

## CHAPTER FOUR

### CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to present the conclusion of my analysis of how the non-observance of the Gricean maxims and Suls's theory of incongruity lead to humour in the sitcom *Outnumbered* season 5 episodes 1 and 2.

There are two types of the non-observance that can be found from the whole data, which are violating the maxim and flouting the maxim. Among a total of forty data in my analysis, the type of non-observance that appears the most is flouting the maxim. The maxim of manner, relation, and quality are the types of maxims which are flouted. I also find violating the maxim in the data. The other types of non-observance, as well as flouting the maxim of quantity, are not found in the data.

The data shows that the speaker mostly flouts the maxim of manner. By flouting the maxim of manner, the speakers do not express their 'ideas' directly nor do they state them briefly. For example, in data [36] **“You must always just measure yourself against... yourself,”** Sue does not give

the advice to Karen briefly; instead, Sue creates an unclear utterance that even she herself cannot understand. This also happens in Sue's statement in [34], **“Does the lead sing songs in a musical?”** which is incongruous. Therefore, one of the ways for the humour to be created is by the speaker flouting the maxim of manner.

The speakers also flout the maxim of relation in their utterances. The speakers flout the maxim of relation when they change the topic in the middle of their conversation. For example, in data [31], Pete and Karen are talking about apostrophes. Pete is supposed to be serious in talking about apostrophes. However, he is not serious in answering Karen at all. Pete is also not being serious when he is commenting on the emails from the other parents with Sue. As a result, by flouting the maxim of relation the speaker does not only change the topic, but he also changes the mood of the conversation. This creates the humour.

The next non-observance in the data is flouting the maxim of quality. I found that there are various purposes when the speaker flouts the maxim of quality. For example, in data [14], **Right, a cheap tattoo parlour. Smart move, Jake**, Sue flouts the maxim of quality in order to show disagreement.

The viewers know that Sue does not actually praise Jack for being smart. As a result, Sue flouts the maxim of quality to express the opposite meaning of the utterance and she uses this to create the humour. Meanwhile, in data [12], **You were in Camden Market and you suddenly decided to get a tattoo? What are you, a German tourist?** Pete flouts the maxim of quality in order to criticize Jack and make fun of him at the same time. In fact, Pete's

utterance is also funny because he says something that is totally false. In data [4], **Cheerier than yesterday**, by flouting the maxim of quality, Pete wants to express his opinion to Karen sarcastically. Pete's utterance also creates humour because the viewers know that he states the opposite condition of what actually happens to Karen. As a result, flouting the maxim of quality is an effective way to create the humour.

There is also an interesting case in data [11] when flouting the maxim of quality and flouting the maxim of manner happen at the same time. In order to understand the jokes, the viewers should find out both of the implicatures that are generated from flouting the maxim of quality and manner.

The use of both flouting the maxim of manner and flouting the maxim of relation can be found in data [15] and [17]. The viewers may become confused when they need to find the correct implicature from the utterance to understand the humour.

Violating a maxim also occurs in the data. Violating a maxim happens when the speakers try to mislead the hearer. It usually happens when the speakers do not give complete information or try to hide something from the hearer because he or she does not want the hearer to know about his or her real intention. For example, in data [37], **Which I'm sure you can hit, Ben, yeah. I'll be in the shed if anyone wants me**, Pete seems to encourage Ben to sing while actually he has another intention. He actually does not want to hear Ben sing. In other words, Pete misleads Ben by giving Ben encouragement that he can sing.

The other types of non-observance of Gricean maxims are not found in the sitcom: flouting the maxim of quantity, infringing a maxim, opting out of a maxim and suspending a maxim. There is no flouting the maxim of quantity found because the amount of information given by the speaker is sufficient, not more or less. Infringing the maxim is also not found because most of the speakers are teenagers and adults who can communicate well with each other. Furthermore, none of the utterances from the speakers opt out of a maxim because the speakers do not have any ideas that have to be hid from the other speakers. The last non-observance that is not found is suspending a maxim because the speakers are able to address their ideas without using any codes.

In this chapter I would also like to share some difficulties that I encountered in analyzing the data. I find that looking for the correct implicature within an utterance is quite difficult. In my experience, stating the incorrect implicature might lead to misunderstanding of the jokes. Therefore, other writers who wish to do a similar research regarding incongruity have to be careful and accurate in stating the implicature within a flouted utterance, so that the readers can understand the jokes.

From my analysis, we can learn how laughter occurs by means of non-observance of the Gricean maxim related to Sul's theory of incongruity. Therefore, the non-observance as well as Suls' incongruity can help us to gain a better understanding of this kind humour.

Word Count: 1023