...

Ouh my god, this is ugly. Jim!

**Jim Carrey**: Hi Dave!

**David Letterman**: Hi

**Jim Carrey**: Oh my gosh, I’m so embarrass, I’m so sorry.

**David Letterman**: Forget that, are you alright?

**Jim Carrey**: Yeah, it’s good, a lot of air right here.

**David Letterman**: No, I can’t believe that, how did this...why are you in there?

**Jim Carrey**: Well, I was, go on my dressing room, and I saw this, this claw machine, and I just had to have what I saw in here.

**David Letterman**: What was in there that was caught your...

**Jim Carrey**: Check it out!

**David Letterman**: Uh-huh?

**Jim Carrey**: It’s an Oscar!

**David Letterman**: An Academy Award, yeah...

**Jim Carrey**: You know how badly I want this.

**David Letterman**: Yes I know, lemme... you want to come out now?

**Jim Carrey**: Yeah, I think I probably should.

**David Letterman**: Alright, we have Hugh... I’m sorry, are you guys with the show?

**Crew**: Yes sir.

**David Letterman**: Would you mind... just...
Jim Carrey: I just wanna feel what it’s like won it I couldn’t escape myself.

David Letterman: I’m so... I feel like this is my fault but if you could just... we should remove the claw machine, it’s not supposed to-

Jim Carrey: No, it’s totally me.

David Letterman: It’s supposed to be in the commisary, easy...

Jim Carrey: Aw, yeah, it’s stuck in my legs, it’s got in my shoes.

David Letterman: Now, finally you got some air.

Jim Carrey: Yeah, oh, wow!

David Letterman: You don’t want one of the... deep bane thrombosis thing.

Jim Carrey: Anybody, wanna plush toy?

David Letterman: Hahaha... come on, lemme...

Jim Carrey: Thanks.

David Letterman: Good to see you. I’m so sorry.

Jim Carrey: That’s for Harry.

David Letterman: Okay, that’s for our general secretary, come on.

Jim Carrey: Oh, uh, uh... give this to Meryl Streep.

David Letterman: Jim Carrey!

Jim Carrey: Thank you, thank you, wow.

David Letterman: Nice to have you here.

Jim Carrey: Thank you, it’s so good to be back, so good to be back.

David Letterman: Lemme, uh... I was reading a little something you’ve said...
Jim Carrey: Oh, you know what, Dave?

David Letterman: What did you got?

Jim Carrey: Before we begin, can I, can I just, I just want to take a little bit of a precaution here, could you this... this goes in your ear, in your mouth or anywhere you feel like as a civilian.

David Letterman: Did it...

Jim Carrey: Oh yeah, I know, it’s all safe, it’s sterilized. Now I just want to ask you a couple of simple questions, ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answers are fine. Have you travel abroad lately?

David Letterman: Hmm..

Jim Carrey: Okay, have you ever kissed a monkey or licked an airport toilet seat?

David Letterman: Hmm..

Jim Carrey: Maybe? Okay, all right, that’s not important, that’s not important, the third question is are you now or do you plan to be a member of ISIS?

David Letterman: Hmm.. hmm..

Jim Carrey: I just thought I’d throw that one when you can’t be too careful, you know, here. Lemme see.

David Letterman: You got there.

Jim Carrey: Oh yeah that’s 55 degrees, just like this studio, just like this studio. That’s a little low, but it’s not symptomatic, don’t travel to Jersey! It’s crispy, much more serious about this stuff. Did i say crispy?

David Letterman: That’s fine.

David Letterman: Are you... because you travel the world promoting the movies and such, are you worried about the diseases in coming down?
Jim Carrey: Once you've done a couple of press tours are you welcome death.

David Letterman: Really? Really? You welcome death?

Jim Carrey: You do... You do... nothing left that’s meaningful. You know i’ve been married a couple of times, it takes a lot to scare me Dave.

David Letterman: Alright, well, good to hear that, interesting perspective. Now, hmm... let’s do a little Matthew McConaughey. Because you before, Matt Damon is the only one i knew who did come close on the Matthew McConaughey, did you... is there any secret to do it?

Jim Carrey: Oh no, it’s real simple Dave, all I gonna do is let go the illusion that exist, drive out of my liking, role in this burger. You want?

David Letterman: No... no thanks.

Jim Carrey: It makes me feel save Dave, it’s not even burger anymore. It’s more of an anchor.

David Letterman: Now... what i was gonna say is... by the way nice job on the Saturday night live.

Jim Carrey: Thanks a lot, thanks a lot.

David Letterman: How many times have you host the show?

Jim Carrey: Three times, yeah... Let’s just enough for anybody.

David Letterman: It’s a lot of work.

Jim Carrey: Yeah it’s a lot of work, It’s crazy. They’re ripping you out of your shoes, Donna, she’s like a jail guard, she comes up behind and lifshop your feet and “Don’t struggle! Just don’t struggle!”

David Letterman: Hehehe... and she’s with the show?
Jim Carrey: Yeah she’s with the show, fortunately, fortunately. I did meet her up before.

David Letterman: Hehehe... we’ll be right back here with Jim Carrey.

David Letterman: Jim oh Jim.. now emm... I think people first begin to realize your talented skills and abilities in the living color, but did you ever wanna be on Saturday Night Live?

Jim Carrey: Oh yeah, I wanted to really bad.

David Letterman: Did you do audition for the show?

Jim Carrey: I did, and it’s a crazy story, cause you know, I always look for omens in the universe, what’s the universe send to me to any one moment, you can kinda like see what’s gonna go on, and I went over to NBC and Burbank. And I... it was a really important day for me I got in a car, and I was thinking every hope everything goes well, and the first thing I heard when I’ve closed the door of the car was “don’t do it! Don’t jump!” and I looked up at the top of the NBC building where the logo was NBC page standing on the end for NBC try to get up the nerve to step off, and news crews were finally have the building it was like instant coffee for them, and... this is not gonna go well, not gonna go well.

David Letterman: This might kinda tippy

Jim Carrey: This is an omen forsure.

David Letterman: What was your audition material? do you remember?

Jim Carrey: Oh my gosh, a buncha characters and stuff but mostly I couldn't really concentrate because it was like, is she gone? Is she’s still around? What happen? I hope someone stiff away.

David Letterman: We had talked about her I was talking about earlier today, we're talking about your grandson. Four-and-a-half years old, a half years old. There’s a funny story about you and he was on an ATV...
Jim Carrey: Well yeah, we love to go up to the cabin I have a cabin up in canada and it’s a... it’s a million of nowhere. Beautiful, you know.. little lake with a barn full of skulls

David Letterman: I’m sorry it’s barn full of skulls?

Jim Carrey: Yeah, cause I do my arts and crafts up there, and I make lampshades, the things like that, some pretty, all organic, all totally organic. I make one for ya, I make one for ya..

David Letterman: No... No... I have money, I’m good thank you.

Jim Carrey: I mean, people are wondering on my property all the time. But I go up there with the family and I was up there last winter with my daughter and my grandson and we’re on the ATV’s and ice and snow, we’re flying through the trails and he’s on the back to mine my daughters behind us and he’s gone faster grandpa faster faster. And i turn then i say hey we gotta gotta slow down so your mom can catch up, he says; dumb the bitch! you just never know what they're going to come out.

David Letterman: No, you’ll never know, that’s the beautiful things about kid, you just never know.

Jim Carrey: Who knows where the **** they learned that.

David Letterman: Speaking of canada, how about this?

Jim Carrey: Yeah, deal with it! Deal with it, everybody, everybody, who said I wouldn’t make it! Deal with it, who said I couldn’t do it! And lick me now! They can lick me!

David Letterman: It’s an actual stamp and they have a..

Jim Carrey: I don’t even shave for.

David Letterman: Who this is remind us of?

Jim Carrey: I don’t know.

David Letterman: If it was not you, who is that?
Jim Carrey: I don’t know, it looks like there needs to be a condom on it. To keep everybody save.

David Letterman: Well, that’s not my problem. Let’s talk about... Jeff Daniels was here not so long ago and we’re talking about the twenty years since the original Dumb and Dumber, and have you been working on it for twenty years?

Jim Carrey: No... no... no... I’ve done some other things. Yeah I feel... it’s a great position now to be here. Cause... cause... people come up to me, it’s really dear movie to them, really they grow up with it, and I slipped into this weird iconography that I really enjoyed connecting with people on it. And... and when I work with people on saturday night live or in Dumb and Dumber they always pulling me aside and telling me this is a thrill. you know I grew up with you, you know Rachel Melvin who plays Harry's daughter in the movie brought me aside and said this is this is so such a thrill you know when the first Dumb And Dumber came out you know I was little colicky.

David Letterman: I’d say it mostly, very meaningful, but a... How about this, the first thing I would have done when the deal was set to have you’re gonna do the follow up the sequel, sit down to watch the original did you sit down to watch the original?

Jim Carrey: Well you know it's it's hard to get away from it, it’s everywhere you know It's like, yeah... I've watched bits and pieces a bit but, when I find...

David Letterman: Well, did you and Daniels get together to watch?

Jim Carrey: We didn’t, we didn’t get together now, we don’t like each other very much.

David Letterman: Oh, I’m sorry to hear that.

Jim Carrey: No, no, we love each other. But a... it was amazing because as soon as we do the characters in the first time we saw them in the dailies jumping off the bus together, it was like, oh we’re back, in it wasn't even like I was Lloyd anymore, lloyd's in his own band now, and it was just like wow... It feels good, you know.
**David Letterman**: What I notice in the film you look exactly the same in the film as you did in the original.

**Jim Carrey**: Well it's all digital now Dave. You know, ehm hmm.. the turkey neck team getting down here... I mean look at this, look at me now, “this is the truth, this is the real truth, that’s the real deal right there. I play bass in a quintet on the weekends.

**David Letterman**: Jeezz that was...

**Jim Carrey**: That’s really hurt

**David Letterman**: Yaah look like, look like it hurt. Now it’s a clip time *Dumb and Dumber to* November 14th, what we gonna see here on the movie?

**Jim Carrey**: Well, with drop in on the movie here, we're gonna see Harry and Lloyd finding the people that raised harry's daughter, and unfortunately she's not there, so, what they are trying to do is hook them up on the phone.

**David Letterman**: let’s take a look.

(clip)

**Harry’s Father**: Adele, what do you say, we call penny right now with the news that her biological father's looking for her. She’ll be so excited. Let’s call her.

**Harry**: It’s ringing.

**Loyd**: Whoever this is, we’re in the middle of something really important can you call back later?

**Harry**: No, I can’t call back later, I have something to tell you when it might freak you out a little bit, but, this is your dad.

**Loyd**: What? Hold on, hey guys, i know this is a weird time but i gotta take this, it’s my dead dad.

She’s got me on hold.
Jim Carrey : Hahahahahahaha...

David Letterman : It’s my dead dad... Alright, easy, wait a minute, oh my God, oya, okay... It’s just that funny ladies and gentleman, Jim Carrey, *Dumb and Dumber to*, November 14th.