

THE FLOUTING OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE MAXIMS: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING OF PRAGMATICS IN EFL CLASSROOM

Sidik Indra Nugraha

Department of English Education, University of Singaperbangsa Karawang, Indonesia
E-mail: sidik.indranugraha@staff.unsika.ac.id

APA Citation: Nugraha, S. I. (2017). The flouting of cooperative principle maxims: Implications for teaching of pragmatics in EFL classroom. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 3(2), 231-240.

Received: 15-04-2017

Accepted: 18-05-2017

Published: 01-07-2017

Abstract: This research reports on the flouting of cooperative principle maxims in a comedy movie. The data were taken from conversational exchanges of a comedy movie entitled *Meet the Parents*, and were collected by transcribing the exchanges exposing humor occurred in the movie. The exchanges potentially flouting the maxims were analyzed in the light of Grice's CP maxims, elaborated further in Thomas (1995), to look into the types of maxims flouted and the ways the maxims were flouted. The exchanges were then further analyzed as to find whether the types of verbal humor are particular to each maxim flout. The analysis revealed that the four types of maxims, i.e. Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner, occurred to have been flouted so as to create humor. The Quality maxim was the most commonly flouted (55.6%), whereas the least commonly flouted was the Relevance maxim (6.3%). The speakers flouted the maxims in a number of different ways particular to each maxim. Moreover, the analysis found that maxim flouts were relevant to the types of verbal humor. Therefore, given the importance of pragmatic competence that the foreign language (FL) learners should acquire, it is suggested that pragmatics should be explicitly taught and integrated into the teaching of English.

Keywords: *pragmatic competence, the cooperative principle, conversational exchanges, maxim flout, verbal humor*

INTRODUCTION

Recently, there has been a considerable interest in pragmatic accounts of Cooperative Principle (henceforth CP), particularly maxim flouts. Within the CP, maxim flout and subsequent implicature are relevant to any type of communication with different communicative goals (see Lindblom, 2006; Dynel, 2008) such as commercial advertisement (e.g. Kusumarasdiyati, 2003; Apriyantini, 2008), psychology (e.g. Jia, 2008), political debate (e.g. Smith, 1999), informal communication (e.g. Brumark, 2004), and verbal humor (e.g. Chadafi, 2014; Dornerus, 2005).

As mentioned above, maxim flout in verbal humor is the one that has given rise to extensive pragmatics research such as ones conducted by Dornerus

(2005) and Chadafi (2014). Dornerus (2005) focused on the types of maxim that are most frequently broken and the reasons the maxims were broken. It was found that the characters not only flouted but also violated the maxims, though the occurrence of maxim violations were insignificant compared to that of maxim flouts. The study also found that the Relevance maxim was mostly flouted so as to create humor. Chadafi (2014), however, excluded maxim violations but focused solely on maxim flout to produce verbal fun. The study explored the types of maxim flouted and the ways the maxims were flouted in a comedy movie. The study revealed that the CP maxims was flouted so as to create humor, while

the Quality maxim occurred to be the most commonly flouted (Chadafi, 2014).

Both previous studies above (i.e. Chadafi, 2014; Dornerus, 2005) have only covered the types of maxim flouted and the ways the speakers flout the maxims so as to create humorous situation. This leaves a potential for further analysis as to what types of verbal humor particular to each maxim flout and how they relate one another, which the present study concerns. The present study hence attempts to continue what the previous studies revealed by expanding the research problems into types of verbal humor. This research thence was focused on three research questions: 1) What types of conversational maxims are flouted?; 2) How do the speakers flout the conversational maxims?; and 3) What types of verbal humor are particular to each maxim flout?

Pragmatics always seems identical to Austin, a philosopher who set out groundwork for pragmatics as known today (see Thomas, 1995). Austin, along with his influential pupil, Grice, was known to be an ordinary language philosopher who argued that, in spite of the fact that language is to some extent imperfect (Dornerus, 2005), people can manage to understand language “extremely effectively and relatively unproblematically just the way it is” (Thomas, 1995, p. 29). In a conversation, it is supposed that the hearer arrives at the speaker’s intended meaning, indicating that the message is successfully put across (Mey, 2006). In a typical communication, Mey (2006) further argues, many people believe that the hearer relies his/her inference of meaning on taking literally what the speaker says through his/her words. From that, it can be inferred that as long as the speaker means what his/her words actually say, i.e. the speaker explicitly states what he means, the hearer does not need to take lots of work inferring the

meaning. In a given situation, however, there are times when people mean more or different from what their words actually say (see Grundy, 1996), as exemplified in [1], [2], and [3]:

[1] Dina: Oh, yucky. What smells of old sour milk?
Pam: Oh, poor Greg got spit up on by a baby.
Dina: He didn’t.

[2] A: Is there another pint of milk?
B: I’m going to the supermarket in five minutes.

(Davis, 2007, p. 2)

[3] Greg is blamed for flushing the toilet which is nearly full so that it overflows the yard. Denny makes fun of him.
Denny : Nice stench. You’re really on a roll there, bud.
Greg : Bite me, Denny.

The hearer in [1] above would not find it difficult to appreciate what the speaker means since what the speaker means is exactly what her words said. In [2], however, the hearer cannot infer meaning the same way as in [1]. To mean that there is no milk but that some will be bought from the supermarket, the speaker hints at the meaning (Davis, 2007). Similarly, the speaker in [3] does not mean what his words literally said, that is, it is unlikely to say that the overflowing septic tank smells nice, and that causing the septic tank overflows the yard is a successful effort done by Greg. Therefore, the speaker means completely the opposite of what his words actually said.

Grice (1975) as cited in Thomas (1995) distinguished implicatures into conventional and conversational implicature. Conventional implicature or non-conversational implicature always carries the same implicature no matter what the context is (Thomas, 1995) or “context-independent” (Meibauer, 2006, p. 365). This implicature is characterized by the occurrence of particular words

which give additional meaning when they are used such as *but, even, therefore, and yet* (Thomas, 1995, p. 57), as illustrated in [4]:

[4] My friends were poor, but honest.
(Thomas, 1995, p. 57)

The word *but* in [4] above “carries the implicature that what follows will run counter to expectations” (Thomas, 1995, p. 57), that is, the poor is dishonest. The word *but* always carries this implicature no matter what the context is.

In contrast to conventional implicature, conversational implicature is “context-dependent” (Meibauer, 2006, p. 365), as exemplified in [5] below:

[5] A: What on earth has happened to the roast beef?
B: The dog is looking very happy.
(Levinson, 1983, p. 126)

To implicate *Perhaps the dog has eaten the roast beef*, B’s utterance need to occur in the particular sort of setting as illustrated in [5]. Since the implicature is derived by considering the context in which it occurs, it is thus a conversational implicature (Levinson, 1983).

In William James lecture at Harvard University in 1967, Grice first set out the Cooperative Principle (CP) as a general rule of conversation in which interlocutors are expected to follow (Thomas, 1995; Wardhough, 2002; Lindblom, 2006; Mey, 2006). The underlying assumption of CP is that in most conversations “participants are cooperating with each other” (Yule, 1996, p. 145). The CP together with its supporting four maxims is formulated as follows:

The Cooperative Principle

Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purposes or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged

The Maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:

- (i) do not say what you believe to be false
- (ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

The Maxim of Quantity

- (i) make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
- (ii) do not make your contribution more informative than is required

The Maxim of Relevance

- (i) make your contribution relevant

The maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous, and specifically:

- (i) avoid obscurity
- (ii) avoid ambiguity
- (iii) be brief
- (iv) be orderly

(Levinson, 1983, pp. 101-102)

The implication of the CP and its four maxims is, that all the speaker says will be “true, have the right amount of information, be relevant, and will be couched in understandable terms” (Davis, 2000, p. 2). In everyday speech, however, there are times when speakers do not always conform to the rules. As Grice (in Lindblom, 2006) points out, interlocutors can fail to fulfill the maxims in a variety of ways, i.e. one might violate a maxim, opt out, encounter a clash of maxims, and flout or exploit a maxim. Lindblom (2006) argues that the last possibility of maxim non-fulfillment is most interesting since it leads to generation of implicature. This is a situation when a maxim is flouted or exploited in which the hearer gets alert to an implied meaning. Thomas (1995, p. 63) exemplifies how a maxim is flouted, originally taken from movie *Splash*:
[6] A: Do you want a coat?

B: No, I really want to stand out here in the freezing cold with no clothes on.

On the face of it, B's reply is not what A expects. For a competent language user, however, it is no longer being a problem. Grice (in Thomas, 1995) contends that if A maintains the assumption that B observes the CP and thus gives an answer relevant to the given question, then A will look for another level of meaning, i.e. implicature.

METHOD

This study is largely qualitative. Every occurrence of humor due to maxim flouts is identified qualitatively. In addition, the study is supported by some quantification to reveal trends in maxim flouts with regard to creation of humor. The main data source is a comedy movie entitled *Meet the Parents*. The movie is purposively chosen as it contains many funny scenes resulting from the characters' witty remarks which generate a comical situation, supposedly exploiting Grice's CP maxims. The data of conversational exchanges are acquired by transcribing the whole exchanges exposing humor which occur in the movie. The transcription includes the conversational exchanges produced by

the movie characters which center on Greg, Pam, Jack, Larry, and Dina. These characters are selected for their considerable contributions to the production of humor resulting from maxim flouts. The conversational exchanges are analyzed as to find the possible exploitation of maxims in the light of Grice's theory of CP. Firstly, the exchanges which potentially flout the maxims are identified. Secondly, the exchanges are classified with regard to the maxims being flouted as well as the ways the maxims are flouted. Thirdly, the exchanges are further analyzed as to find the relevant types of verbal humor particular to each maxim flout in accordance with Alexander (1997) and Dynel (2009). Finally, the exchanges are quantified in accordance with each type of maxim flouted.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Types of maxims flouted

The analysis revealed that four types of maxims, i.e. Quality, Manner, Quantity, and Relevance, are flouted so as to create humor. The types of maxims flouted and their occurrences are briefly presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Types of maxims flouted*

No.	Types of maxims flouted	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Quality	20	55.6%
2.	Manner	6	18.8%
3.	Quantity	4	12.5%
4.	Relevance	2	6.3%
	Total	32	100%

Flouting of Quality maxim

As shown in Table 1 above, the speakers contribute 20 utterances to the Quality maxim flout, placing the Quality maxim to be the most commonly flouted (55.6%). Flouting of Quality maxim occurs when a speaker says something which is blatantly untrue or for which s/he lacks adequate evidence (Thomas,

1995). As it turns out, the speakers flout the Quality maxim not only to prompt the hearers to look for implicature, but also to generate humor, as exemplified in [1]:

[1] *Greg teamed up with Jack, Larry, and Denny in pool volleyball. However, the team did not expect much from Greg for his poor performance and his lack of defense*

technique in blocking the spike. Therefore, the opponent would spot him to yield score. Larry expressed his contempt in a mocking yet entertaining way saying that Greg was not better than Florence Nightingale.

Jack : We're getting creamed.

Larry : **If Florence Nightingale over here would play defense.**

Greg : Larry, I missed one shot.

Larry : It was a big shot.

To make sense the utterance (in bold print) in [1] above, it is necessary to first identify to what or whom the speaker intends to refer through referring expression *Florence Nightingale*. Given the context, it can be inferred that the intended referent would be Greg based on the assumption that *Florence Nightingale* and Greg have, to a large extent, something in common, i.e. Greg is a nurse, while *Florence Nightingale* was a nurse. In addition, the phrase *play defense* signifies Greg's position in the volley ball game.

Having identified the referent, it is now easier to examine the speaker's intended meaning. As demonstrated in [1], Larry's utterance (in bold print) appears at first blush to be untrue, i.e. that *Florence Nightingale* can be more counted on playing defense than that of Greg. However, since there is no indication of misleading or deceiving the hearer, Larry thus prompts the hearer to look for another interpretation, i.e. implicature. Blatantly saying something untrue, Larry thus flouts the Quality maxim ("do not say what you believe to be false"). This may give rise to implicature that Greg was bad at playing defense. Larry's flouting maxim utterance is inherently clever and thus potentially leads the hearer to laughter.

Flouting of Manner maxim

From the analysis, it is revealed 6 utterances (18.8%) flouts the Manner maxim. The Manner maxim requires a speaker to be "perspicuous" manifested in the four sub-maxims, i.e. "avoid obscurity

of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief, and be orderly" (Levinson, 1983, p. 102). Flouting of Manner maxim in which the speaker gives an ambiguous expression is exemplified in [2]:

[2] *Greg went upstairs to Danny's room to borrow some of his clothes. He commented on Denny's room arrangements including a poster of female rap singer L'il Kim.*

Greg: Oh, Li'l Kim. She's **phat**. P-H phat.

The bold expression is pronounced /fæt/. This pronunciation possibly leads to two words with the same sound but different meanings (homophone) (see Alexander, 1997; Dynel, 2009), i.e. *fat* which means "covered with, having much, fat" (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English), and *phat* which means "excellent" according to black slang. Even if the speaker later clarifies that he intends to mean *excellent* by adding "...P-H phat.", but nevertheless it is obvious that his intention is to induce humor by favoring such word instead of another least ambiguous one. Therefore, of this blatant ambiguous expression, the speaker flouts the maxim of Manner ("avoid the ambiguity of expression").

Flouting of Quantity maxim

The findings revealed that 4 utterances (12.5%) flouts the Quantity maxim. The Quantity maxim is flouted when a speaker blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires (Thomas, 1995). As exemplified in [3], the speaker flouts the Quantity maxim by giving less information than the situation requires:

[3] *Greg was blamed for flushing the toilet so that the nearly full septic tank was overflowing the lawn. However, he insisted that it was not him but Jinx, the cat.*

Greg : Jack, I told you. It wasn't me. It was Jinx.

Jack : Focker, I'm not gonna tell you again! Jinx cannot flush the toilet. He's a cat for Christ sakes!

Larry : **The animal doesn't have thumbs, Focker.**

It is observed in [3] that Larry's response must be uttered for some other purposes rather than its literal meaning, preventing it from a meaningless utterance since what the speaker means is already known by the hearers, i.e. no animals have thumbs (see Grundy, 1996). Larry's "self-evidently true" (Grundy, 1996, p. 76) flouts the maxim of Quantity, and thus invites the hearer to look for an implicature. Flagrantly withholding the information required, Larry flouts the Quantity maxim only to implicate that the addressee, i.e. Greg, is under delusion that cats flush the toilet. Yet, this Quantity maxim flout is seriously entertaining.

Flouting of Relevance maxim

It is revealed that 2 utterances (6.3%) potentially flouts the Relevance maxim. The Relevance maxim is flouted when a speaker makes a response or observation blatantly irrelevant to the topic in hand (Thomas, 1995), as exemplified in [4]:
 [4] *Greg had to get home quickly. He drove Larry's car and rushed to get ahead of Jack. He drove so fast yet badly that people got uncomfortable inside the cabin. Larry even irritably said that he were not really sure if Greg had handed a driver license.*

Debbie : What a fun ride.
 Bob : Who gave him the keys?
 Larry : Okay, we we're out.
 Linda : Yeah, we've had enough excitement.
 Larry : I wonder if he has a license.
 Bob : **Yeah, a license to kill.**

It is observed in [4] that the speaker makes a response which is blatantly irrelevant to the subject in hand, i.e., instead of driving license, the speaker abruptly changes the subject of talking to killing license. However, it is obvious that there is nothing on the speaker's part intending to be uncooperative since the hearer would correctly assumes the speaker's intended meaning, i.e. Greg is driving like a maniac. Therefore, the speaker flouts the maxim of Relevance. As it turns out, flouting the maxim, the speaker intends to jocularly engage his interlocutor in humor by teasing Greg for his mad driving car. The Relevance maxim is the least frequently flouted which accounts for 6.3% of the total utterances.

The ways the speakers flout the maxims

The analysis reveals six ways the speakers flout the maxims as presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2. *The ways the speaker flout the maxims*

No.	The ways the speakers flout the maxim	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Saying something untrue	17	53.1%
2.	Saying something for which the speakers lack adequate evidence	3	9.4%
3.	Making obscure expression	1	3.1%
4.	Making ambiguous expression	5	15.6%
5.	Giving less information than the situation requires	4	12.5%
6.	Making a response or observation obviously irrelevant to topic in hand	2	6.3%
Total		32	100%

It is revealed that the speakers flout the maxims in a number of different ways particular to each maxim. The first two

occurs particularly when the speakers flout the Quality maxim. 3 and 4, on the other hand, appears to be particular to

Manner maxim flout. Finally, 5 and 6 are commonly found in Quantity and Relevance maxim flout respectively.

Saying something untrue

The way the speaker flouts a maxim by blatantly saying something untrue is commonly found in Quality maxim flout, accounting for 53.1% of the total ways listed. It is exemplified in [5] as follows:

[5] *Greg told Pam that her father, Jack, had just interrogated him with polygraph machine. Pam said that Jack was in the CIA for 30 years.*

Greg: **It's wonderful I've actually got a CIA spy-hunter on my ass.**

As demonstrated in [5], what the speaker means is completely the opposite of what his words actually said, i.e. there can never be in the world that one is pleasant for being spied by the CIA without any obvious reasons. This opposite results in irony. The irony appears to be obvious particularly in the word *wonderful*, the intended meaning of which exposes a complete opposite, i.e. displeasure. Blatantly saying something untrue, the speaker thus flouts the maxim of Quality ("do not say what you believe to be false"). This may give rise to implicature that the speaker, Greg, is totally annoyed by Jack's suspicion on him. Despite its subtle humor, this irony is inherently clever and thus potentially leads the hearer (and the movie audiences) to laughter.

Saying something for which the speakers lack adequate evidences

In addition to saying something untrue, the Quality maxim is flouted when the speakers blatantly say something for which they lack adequate evidences. It constitutes 9.4 % of the total ways the maxims flouted. Flouting the Quality maxim by saying something for which the speaker lack adequate evidence is exemplified in [6]:

[6] *For house safety, Jack installed some cameras hidden in furniture and stuffs inside the house. When Greg looked around, he spotted an antique vase and said amusingly if it had camera inside.*

Greg: **Oh, that's a lovely vase. That's great. Let me guess, Jack. Is that one of your secret cameras too? Boogah ... woogah ... woogah!**

It is observed in [6] above that what Greg says is something he himself is not really sure about obviously when he says *Let me guess Jack*. In addition, the following statement *Is that one of your secret cameras too?* bears an idea of an unsupported statement (Cruse, 2000, p. 356). Blatantly saying something for which he lacks adequate evidences, Greg thus flouts the Quality maxim. However, this Quality maxim flout is seriously funny.

Making obscure expression

This way of flouting maxim particularly deals with the Manner maxim flout ("avoid obscurity of expression"), constituting 3.1% of the total ways analyzed. Flouting of Manner maxim in which the speaker blatantly makes an obscure expression is exemplified in [7]:

[7] *Greg and Pam were visiting Pam's parents, Jack and Dina Byrne. Dina was so surprised to meet Pam.*

Dina : Where's my "**wittle**" girl?

Pam : Mommy! Mom! You look so beautiful.

On the face of it, the bold expression produced by Dina potentially obscures the hearer, i.e. Pam, since this invented word is nowhere else found in any common dictionary entry. The word *wittle* may be formed by combining the word *wit* to the end part of the word *little*, the word formation of which is called "blending" (Yule, 1996, p. 66; Dynel, 2009, p. 1287). Therefore, the speaker flouts the Manner maxim of the subsume "avoid obscurity of expression".

Making ambiguous expression

Ambiguity expression largely deals with flouting of Manner maxim. It specifically fails to fulfill the second subsume of the Manner maxim, i.e. “avoid the ambiguity of expression”. The analysis reveals 5 utterances (15.6%) flouts the maxim of Manner in this way. The example of which is exemplified in [8] as follows:

[8] *Pam and Greg visited Pam’s parents, Jack and Dina. Pam called Jack “Flapjack”, while Jack called her “Pamcake”.*

Pam : Hi, Daddy!

Jack : Hi! Sweet pea! I missed you so much, **Pamcake**.

Pam : I missed you too, **Flapjack**.

It is observed in [8] that the speakers ambiguously use the words in bold print to call each other’s name, i.e. *Pamcake* for Pam and *Flapjack* for Jack, while those words are also phonetically similar, i.e. homophone and homonym respectively (see Alexander, 1997), to a type of dish pancake. Blatantly producing potentially expressions, the speakers thus flout the maxim of Manner (“avoid ambiguity of expression”). However, it is obvious that producing such potentially ambiguous expressions, the speakers attempt to appeal their interlocutors humorously.

Giving less information than the situation requires

This way of maxim flout specifically relates to the Quantity maxim, constituting 12.5% of the total findings. The Quantity maxim requires a speaker to give the right amount of information to the situation requires (Thomas, 1995). Flouting the Quantity maxim by giving less information than the situation requires is exemplified in [9]:

[9] *While enjoying dinner, Jack talked about Greg’s hometown where he grew up. Jack said that Greg must’ve had fresher vegetables than that of the served ones since he grew up in the farm. But, Pam*

interrupted saying that Greg grew up in Detroit.

Jack: You must’ve had vegetables fresher than that, grow up in a farm, Greg.

Pam: **Dad, uh, Greg grew up in Detroit.**

Jack: He told me he grew up on a farm.

As demonstrated in [9] above, the speaker fails to give the right amount of information, i.e. giving less information than the hearer needs regarding Greg’s hometown Detroit, and thus flouts the Quantity maxim. The speaker deliberately withholds the information to implicate that it is hardly found farmlands in Detroit as a matter of fact that Detroit is prominently known as an industrial city. This type of maxim flout also contributes to creating humor.

Making a response or observation obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand

This way of maxim flout particularly concerns with the Relevance maxim, accounting for 6.3% of total findings. The Relevance maxim simply requires the speaker to give a relevant response or observation to the topic in hand (Thomas, 1995). The example of which is exemplified in [10] as follows:

[10] *When Greg in a market, he asked the shopkeeper for a bottle of the most expensive champagne.*

Greg : ... and what’s you’re the most expensive bottle of champagne?

Shopkeeper : Mumm’s. It’s on sale for \$13.59.

Greg : Really? That’s it? You don’t have, like, \$80, or, a nice, like, \$100 a bottle of something?

Shopkeeper : **You can have a whole bunch of Mumm’s.**

It is observed in [10] that what the shopkeeper says (in bold print) is not what Greg expects. Instead of saying *No* for the exact answer, the shopkeeper turns to be

“lengthy”. However, this has nothing to do with flouting of Manner maxim whereby the shopkeeper fails to be brief. Rather, this is the case where the speaker, for the sake of humor, blatantly fails to give the hearer a relevant answer by pretending to misunderstand the question as if Greg intends to buy *Mumm’s* with the amount of money Greg mentions instead of asking whether the shopkeeper sells champagne which costs that amount of money. Blatantly failing to give relevant answer, the shopkeeper thus flouts the maxim of Relevance.

Regarding the findings and their respective discussions of the ways the speakers flout the maxims, it can be concluded that the speakers flout the maxims in a number of different ways particular to each maxim. The speaker flouts the Quality maxim by blatantly

saying something which is untrue or for which s/he lacks adequate evidences. On the other hand, the speaker flouts the Manner maxim by blatantly giving ambiguous and obscure expression. The Quantity maxim flout occurs when the speaker gives less information than the situation requires, whereas the Relevance maxim is flouted when the speaker makes a response or observation blatantly irrelevant to the topic in hand.

Verbal humor and maxim flouts

From the analysis, it is found that maxim flouts are also pertinent to types of verbal humor specific to each maxim flout. Based on Alexander (1997) and Dynel’s (2009) categorization of verbal humor, it is revealed eight types of verbal humor specific to each maxim flout as presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3. *Types of verbal humor*

No.	Types of verbal humor	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Irony	8	25%
2.	Exaggeration	4	12.5%
3.	Witticism	3	9.4%
4.	Neologism	1	3.1%
5.	Pun	4	12.5%
6.	Allusion	1	3.1%
7.	Subversive humor	4	12.5%
8.	Interactional pun	2	6.3%
	Total	32	100%

The occurrence of the types of verbal humor as listed in Table 3 above can lead to a certain extent predicted from maxim flouts. It is revealed that some types of maxim flouts appear to lead to certain types of verbal humor. For example, the first type of Quality maxim flout, i.e. the speaker blatantly says something untrue, leads to the occurrence of irony and exaggeration. The second type of Quality maxim flout, i.e. the speaker says something he or she lacks adequate evidences, tends to lead to the occurrence of witticism. While the first type of maxim of Manner flout, i.e. the speaker is being obscure, is relevant to neologism, the

second type of Manner maxim flout, i.e. the speaker is being ambiguous, is pertinent to pun and allusion. It is also found that the first type of Quantity maxim flout, i.e. the speaker gives less information than the situation requires, appears to be particular to subversive humor. Finally, the maxim of Relevance is particular to interactional pun.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions refer to the research findings and discussion in accordance with the research problems mentioned above. First, regarding the first research problem, i.e. the types of maxims flouted,

it can be concluded that the four types of maxims, i.e. Quality, Quantity, Relevance and Manner, occur to have been flouted by the speakers so as to create humor in the movie discussed. With regard to the second research problem, it is revealed that the speakers flout the maxims in a number of different ways particular to each maxim. The speakers flout the Quality maxim by saying something which is blatantly untrue or for which s/he lacks evidence. On the other hand, the speakers flout the Manner maxim by being ambiguous and obscure. Moreover, the Quantity maxim flout occurs when the speakers give less information than the situation requires, whereas the Relevance maxim is flouted when the speakers make a response which is blatantly irrelevant to the topic in hand. Finally, regarding the third research problem, it is found that maxim flouts are also relevant to the types of verbal humor particular to each maxim flout, for example, irony, exaggeration, witticism, pun, allusion, neologism, subversive humor, and interactional pun.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. (1997). *Aspects of verbal humor in English*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Apriyantini, E. (2008). The flouting to observe Grice's cooperative principles maxims in TV cellular operator advertisement. Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis. Indonesian University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia.
- Brumark, Å. (2004). Non-observance of Gricean maxims in family dinner table conversation. *Södertörns Högskola University College Working Paper*, 4, 1-44.
- Chadafi, M. (2014). *The floats of Grice conversational maxims in "1001 jokes" humor book by Richard Wiseman*. Unpublished Magister Thesis. Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, Indonesia. Retrieved from http://eprints.ums.ac.id/31493/12/Naskah_Publikasi_Ilmiyah.pdf
- Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Dynel, M. (2008). There is method in the humorous speaker's madness: Humor and Grice's model. *Lodz Paper in Pragmatics/Special Issue on Humor*, 4(1), 159-185.
- Dynel, M. (2009). Beyond a joke: Types of conversational humor. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3(5), 1284-1299.
- Dornerus, E. (2005). Breaking maxim in conversation: A comparative study of how scriptwriters break maxims in desperate housewives and that 70th show. Unpublished Postgraduate Dissertation. Karlstad Universteit, Karlstad, Sweden.
- Grundy, P. (1996). *Doing pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jia, L.I. (2008). The violation of cooperative principle and the four maxims in psychological consultant. *Canadian Social Science*, 4(3), 87-95.
- Kusumarasdiyati. (2003). A pragmatic analysis of verbal offers used by snack vendors in Malang. In R. B. Cribb (ed.) *Asia examined: Proceedings of the 15th Biennial Conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia, Canberra, 29 June-2 July, (1-12)*. Canberra, Australia, ASAA.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindblom, K. (2006). Cooperative principle. In J. L. Mey (ed.), *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics* (pp.151-158). Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Mey, J. L. (2006). Pragmatics: Overview. In J. L. Mey (ed.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics* (pp. 786-797). Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Moron, R.G., Cruz, M.P., Amaya, L.F., & Lopez, H.O.M. (2009). Introduction: Incorporating pragmatics to foreign/second language teaching. In Moron, Reyes Gomez *et al.* (eds.), *Pragmatics applied to language teaching and learning* (pp. vii-xxx). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Smith, C. (1999). Political debate language and Grice's cooperative principle. *Studies in Language*, 15(1), 349-361.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Wardhough, R. (2002). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Company.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.