

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **CONCLUSION**

There are fifteen data I have gathered and analyzed in the Chapter Three. From those data, it is found that there is one datum which flouts maxim of quality: Data 1; there are five data which flouts maxim of quantity : Data 2, Data 3, Data 5, Data 7, Data 9; there are three data which flouts maxim of relation : Data 4, Data 12, Data 13; there are six data which flouts maxim of manner : Data 8, Data 10, Data 11, Data 12, Data 14, and Data 15; there is one data with infringed maxim: Data 6.

The number of data which flouts maxim of manner is the biggest than the other data. From the number of the data itself, it can be concluded that the flouting maxim of manner is the most prominent trigger of the shift of the couple jokes' script in Getfrank website. This shows that give a long-winded or to provide information in not brief way is potential to cause laughter. Most of the speakers who flout this type of maxim are women, like in Data 7, Data 9, Data 11, Data 12, and Data 16.

In my opinion, this may be related to the ‘fact’ that women are hard to be understood. Probably, one of the reasons of why they are considered to be hard to understand is because they mostly talk in a not-brief way. Or, women flouts maxim of manner the most probably to soften what they are about to say, for example, like in Data 11, the woman can be said to soften her expression of hatred to her mother-in-law.

The second most prominent non-observance found in the data is the flouting the maxim of quantity. This shows that adding information is apparently also potential to create humorous effect.

The third most prominent trigger of the scripts shifts is flouting maxim of relation. The flouting maxim of relation is just another effective way to make a joke a joke. This type of non-observance creates such humorous effect from its ‘weirdness’. The ‘weirdness’ itself refers to disconnection-like connection. If we look at some jokes which depend on flouting maxim of relation to be the trigger of incongruity, we will see a disconnection between the speakers in the story. Still, at the same time we know that, a connection does exist and the speaker is not impaired. This connection matter is proven to be another way to create humorous effect.

The types of non-observance which exist rarely from the collection are flouting maxim of quality and infringing the maxim. Compared to the flouting maxim of manner, quantity and relation, these two types have lower prominence. This might show that in Getfrank website, funny jokes are mostly those which based on talking

in a long-winded or not brief or ambiguous in responding to someone's utterance, adding information or giving unrelated response to what someone is required instead of lying, in form of sarcasm, or be ambiguous when responding to someone. Infringing the maxim itself is also the least prominent in this website. It is simply because there are only a few data which involve drunkenness of someone, children who still have imperfect linguistics performance, or misunderstanding between a native speaker of a place and a foreigner. There are only a few jokes which are based on those things; it may be because those jokes could not always be understood by all joke readers. Some jokes based on infringing a maxim might also need certain knowledge. In Data 6, however, infringing a maxim happens because of drunkenness.

Violating a maxim, opting out a maxim and suspending a maxim are the types which do not exist at all in all data I found. Opting out a maxim and suspending a maxim are two types of non-observance which I think to be difficult to use as base of jokes. Opting out a maxim involves code using, which I do not find in the website. Code using itself, is usually found when people are talking using certain terms to refer to something to someone so that other people would not know about it. If I can relate this to Raskin's theory of scripts, code using simply does not change script. For example, two people are talking to each other about a friend they hate. When they use X to address the friend they hate, there will be no change with the scripts in the story. The story just goes straight, without any surprise like what we find in other data. This is the same as suspending a maxim. Suspending a maxim could be said not to trigger scripts change.

Refusal to cooperate with the speaker here is proven to be another ‘No’ for making a joke.

Another thing I find from the analysis is about the scripts. The scripts’ change in a joke is said to be the trigger of laughter, and it does. I’d like to say that script change is like a speed hump which is built to limit the speed of any kind of transportation which passes through it. Let us imagine ourselves driving a car. We follow the road smoothly and unconsciously fast. However, as we drive the car faster and faster, and become less aware, we pass the speed hump and we are surprised because of it. We finally go back to our awareness and probably say, “I didn’t see it coming!”

Reading jokes is the same thing. Script change can be also referred to be a limit. It is a limit for our expectation, or, for our imagination. A story has this component, which I would address as ‘fence’. When we follow a story, we are actually made to, as I mention before, drive our car in a road with fence on its left and right side. When we read a joke, we follow the story, until we reach one point when every of our expectation of the story fails. This is the sense of incongruity that is somehow ‘ticklish’ and makes you us want to laugh. The ‘ticklish’ sense here can be said to be the result of unexpected ‘movement’ of the story. In other words, the main key to incongruous effect is the fact that there is an unexpected truth; what we read is not as what we think to be.

Still, I find here that the intensity of how ‘ticklish’ the change of the scripts is, is different one another. The difference itself is influenced by the background

knowledge of a person. Person A, who rarely reads jokes will have greater chance to acquire the 'ticklish' effect than person B who has already read many jokes before. Let's say that person B reads many jokes which are based on the change of the scripts, a certain mindset is unconsciously created in person B's mind. The mind of the person somehow would learn the pattern of the jokes and in the end, it will decrease the effect of incongruity and furthermore, the 'ticklish' effect, since the unexpected truth has now become expected regardless of the person's will. It is like entering a haunted house in a playground. The more often we enter the house, the less scared we would be for we already know what we will see.

Not only background knowledge of a person, sense of humor is something that is also important to be the indicator of how 'ticklish' a change of scripts would be. Personally, I think that everybody has different sense of humour. What is funny for one may be different to what is funny for the other one. One laughs at slapstick comedy while one may find it boring and choose dark comedy instead. Even without reading many jokes before, a person could see a joke merely just as a usual story. Thus, another thing that can be concluded here is that to decide whether a joke is a joke or not is subjective matter.

Regardless of my findings here, I hope that there will be other research on the jokes of *Getfrank* website which may be based on other humour theories. I do also hope that there will be further research about opting out a maxim and suspending a

maxim – to see if there is really a possibility for these two types of non-observance to be used as jokes base.

(1390 words )