CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I would like to put forward my concluding points based on my analysis in the previous chapter. In my thesis, there are eleven jokes as the data source and all of them contain utterances which do not observe the Gricean maxims. There are 20 utterances altogether. However, some utterances break more than one type of maxims. I find that there are eighteen utterances flouting a maxim: nine flout the maxim of manner, five flout the maxim of quantity, two flout the maxim of quality, and two flout the maxim of relation.

As we can see that there are eighteen utterances out of twenty or 90 percent flouting a maxim. In my opinion, it happens because the speaker and the hearer has a close relationship. The speaker who has a close relationship with the hearer sometimes says something that has an implicature. The speaker most probably thinks that the hearer will understand the meaning of the speaker's utterance without any further explanation again. Unfortunately, the hearer sometimes does not understand what the speaker wants to imply. This case also happens in the jokes that I analyze, which is marriage jokes. The conversation is between married couple who talks about the common topics that they have in

29

married life. The examples of the topics are about trying to make the wife happy or trying not to have a big conflict, etc. Because of the close relationship, the married couple sometimes does not want to say something directly. It is because they do not want to hurt each other by their utterance and prevent them from having a big conflict. Mostly, the utterances in all my data have implicatures that can be analyzed with the types of flouting a maxim. In my opinion, flouting a maxim is effective for creating a joke, because it involves the readers in identifying the speaker's utterance which contains an implicature and causes a conflict in the conversation.

In my analysis, the maxim of manner is the most flouted maxim. I find that there are nine utterances out of eighteen utterances or 50 percent that break this maxim. As I have mentioned before, a married couple prefers not to say something explicitly. The reason is because they want to keep each other's feeling and they do not want to have a big conflict with their spouse. Therefore, their utterance is usually not straight to the point or ambiguous. It makes the hearer need more time to think and understand what the speaker wants to imply. Then, it will create a funny effect to know the unexpected meaning from the speaker's utterance. For example, in data 1 the wife's answer about her reason why she is crying after she has had a dream is unexpected. It is different from what the husband or the readers think first. She says that she is crying because she regrets getting married to her husband. Because of this unexpected answer, it can create humor in the joke.

As I have explained in the first paragraph of this chapter, some of my data have more than one flouting a maxim; for example, in data 1, 3, 4, and 8, the

30

utterances have flouted the maxim of manner and quantity. In my opinion, the reason why an utterance can flout the maxim of manner and quantity is quite simple and logical. When a speaker's utterance is less informative, it tends to be unclear. Because of the less information, it will make the hearer confused and does not get the implication of the speaker's utterance. Then, when a speaker's utterance is unnecessarily too informative, at the same time it will not be straight to the point. Based on the two cases above, I can conclude that flouting the maxim of manner and quantity are most often related to each other. Besides, the utterance that flouts more than one type of maxim can prompt the readers to be more aware in analyzing the utterance that leads to the humor in the jokes.

Next, I also find one out of eleven data that has two utterances violating a maxim. In my opinion, usually a wife or a husband violates a maxim when his or her affair is about to be known by the spouse. By violating a maxim, the speaker can mislead the hearer. For example in data 2, the husband violates the maxim when his wife asks him about where he was last night. He does it because he wants to mislead his wife. He does not want his wife to know about his mistress. However, there are only few jokes that violate the maxim. It is because there is only one data from all my data source that tells about an affair and contains violating a maxim.

To analyze the humor in the jokes, I use the Incongruity theory. All of my data can be explained by this theory. In my opinion, this theory is effective to make the readers smarter to think hard in understanding the humor that is produced in the jokes. This kind of jokes, which relies on the use of language, requires the readers to think seriously about it.

31

All my data have unpredictable ending because it is different from the reader's prediction. I find that the situation in the jokes is not the same as the common marriage life that the readers usually see or hear. Because of the different prediction, humor is created. It is interesting to find the rule why it can be different and yet, it still makes sense. Therefore, it is a good theory to help the readers understand the jokes.

Finally, I would like to give suggestions for further researchers who are interested in the same topic. Gricean maxims can be used to analyze any text in the form of conversation. We can find many utterances that break the Gricean maxims in novels, films, or online comics. The Incongruity theory can be used to analyze the humor in other types of jokes such as school jokes, family jokes, or kid jokes, etc. as it is a very good theory.

(Word Count : 1012 words)

Maranatha Christian University