CHAPTER V

This chapter in invented to give the conclusion based on the findings and discussion before. This chapter also presents the suggestion to the next researcher who would like to do analysis on pragmatic.

A. Conclusion

At the result, writer found 14 data which containing 6 utterances of Generalized Conversational Implicature and 8 utterances of Particularized Conversational Implicature. The Axe Files show also containing implied meaning which have 7 functions of language, they are: 3 utterance from personal, 1 utterance from regulatory, 4 utterances from representation, 1 utterance from interactional, 2 utterances from instrumental, 2 utterances from heuristic, and 1 utterance from imaginative as the answers of research questions before.

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher concludes that there are two types of conversational implicture that can be found on the Axe Files Talk Show; those are generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature based on the theory in chapter two. Generalized conversational implicature dominated the data because it is usually used in daily conversation. This result also happened in most of previous researchers.

There are seven functions of using conversational implicature in the conversation of the Axe Files talk show and all those were use in the conversation. Beside, this is a kind of formal talk show, but, creating a sense

of humor were used also used on it as imaginative function which uttered by the host once, to entertain the audience during his conversation in the show. Basically, all of the function are used to create the atmosphere of the show as enjoy as possible.

B. Suggestion

Firstly, as the writer, hopefully from this analysis could give benefit in education. Then, for the teachers, they supposed to teach their students to become a kind person. The way to become a good person is the student must have a good conversation. Also could having good conversation with nice and match joking with friends.

Secondly, for other people with other profession, the writer also hope that after reading this research, commonly they will understand about the conversational implicature which explains about the implied meaning of the utterance. Then, when they should be at any situation where implication is needed, it can help them by its knowledge.

Officially, after finishing this research, writer also hope the reader can study about speaking. Because, if the people knowing about conversational implicature, they will speak well. In other hand, their friends can understand about what are they saying. So, reader can speak with other people at any context well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arifah, R. (2014). A Study of Conversational Implicature in Sentilun TalkShow on Metro TV. Surabaya: University of Wijaya Putra.
- Brown, G. &. (1993). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carnel, J. (2011). The Jonathan Ross Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno. *Aspects of Talk Show Interaction:* , 25.
- Carnel. J. (2011). Aspects of Talk Show Interaction: The Jonathan Ross Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno. Faculty of Arts and Philosophy English Linguistics Department: Ghent University.
- F., N. A. (2016). Thesis. *conversational implicature on the chew talk show*, Maulana Malik Ibrahim. Malang.
- Friedman, T. (n.d.). Retrieved March 25, 2018, from http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Friedman
- Grice, H. P. (2004). Logic & Conversation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. USA: State University of New York Press.
- Haugh, M. (2015). *Mouton Series inPragmatics: Im/Politeness Impicature*. Germany: Library of Congress Cataloging.
- Heritage, C. G. (1990). *Conversation Analysis*. L.A.: Annual Reviews Inc.
- Huda, S. (2013). An Analysis of Conversational Implicature of Native and Nonnative Guests in CNN Interview Script. Kudus: University of Muria Kudus.
- Ille, C. (2001). Semi-Institutional Discourse: The case of talk show. *Stockholm*, *Sweden: Elesevier*, *Vol. 1*, 385-388.
- Kerr, S. (n.d.). Retrieved March 25, 2018, from http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steven_Kerr
- Levinson, C. S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlejhon, S. W. Communication Theory. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Mey, L. J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction 2nd Edition*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Paul, G. (2002). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Riemer, N. (2010). Introducing Semantics. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Saj, H. E. (2012). Discourse Analysis. Personal Pronouns in Operah Winfrey Hosting Queen Rania of Jordan, 530.
- Saragi, Y. M. (2011). Flouting Maxims in Conversational Implicatures in the Ellen Degenerates Talk Show. Surabaya: State University of Surabaya.
- The Axe Files. (2018). USA: The University of Chicago of Politics & CNN Present.
- Wagner, A. (n.d.). Retrieved March 25, 2018, from http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alex_Wagner
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.