



**PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF MAXIM
FLOUTING CREATING HUMOR IN
HANGOVER MOVIE**

A THESIS

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Sarjana Degree Majoring Linguistics in English Department
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University**

Submitted by:

ARUM SETIANI

NIM: 13020115120057

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG
2019**

PRONOUNCEMENT

The writer honestly claims that this thesis purely done by herself and this thesis does not contain material that previously written by any other person. She only quotes some materials that are related to the references used, so the content of this thesis is in under the writer's responsibility.

Semarang, August 2019

Arum Setiani

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

Life throws you curve balls, things do not go your way, but please keep trying to have the glimmer of hope of getting better. Something good is on its way.

Alivia Dandrea.

Nek malese teko, ditindes malese.

Sobrun Jamil.

This thesis is dedicated to

Bapak, Ibu, Mbak Nilla, Shelly, Zhico, and Firlo.

APPROVAL

**PRAGMATICS ANALYSIS OF MAXIM FLOUTING CREATING HUMOR IN *HANGOVER*
MOVIE**

Written by:

Arum Setiani

NIM: 13020115120057

is approved by thesis advisor
on August 7, 2019

Thesis advisor

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum.
NIP. 196610041990012001

The Head of English Department

Dr. Agus Subiyanto, M.A.
NIP. 196408141990011001

VALIDATION

Approved by
Strata I Thesis Examination Committee
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University
On August 7, 2019

Chair Person

First Member

Dr. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum.
NIP. 196111091987032001

Mytha Candria, SS., M.A., M.A
NIP. 197701182009122001

Second Member

Third Member

Dr. Agus Subiyanto, MA.
NIP. 196408141990011001

Ayu Ida Savitri, S.S., M.Hum.
NIP. 1979082220008012013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thanks to the almighty God, Allah SWT who gives me time, chance, and fortune to finish this thesis on “**Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Creating Humor in *Hangover* Movie**”. On this occasion, I would like to express my gratitude to some people who help and motivate me in doing my research.

My biggest gratitude is addressed to Dr. Nurhayati, M. Hum as my thesis advisor who always patiently gives me advice, guidance, and correction during completing this thesis.

My deepest thank also goes to the following:

1. Dr. Nurhayati, M. Hum, as the Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
2. Dr. Agus Subiyanto, MA, as the Head of English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
3. Dra. Cut Puan Ellisafny, M. Ed, as my academic supervisor.
4. All lecturers in English Department, particularly in Linguistics section Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
5. My wonderful parents, Rustamaji and Waryuni, who give their endless support and pray. I know it is not much but I do this thesis with all of my heart to make you guys proud.
6. My sisters and brothers, Nilla, Shely, Zhico, and Firlo, who always give extra strength to me.
7. My loyal roommate, Nia Herdiyanti, thank you for sharing your snacks, noodles, parfume and many other things.
8. My Baskoro Buddies, Pute and Santi, thanks for every single thing you guys have done for me. Both of you would never know how grateful I am for having you guys as my very best friends. Also Deny, you really need to know that I am proud of our comradeship even though we fight a lot.
9. All of my English Department friends, especially those people from class B, you guys are rock.
10. Gita Bahana Arisatya that has a bunch of people that became my stress release surrounding
11. Everyone who is helping me to finish this thesis successfully.

I would be really delighted to receive any suggestion or criticism for this thesis since I realize that this thesis is still far from perfect. However, I hope this thesis can be useful for researchers in the future especially those who are interested in maxim and humor.

Semarang, August 2019

Arum Setiani

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLES.....	i
PRONOUNCEMENT.....	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION.....	iii
APPROVAL.....	iv
VALIDATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
ABSTRACT.....	xiii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Research Question.....	3
1.3 Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.4 Scope and Limitation of the Study.....	4
1.5 Previous Studies.....	4
1.6 Organization of the Writing.....	7
CHAPTER II LITERARY REVIEW.....	9
2.1 Humor.....	9
2.2 Cooperative Principle.....	12
2.3 Maxim Flouting.....	13

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD.....	17	
3.1 Type of Research.....	17	
3.2 Data, Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique.....	17	
3.3 Method of Collecting Data.....	18	
3.4 Method of Analyzing Data.....	18	
 CHAPTER IV FINDING AND DISCUSSION.....	 19	
4.1. Findings.....	19	
4.2..... Discussion		22
4.2.1. Types of Humor Found in <i>Hangover</i> movie.....	22	
4.2.2. Maxim Floutings Found in <i>Hangover</i> movie.....	29	
4.2.3. How Maxim Flouting Can Create Humor.....	32	
 CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION.....	 43	
REFERENCES.....	45	
APPENDIX	47	

ABSTRAK

Dalam proses komunikasi menggunakan suatu bahasa, humor sering terjadi baik disengaja maupun tidak. Humor dapat disampaikan melalui gambar, ujaran, atau ekspresi wajah. Dalam suatu percakapan, penutur sering menciptakan humor melalui pelanggaran maksim. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengungkap jenis humor apa saja yang terjadi dalam film komedi *Hangover* dan bagaimana pelanggaran maksim yang ditemukan dalam film *Hangover* dapat menimbulkan humor. Dalam penelitian ini, metode observasi non partisipan digunakan dalam proses pengumpulan data. Penulis menggunakan teori humor dari Salvatore Attardo dan teori Prinsip Kerja Sama oleh Paul Grice dalam pengolahan data. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan terdapat 3 jenis humor yang ditemukan dalam film *Hangover*. Humor yang ditemukan dalam film *Hangover* disampaikan oleh penutur melalui pelanggaran maksim kebenaran, pelanggaran maksim kuantitas, pelanggaran maksim keterkaitan, pelanggaran maksim sikap. Pelanggaran-pelanggaran maksim yang terjadi dalam film *Hangover* dapat menimbulkan humor karena pelanggaran-pelanggaran tersebut memenuhi salah satu kriteria dari teori humor yang diusulkan oleh Salvatore Attardo.

Kata kunci: pelanggaran maksim, implikatur, humor, film *Hangover*.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

People as social being have to build interaction with others in order to fulfill their need. In this social interaction, it's nearly impossible for people to not to communicate. Communication is known as a process that involves sending and receiving information between two or more participants. The participant who sends the message or information is termed the sender, while the participant who receives the message is termed the receiver. Communication is also identified as a process of reaching mutual understanding. The message is exchanged between the sender and the receiver through a general system such as language, signs, or behaviors. The sender has a responsibility to encode the message, while the receiver must decode the message and find its meaning. The message conveyed in communication can include many things such as ideas, opinions, beliefs, facts, attitude and even emotions or feelings.

In conveying the message, people sometimes create humor. It is established when something causes amusement. Something might be considered funny by some people, but sometimes it might be not. It depends on many aspects such as culture, age, level of education, and personal experience. Humor is usually delivered through words, utterances, pictures, moves, or even facial

expressions. In conversation, humor often occurs when speakers flout the conversational maxims. Flouting maxim is an act in which the speakers patently fail to observe the maxims in order to reach another intention. They do not intend to lead the listeners get into a misleading but they want their listeners catch a meaning that is different from the expressed meaning.

The focus of this study is on the types of humor found in *Hangover* movie and maxim flouting performed by the characters of this movie. Another focus of this study is how maxim flouting can create humor. This study involves an American comedy movie entitled *Hangover* movie. *Hangover* is a Warner Bros movie directed by Tod Phillips and written by Jon Lucas and Scott Moore in 2009. It has four main characters that are Doug Billings (Justin Bartha), Phil Wenneck (Bradley Cooper), Stu Price (Ed Helms), and Alan Garner (Zach Galifianakis). Doug Billings is getting married with his lovely woman, Tracy Garner (Sasha Barrese), in two days. Before walk down the aisle, he decides to go to Las Vegas to have a bachelor party with his two buddies, Phil Wenneck and Stu Price, and Tracy's brother, Alan Garner. One morning, the three men wake up in a huge mess without Doug. They can not remember a thing what happen after they had a little private party at the rooftop the night before. They wake up and find a chicken in the room, a baby in the wardrobe, and even a tiger in the bathroom. All of those things help them to track down where Doug is. After searching for Doug for a very long time, they find him in an unpredictable place and prepare him for the wedding in a very little time.

The first reason that led the writer chose *Hangover* as the object is because this movie was the best comedy movie in 2009. This is evidenced by many awards given for this movie. *Hangover* has received an award for Best Motion Picture-Musical and Comedy in a huge annual ceremony, Golden Globe Awards. *Hangover* also won other three awards as Best Comedy Film in Broadcast Film Critics Association Awards, MTV Movie Award, and St. Louis Gateway Film Critics Association Awards. Besides, many maxim floutings occur in conversations between the characters of this movie.

1.2. Research Questions

In conducting this study, the writer focuses on the following problems:

- a. What are types of humor found in *Hangover* movie?
- b. What are maxim floutings performed in *Hangover* movie?
- c. How can maxim floatings performed by the characters in *Hangover* movie create humor?

1.3. Purpose of the Study

This study aims at investigating the types of humor found in *Hangover* movie.

This study also identifies what maxim flouting found in *Hangover* movie and how maxim flouting can create humor.

1.4. Scope and Limitation of the Study

The scope of this study covers the three types of humor found in *Hangover* movie and maxim flouting produced by all of the characters in *Hangover* movie. The analysis of humor in this study covers three types of humor which are hostility humor, incongruity humor, and release humor. Another analysis that is about maxim flouting covers quantity maxim, quality maxim, relation maxim, and manner maxim.

1.5. Previous Studies

Some researchers had been conducted some studies relating to the topic of this study. Niclas Andersen (2013) conducted a study that investigates maxim flouting in comedy series entitled *Community*. This research aimed to discover what maxims are flouted the most and what maxims flouting from each character that create comedy. This study also examined the functions of maxim flouting found in *Community* comedy series. The results showed the maxim flouting that frequently appeared is quantity maxim flouting, and there are some characters that use maxim flouting more often than others. The disadvantage of this study is that the result of the third research problem is not clearly explained. The writer also should use a theory in determining the functions of the maxim flouting found in *Community* comedy series.

Septi Dyah Anggraini (2014) initiated to conduct a research entitled *A Pragmatic Analysis of Humor in Modern Family*. This study focused on the maxim floutings that create humor in *Modern Family* and also the form and the functions of humor created. The results of each research problem are clearly

stated. Nevertheless, the table of the findings with many abbreviations is quite complicated to read as the writer did not put the notes of the abbreviation under the table.

Aditya Putra Wardana (2015) tried to analyze the violation of Gricean Maxims as verbal humor in a series entitled *The Big Bang Theory*. Qualitative approach was applied for this study. The writer claimed that he used Grice's theory of maxim and humor theory proposed by Salvatore Attardo to examine the data. However, the results majorly showed only the violation of maxims found in *The Big Bang Theory*. It becomes the disadvantage of this study as the writer did not clearly explain how humor theory applied for analyzing the data.

Bagus Destrianto (2018) investigated humorous effect on flouting conversational maxims in Indonesian drama comedy named *Bajaj Bajuri Spesial Lebaran*. This study dealt with maxim flouting found in *Bajaj Bajuri* drama comedy and its humorous effect. In observing the data, the writer used descriptive qualitative approach. The disadvantage of this study lied in the theory that is applied. In analyzing maxim flouting, the writer applied Grice's conversational maxim theory while in observing the humorous effect appeared, the writer did not involve any humor theory.

Ade Dwi Irjayanti (2018) conducted a study in finding humorous effect created by maxim flouting in *Deadpool*. The results of this study revealed that there are some ways of delivering quality maxim flouting done by Deadpool such as hyperbole, banter, irony, and sarcasm. Another result of the study was

humorous effect created by Deadpool's quality maxim flouting. The writer should have explained more why the data belong to quality maxim flouting before she further explained about the ways of maxim flouting and the humorous effect.

Unlike the previous studies above, the focus of this study is types of humor found in *Hangover* movie. The novelty of this study is that the writer examines how maxim flouting can create humor and finds out that there are some maxim floutings that do not create humor.

1.6. Writing Organization

This writing organization consists of a general description of the content structurally started from chapter I until chapter V.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with some parts like background of the study (1.1), research questions (1.2), purpose of the study (1.3), scope and limitation of the study (1.4), previous study (1.5), and writing organization (1.6).

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter consists of theories used by the writer in analyzing the data. The parts of this chapter are implicature (2.1), context (2.2), cooperative Principle (2.3), maxim flouting (2.4), and humor (2.5).

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH METHOD

The points in this chapter are research design (3.1), data and data sources (3.2), data collection (3.3), and data analysis (3.4).

CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS

This chapter reveals the result of analysis and the explanation to answer the formulation of problem that has been mentioned in chapter I using the theories in analysis method in chapter II.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter consists of the summary of the analysis result in chapter IV and the writer's suggestion for the future researchers.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Humor

According to Ross (2005: 2) in his book entitled *The Language of Humour*, humor is simply defined as something that makes a person laugh or smile. Humor is used by people when they try to show affiliation to their group. Blake (2007:3) points out that in humor, sometimes what strikes some people as funny will not strike other people in the same way.

Based on many modern theories of humor, Attardo (1994:47) formulates three major types of humor which are hostility humor, incongruity humor, and release humor.

a. Hostility Humor

Hostility humor is also known as assertive or superiority humor. In this type of humor, humor is delivered in an aggressive way. According to Attardo (1994:49-50), Plato, Aristotle, and Thomas Hobbes are the most influential proponents of hostility theory. The earliest theory by Plato and Aristotle states this theory deals with the negative element of humor. The negative side of humor is mainly used to denigrate or humiliate others' unluckiness. Plato and Aristotle emphasize that laughter is a mean of power when it is used to ridicule someone's

faults or flaws, so that it expresses someone's feeling of being superior towards the interlocutors.

Hobbes in Attardo (1994:50) presents a term named 'a butt of joke' that refers to the target of the humor or anything that is being laughed at. A butt of joke is usually someone's imperfection or unfortune. The butt of joke is also can be the speaker's imperfection. It is called self-deprecation. Self-deprecation means targeting oneself as the object of humor. Exposing someone's flaws or dissabilities, talking about failures in the past, and mentioning one's mistakes are examples of self-deprecation. Hobbes also uses another term named 'sudden glory' to indicate humorous experience comes because of an expression of a superiority feeling of a human being towards another human being.

b. Incongruity Humor

Attardo (1994:47) states that Immanuel Kant and Schopenhauer are philosophers who are associated with humor of incongruity. Kant opines laughter emanates from a sudden conversion of an expectation into nothing. Meanwhile, Schopenhauer assumes that laughter is the expression of incongruity. Laughter is occurs when there is incongruity between a concept and the real objects. (Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Idea*, 1819, cited in Attardo, 1994: 48).

Another idea of incongruity is proposed by McGhee in Attardo (1994:48). He points out that incongruity is the relationships between components such as idea, event, and social expectation. Incongruous is perceived when the arrangement of the component is incompatible with the normal or the expected

pattern. Ross (2005:8) declares three requirements to build humor related to incongruity. First requirement is there is a conflict between what is expected and what actually occurs in the joke. The second requirement is the conflict caused by an ambiguity in language. The last requirement is there is punch line that resolves the conflict.

Referring to the explanation above, humor of incongruity occurs when there are differences between what is expected and what later happens. Humor is created by two conflicting meanings, which are the mental pattern or expectation that people have in mind and how will it turn out. When what is expected turns into something unnormal or different from the normal or expected patterns, it is considered as incongruous.

c. Release Humor

Attardo (1994:50) states that release humor deals with comment on feelings and psychology. This type of humor is basically based on the idea that humor is used to release tension and physic energy. Green in Riley (2017:149) assumes that humor is usually used to provide relief. Humor is found in jokes to antidote to personal tension or pain and helps to neutralize the pain.

Humor can be perceived when someone releases the stress, tension, inhibitions, and pain through activities, events, or other stimulus. When someone's tension is released, he will feel liberated. In conclusion, release theory of humor is a theory in which someone who is being controlled or suppressed releases the tension and energy.

2.2. Cooperative Principle

Cooperative principle is a term that commonly appears related to conversational implicature. Conversational implicature can be perceived as something that is implied in a conversation. As Paul Grice (1991: 26) claims there are some certain features in discourse that essentially connected with conversational implicature, called cooperative principle or known as CP. The cooperative principle is a concept in which speakers have to be efficiently contributed in the conversation.

There are four attendant conversational maxims related to the principle: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Quantity maxim deals with the sufficient contribution of the speakers in the conversation. The speakers have to give a response as much as their interlocutors need. The maxim of quantity will not be fulfilled if they are being too informative or less informative. Quality maxim is about genuineness. The speakers are not allowed to say something that they believe to be false. The speakers are also not allowed to say something they lack of adequate proof. Maxim of relation deals with relevancy of the context in a conversation. The speakers have to response relevantly towards their interlocutors' utterance. Another type of maxim is manner maxim. It covers ambiguity and prolixity in a conversation. The speakers are expected to be perspicuous and brief (Grice, 1991:26). There are two different ways of conducting the maxims of conversation: observance of maxims and the non-observance of maxims.

1. Observance of Maxim

The speakers follow the maxims in Grice's cooperative principle and manage to observe the maxims in the conversation they involve. The example of observance of maxim below is presented below.

Husband : Where are the car keys?

Wife : They're on the table in the hall.

Wife's contribution in the conversation above shows observance of maxims. She has answered clearly (manner) and given the right amount of information for her husband's question (quantity). The answer is also conformable with the husband's question (relation).

2. Non-observance of Maxim

Non-observance of maxim occurs in a conversation when there is a participant who does not obey the maxim. Non-observance of maxim can be further subdivided into some types which are infringing maxim, violating maxim, opting out maxim, suspending maxim, and flouting maxim.

2.3. Maxim Flouting

Maxim flouting occurs when the speakers blatantly fail to observe a maxim. They do not intend to mislead the hearer but they try to deliver their implicit meaning different from the expressed or surface meaning. Some examples for flouting of maxim are as follow:

1. Flouting the Maxim of Quality

Speaker flouts quality maxim when they deliver something that is believed to be false and something without sufficient evidence. Irony, hyperbole, and sarcasm are some strategies usually used in delivering flouting maxim of quality.

For example:

Barley: What do you do?

Anna: I'm a teacher.

Barley: Where do you teach?

Anna: Outer Mongolia!

Barley: Sorry to ask.

From dialogue above, Anna uses sarcasm in delivering the flouting maxim of quality. Barley can interpret that Anna was not pleased with his attention through Anna's response since "outer Mongolia" is seen as somewhere impossibly remote.

2. Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

This flouting maxim occurs when the speaker blatantly provides either too much information or less information. For example:

Interviewer: What do you think of Tony Blair as Prime Minister?

Interviewee: He's always well dressed, great smile and he likes Jazz.

The interviewee obviously flouts the maxim of quantity by providing insufficient information towards the question. Even though the interviewee seemed uncooperative, they might implicate something by giving the answer above. They might think that Tony Blair can not be rated as Prime Minister.

3. Flouting the Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation is flouted when speakers are being irrelevant to the topic in a conversation. They commonly flout relation maxim by abruptly changing the subject or clearly failing to address the other's person goal in asking question (Thomas, 2013:70). For example:

Marry: Have you washed the dishes, Maggie?

Maggie: When is Uncle Tom coming?

According to the dialogue, Maggie is not being relevant. By changing the subject, she implies that she has not washed the dishes.

4. Flouting the Maxim of Manner

The speakers flout the maxim of manner when they deliver something that generates ambiguity and obscurity for their interlocutors. The flouting of maxim manner also arises when the speakers give long-windedness utterances. For example:

This conversation occurred during a radio interview with an un-named official from the United States Embassy in Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

Interviewer : Did the United States play any role Duvalier's departure? Did they, for example, encourage him to leave?

Official : I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion.

Instead of simply replying "Yes", the official chooses to flout the maxim of manner by delivering a long-winded and intricate answer. The official might implicate that the conclusion is still a hypothesis that we have not known about the truth yet.

CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

3. 1. Type of Research

This study is categorized as descriptive qualitative research as the writer focused on classifying the object and did not employ statistical analysis in obtaining the findings. Descriptive research is research involving the process of defining, classifying, or categorizing (Marczyk et al, 2005:16). This study also can be categorized into quantitative research in terms of the numerical data of occurrences.

3. 2. Data, Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The data used in this study are utterances derived from *Hangover* movie script written by Jon Lucas and Scott Moore in 2007. The movie script is taken from http://springfieldspringfield.co.uk/movie_script.php?movie=hangover-the. The population of this study is all the utterances containing maxim flouting performed by all the characters in *Hangover* movie. The purposive sampling technique is applied in this study as the writer chose certain utterances that represent each type of maxim flouting.

3. 3. Method of Collecting Data

For this study, the writer used non-participant observation method since there was no participant involved in collecting the data. Sudaryanto (2015:203) argued that observation method is *simak* method in which the writers analyze and observe the data merely from the written sources. In collecting the data, the writer read the movie script frequently to check the accuracy of the movie script. The last step in collecting the data is note taking. The writer made some notes and marked all the utterances containing maxim flouting.

3. 4. Method of Analyzing Data

The method of data analysis used by the writer in this study is pragmatic identity method. Sudaryanto (2015:18) suggested that pragmatic identity method covers all the reactions and responses of a speech which are produced by speakers. For this study, some steps are done by the writer in analyzing the data:

- a. After collecting the data, the writer classified the utterances according to the types of maxim flouting
- b. The writer observed the implicature of all maxim floutings
- c. Then, the writer examined whether all the maxim floutings found in this movie create humor.

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the writer presents the results of the study into two subchapters. The first subchapter reveals the findings of this study represented in tables while the second subchapter contains the discussion of the findings. In the second subchapter, the writer explains how maxim floutings found in *Hangover* movie can create humor.

4.1. Findings

4.1.1 Types of Humor Found in *Hangover* Movie

The three types of humor proposed by Attardo are found in *Hangover* movie. The number of occurrence of each type of humor is showed in the following table.

Table 1. Types of Humor Found in *Hangover* Movie

No.	Types of Humor	Occurrence
1.	Hostility Humor	7
2.	Incongruity Humor	13
3.	Release Humor	11
Total		31

4.1.2 Maxim Floutings Found in *Hangover* Movie

The four types of maxim flouting are found in *Hangover* movie. All the processes that have been analyzed are showed in the following table.

Table 2. Maxim Flouting Found in *Hangover* Movie

No	Type of Maxim Flouting	Frequency
1.	Quality	11
2.	Quantity	12
3.	Relation	3
4.	Manner	3
Total		29

According to the table 2, the flouting of maxim that frequently appeared in *Hangover* movie is the flouting maxim of quality with 12 occurrences. Afterwards, the second place is taken by quality maxim flouting with 11 occurrences. The frequency of both relation maxim flouting and manner flouting maxim are in the same number of occurrence that is 3.

4.1.3 Maxim Floutings that Create Humor in *Hangover* Movie

Most of maxim floutings found in *Hangover* movie create humor. However, there are also some maxim floutings that do not create humor. Those maxim floutings simply contain implied meanings without any kind sense of humor proposed by Attardo. The data are presented in the following table.

Table 3. Maxim Floutings that Create Humor in *Hangover* Movie

No.	Maxim Floutings	Create Humor	Do not Create Humor
		Frequency	Frequency
1.	Quality	10	2
2.	Quantity	9	2

3.	Relation	3	-
4.	Manner	3	-
Total		25	4

As can be seen from the table above, maxim floutings found in *Hangover* movie create humor situation for the most part. There are 25 data of maxim flouting containing humor in total. The flouting of quality maxim created humor situation 10 times while the flouting of quantity maxim established humor situation 9 times. However, there are 4 data of flouting maxims that do not create humor situation which include 2 data of quality maxim flouting and 2 data of quantity maxim flouting.

4. 2. Discussion

As the writer mentioned before, the three types of humor proposed by Attardo are practically found in *Hangover* movie. Hostility humor occurs 7 times in this movie while release humor occurs 11 times. The most dominant type of humor that is performed in this movie is incongruity humor with 13 occurrences.

4.2.1. Types of Humor Found in *Hangover* Movie

4.2.1.1. Hostility Humor

The number of occurrence of this type of humor is the smallest in *Hangover* movie. There are 7 hostility humor found in this movie. This humor occurs when someone's unfortune or imperfection is used as the object of humor.

Speaker's imperfection or flaws also can be the target of humor. It is called self-deprecation. Hostility humor also occurs when someone has superiority feeling towards others.

The first example of hostility humor found in *Hangover* movie is taken from a conversation between Phil and one of his students. Phil was on his way to meet Doug and Alan when suddenly one of his students called him.

(1) Phi's student : Mr. Wenneck, I was...

Phil : **It's the weekend. I don't know you. You do not exist.**

From the conversation (1), Phil delivered hostility humor by saying that his student did not exist. His utterance shows that Phil felt superior over his student. He did want to talk to his student because his working time was over and it was weekend already.

The second example of hostility humor occurred when Phil, Stu, and Alan met the doctor who handled Phil the night before.

(2) Doctor : Okay, here we go. Patient name, Phil Wenneck, 2:45 am

arrival. Minor concussion like I said. Some bruising. Pretty standard.

Stu : Do you mind if I look? I'm actually a doctor.

Doctor : **Yeah, you said that several times last night. But really, you're just a dentist.**

In conversation (2), hostility humor lies on the doctor's rejection when Stu asked to take a look at Phil's medical record. Same as the previous example, the hostility humor appeared since something is used as the butt of the joke. In this

dialogue, the doctor used Stu's job as the butt of the joke. Besides, the word 'just' in the doctor's utterance showed that he felt superior over Stu. The doctor said that Stu is just a dentist, and he probably assumed that Stu would not be able to read the medical record.

The third example of hostility humor is a conversation involving Phil and Stu. This conversation occurred in an elevator when they were on their way to get a breakfast.

- (3) Receptionist : Hello. Checking in?
- Stu : Yeah. We have a reservation under Dr. Price.
- Receptionist : Okay, let me look that up for you.
- Phil : Dr. Price? Stu, you're a dentist, okay? **Don't try and get fancy.**
- Stu : It's not fancy if it's true.
- Phil : (Talking to the receptionist) **He's a dentist. Don't get too excited. And if, uh, someone has a heart attack, you should still call 911.**

In conversation above, Stu's job is used as the object of humor again. Phil used Stu's job as the butt of joke when he said that Stu was trying to get fancy by adding the title 'dr' in his name for the room reservation. He even made a joke that Stu would not be able to handle heart attack case because he was a dentist.

4.2.1.2. Incongruity Humor

Incongruity humor is the type of humor that frequently appears in *Hangover* movie. There are 13 occurrences of incongruity humor in this movie. Incongruity humor happens in three conditions which are what is expected is different with what actually occurs in the joke, there is a conflict caused by ambiguity in a conversation, and there is a punch line that resolves the conflict.

The following conversation is the first example of incongruity humor found in *Hangover* movie. This is a conversation between Stu and Melissa. Stu was waiting for Phil, Alan, and Doug to pick him up when suddenly Melissa told her boyfriend that she was worried Stu would go to a strip club. She also said that strip clubs are filthy places.

(4) Melissa: That's somebody's daughter up there.

Stu : I was just gonna say that.

Melissa: See? I just wish your friends were as mature as you.

Stu : They are mature, actually. You just have to get to know them better.

Phil and Alan: **Paging Dr. Faggot! Dr. Faggot!**

In this conversation (4), incongruity humor is generated because there is a conflict between what is expected (Stu's friends were as mature as Stu) and what actually occurs (Stu's friends were being childish when they called Stu Dr. Faggot).

The second example of incongruity humor occurred when Phil, Doug, Stu, and Alan had arrived at the hotel where they stayed in Las Vegas named Caesars Palace.

(5) Alan: Can I ask you another question?

Receptionist: Sure.

Alan: **You probably get this a lot. This isn't the real Caesars Palace, is it?**

Receptionist: What do you mean?

Alan: **Did, uh... Did Caesar live here?**

Receptionist: Um, no.

Alan: I didn't think so.

Caesars Palace was built in 1966 to create an opulent facility that gave guests a sense of life during the Roman Empire. In conversation (5), Alan suddenly asked a strange question to the receptionist. He asked whether the place was the real Caesars Palace. He also asked whether Caesar lived there. Alan's questions create perplexity so that incongruity humor is perceived.

The last example of incongruity humor was performed by Stu. Stu, Phil, Alan, and the baby were in the car and were about to go. Stu was in a call with his girlfriend, Melissa, while suddenly some people came and attacked them.

(6) Melissa : What the fuck, Stu? Is that a baby?

Stu : **Why would there be a baby? We're at a winery. That's a goat. Sir, can you please start the tractor so we can get out of here.**

Phil : I'm trying to, but we're fucking blocked.

In conversation (6), incongruity humor happened because what Stu expected was not the same as what happened at that time. Stu expected his

girlfriend ended the conversation, but in reality Melissa was getting more curious when she heard a baby cried. Stu ended up said that it was not a baby but a goat. Stu also expected he and his friends could escape from the people who attacked them, but they were trapped. It can be seen from Stu's utterance that urged Phil to start the car "Sir, can you please start the tractor so we can get out of here."

4.2.1.3. Release Humor

The number of occurrence of release humor in *Hangover* movie is slightly lesser than the number of occurrence of incongruity humor. There are 11 occurrences of incongruity humor in this movie. Release humor occurs when speakers release their tension, frustration, pain, or inhibitions. Someone who releases their tension or energy will feel liberated.

The first example of release humor found in *Hangover* movie was performed by Phil. He and his friends were on their way to Las Vegas.

(7) Phil : You know I drive great when I'm drunk.

Stu : True. Don't forget, Phil was always our designated drunk driver.

Doug : Yeah. You wanna explain it to them, Alan?

Alan : Guys, my dad loves this car more than he loves me, so, yeah.

Phil : Aw, whatever. I left my wife and kid at home so I could go with you guys. You know how difficult that was?

Alan : That's really sweet.

Stu : Yeah.

Phil : **Dude, I was being sarcastic. I fucking hate my life. I may never go back. I might stay in Vegas.**

From the conversation (7), release humor occurs when Phil used his utterance to release his frustration towards Alan and Stu. He frustrated because Alan and Stu could not catch his intention. Phil might intend to get sympathy from his friends so that he could drive the car and had fun. However, his friends failed to observe his intention.

The next example of release humor found in this movie is a conversation involving Phil, Doug, and Stu. Phil and Doug entered the bedroom and asked Stu to hurry. Stu told Phil and Doug that he had something to say. Stu showed a ring and said that he would propose his girlfriend, Melissa. Phil seemed not too happy because he remembered that Melissa was too protective over Stu. Besides, he once cheated on Stu with a bartender.

(8) Stu : She's strong-willed. And I respect that.

Phil : Wow. Wow. He's in denial. Not to mention, she fucked a sailor.

Doug : Hey, he wasn't a sailor. He was a bartender on a cruise ship. You know that.

Stu : **Guys, I'm standing right here. So I can hear everything that you're saying.**

From the conversation above, release humor occurs when Stu released his tension through his utterance. He was annoyed because Phil and Doug were arguing about his girlfriend, Melissa.

The third example of release humor performed in this movie is a conversation between Phil, Stu, and Alan.

(9) Drug dealer: We were at the Bellagio? We were shooting craps. You don't remember?

Stu: **No. No, we don't remember. Because some crazy drug dealer sold him Ruphylin and told him it was ecstasy.**

According to the conversation (9), Stu created release humor when he used his utterance to release his frustration. He frustrated because the drug dealer asked him whether he remember the night before while the drug dealer was the one who made him hangover. Stu and his friends could not remember anything because they consumed Ruphylin.

4.2.2. Maxim Floutings Found in *Hangover* Movie

4.2.2.1. Flouting of Quantity Maxim

Maxim of quantity flouting occurs when a speaker provides too much or too little information. Some characters in *Hangover* movie flout maxim of quantity quite often. This flouting happens 11 times which makes this as the second most dominant maxim flouting found in this movie.

The first example of the quantity maxim flouting is taken from a conversation that occurred in the villa when Stu showed a beautiful ring to Doug and Phil. Stu planned to propose his girlfriend, Melissa, after he got back from the bachelor party.

- (10) Doug : It's a beautiful ring.
 Stu : **It's my grandmother's. She made it all the way through the Holocaust with that thing.**

According to the conversation (10), Stu blatantly flouted maxim of quantity as he provided too much information towards Doug's utterance. Instead of saying thank you or giving a simple expression of agreement that the ring was beautiful, Stu made his contribution more informative than what was required. He explained that the ring belonged to his grandmother who managed to get all the way through Holocaust with that ring. Holocaust is a term referred to genocide during World War II (1941-1945) in which more than five million people murdered. Through his utterance, Stu's utterance implies that the ring was very special to him.

4.2.2.2. Flouting of Quality Maxim

Maxim of quality is flouted when the speaker produces utterances that they believe to be false. Saying something that lack of adequate evidence is also considered as flouting of quality maxim. In *Hangover* movie, the number of occurrence of quality maxim flouting is slightly lower than the flouting of quantity maxim. Maxim of quality is flouted 10 times in this movie.

The following dialogue is an example of quality maxim flouting found in *Hangover* movie. It is a conversation between Stu and his girlfriend, Melissa. After checking all the things that Stu needed to bring, Melissa seemed not too happy about the bachelor party. She was worried that Stu would go to some strip club with his friends. She was worried that Stu would do some crazy things that people usually do in a bachelor party.

(11) Stu : What is the matter?

 Melissa : I don't know. I hope you're not gonna go to some strip club when you're up there.

 Stu : **Melissa, we're going to Napa Valley.**

In conversation (11), Stu flouted the maxim of quality because he delivered an utterance that he believed to be false. Through his utterance, he implied that he would not go to strip club since he was going to Napa Valley, a place that is famous for its winery. Meanwhile, he and his friends were going to Las Vegas. They also went to a strip club there.

4.2.2.3. Flouting of Relation Maxim

The speakers flout maxim of relation when they give irrelevant response to their interlocutors. In *Hangover* movie, this maxim flouting appeared 3 times. The following dialogue is the first example of relation maxim flouting found in *Hangover* movie. This example is taken from a conversation between Stu, Alan, and Phil.

(12) Stu : You know, everyone says Mike Tyson is such a bad ass but I think he's kind of sweetheart.

Alan : I think he's mean.

Phil : **I think it's officially time we call Tracy.**

In conversation (12), Phil made an irrelevant contribution in the conversation. He deliberately flouted the maxim of relation since he ignored the context of the conversation. Instead of stating what he thought about Mike Tyson, he said that that was the time to call Tracy. Through his utterance, Phil might imply that Stu and Alan were wasting the time. They had to stop talking about Mike Tyson and focused on Doug.

4.2.2.4. Flouting of Manner Maxim

The flouting of manner maxim happened when the speakers produce utterances that trigger ambiguity or prolixity. The number of occurrence of this maxim flouting in *Hangover* movie is 3 times. The following is one of manner maxim floutings found in this movie.

(13) Alan : Ahem, do you have to park so close?

Doug : Yeah. What's wrong?

Alan : I shouldn't be here.

Doug : Why is that, Alan?

Alan : **I'm not supposed to be within 200 feet of a school.**

Doug : What?

Alan : **Or a Chuck E. Cheese.**

In conversation (13), Alan flouted the maxim of manner maxim because he did not provide a clear answer for Doug. He left Doug in a perplexity. Both school and *Chuck E Cheese* are place that have a lot of children in it. *Chuck E Cheese* is a huge family entertainment in Texas. Through his utterance, Alan might imply that he did not like places with a lot of kids in it.

4.2.3. How Maxim Flouting Can Create Humor in *Hangover* Movie

4.2.3.1. Humor Created by Quantity Maxim Flouting

Quantity maxim flouting is the maxim flouting that frequently appears in *Hangover* movie. Most of maxim floutings in *Hangover* movie create humor. The first example is quantity maxim flouting that create hostility humor. It is a conversation between Alan and Doug when they were riding to Las Vegas.

(14) Alan: It says here we should work in teams. Who wants to be my spotter?

Doug: **I don't think you should be doing too much gambling tonight, Alan.**

In conversation (14), Doug deliberately flouted the maxim of quantity because he ignored Alan's question and did not provide sufficient information for his interlocutor. This maxim flouting creates humor because it fullfils one of the criteria of humor types proposed by Attardo. Humor created in this maxim flouting is hostility humor because one of the participants feels superior over other

participants. Through his utterance, Doug, who was marrying Alan's sister, felt superior to Alan and forbade Alan to gamble.

The following quantity maxim flouting occurred when Phil, Stu, and Doug were in hospital. They went to the hospital after they found hospital wristband on Phil's pocket. Phil, Stu and Alan managed to meet the doctor. They also asked some questions in hope they would find a clue to find their missing friend, Doug.

(15) Phil: Best Little Chapel, do you know where that is?

Doctor: **I do. It's at the corner of Get A Map and Fuck Off. I'm a doctor, not a tour guide. Figure it out yourself, okay? You're big boys.**

According to conversation (15), quantity maxim flouting was performed by the doctor because he gave insufficient contribution. He did not provide enough information for Phil's question. The doctor might deliberately flouted the maxim of quantity in order to inform Phil that he did not have time to tell the exact location as he had to work. This incongruity humor is created as Phil and friends' expectation was not fulfilled. At first, the doctor seemed going to answer Phil's question, but he ended up drive the three men away and told them to figure out themselves.

Another quantity maxim flouting that creates humor in *Hangover* movie is a conversation involving Phil and Alan. Phil, Stu, Doug, and Alan had arrived in a luxurious villa in Las Vegas. Phil asked other three guys to get ready in 30 minutes since he planned a toast for Doug on the rooftop with the gorgeous view

of Las Vegas at night. After all the guys dressed up, they were leaving their room and going to the rooftop of the villa. All men were dressed in suits except Alan. He was wearing a tucked t-shirt with washed-off color, sport shoes, and a sling bag in a match color to his t-shirt. Phil, who is a kind of fashionable guy, stared Alan's bag and asked that whether he was actually going to wear that bag.

(16) Phil : You're actually gonna wear that man-purse or are you guys fucking with me?

Alan : **It's where I keep all my things. I get a lot of compliments on this. Plus, it's not a man-purse. It's called a satchel. Indiana Jones wears one.**

According to (16), Alan blatantly flouted the maxim of quantity because he was being too informative about his bag. Alan would be considered being cooperative in that conversation if he answered by simply saying yes or no. Alan might imply that he was really going to wear the bag by telling Phil that he got many compliments on that. He also added information that the bag he wore was not a man-purse but a satchel. The utterance "Indiana Jones wears one" might further imply that the bag was cool since it was used by a popular movie character. This maxim flouting creates humor because through his utterance, Alan released his tension or his frustration about Phil who seemed not too happy about Alan's bag.

4.2.3.2. Humor Created by Quality Maxim Flouting

Quality maxim flouting happens when one of the participants in a conversation delivers something that they believe to be false or something that they lack of adequate evidence. In *Hangover* movie, quality maxim flouting is the second most dominant maxim flouting occurred.

The first example of maxim flouting that creates humor is a conversation involving involving Phil and Alan who were arguing about the bag that was worn by Alan.

(17) Alan : It's where I keep all my things. I get a lot of compliments on this. Plus, it's not a man-purse. It's called a satchel. Indiana Jones wears one.

Phil : **So does Joy Behar.**

From the conversation (17), it can be seen that Phil deliberately flouted the maxim of quality because he said something that lack of adequate evidence. This quality maxim flouting creates incongruity humor because there is a punch line performed by Phil. The punch line happens when Phil countered Alan's defense (Indiana Jones wears one) by saying that Joy Behar also worn the same bag. Joy Behar is a 77 year old American comedian. Phil might imply that Alan's bag is old fashioned.

The second quality maxim flouting is a conversation between Phil and Tracy (Doug's bride to be). Phil, Stu, and Alan were in a police office. They were arrested because they stole a police car. While waiting for the interrogation, Phil decided to phone Tracy with hands handcuffed.

(18) Phil : Hey, Tracy! It's Phil.

Tracy : Hey, Phil. Where are you guys?

Phil : **We are at the spa at the hotel.**

In conversation (18), Phil flouted maxim of quality because he delivered information that he believed to be false. Phil produced a quality maxim flouting when he said something untrue. He told Tracy that he and his friends were at the spa at hotel while the reality was not what it said. This maxim flouting contains incongruity humor since there is a conflict between what is expected with what is actually occurred. In this utterance, what Phil said was different with the real condition at the time it is said. He said that he and his friends were at the spa at the hotel while the reality was they were in police office.

The following quality maxim flouting was performed by Stu. He had a conversation with his girlfriend, Melissa, before he off to Las Vegas. Melissa and Stu had been dating for three years. Melissa was an overprotective girlfriend. When Stu was waiting for Phil, Alan, and Doug, Melissa seemed unhappy and wished his boyfriend would not go to strip club. Stu convinced Melissa that he would not do that kind of thing. He also reassured her to not worry since he would not risk Melissa just for a couple of minutes spending time for strippers. Melissa threatened Stu if he did that thing, she would kick his ass.

(19) Stu : And you know what else? Honestly. Why would I risk this (point out Melissa) for a couple of minutes of some 19 year old girl with hard body in school outfit.

Melissa : Yeah, you're right. And if you ever do...

Stu : What?

Melissa : I will fucking kick your ass.

Stu : **Thank you, thank you for that. That is exactly what I need to hear.**

In conversation (19), Stu blatantly flouted the maxim of quality when he said something untrue. He thanked Melissa after she threatened him. This quality maxim flouting generates release humor. The reason why this maxim flouting generates humor is that Stu used his utterance to release his tension. He was being suppressed by Melissa, and he gave thanks to Melissa in order to neutralize his frustration.

4.2.3.3. Humor Created by Relation Maxim Flouting

Relation maxim deals with relevancy. People flout the maxim of relation when they give irrelevant response or answer. In *Hangover* movie, all relation maxim floutings create humor. People usually flout the maxim of relation by abruptly changing the subject.

The first relation maxim flouting that creates humor in this movie is a conversation between Phil, Alan, and Stu.

(20) Stu : You know, everyone says Mike Tyson is such a bad ass but I think he's kind of sweetheart.

Alan : I think he's mean.

Phil : **I think it's officially time we call Tracy.**

According to conversation (20), Phil deliberately flouted the maxim of relation when gave an irrelevant response to the context of the conversation. Stu

told his opinion about Mike Tyson. He thought Mike Tyson was not like what people talk about him. He thought Mike Tyson was actually a good person. Alan also revealed what he thought about Mike Tyson. He said that Mike Tyson was mean because he did not treat Alan as the same as he treated Phil and Stu when they were in his house. Meanwhile, Phil, who looked depressed, created release humor by saying “I think it's officially time we call Tracy.” At that time, they run out of clue to find their friend, Doug. They did not know where they headed to. Phil was the one who really upset. He used his utterance to antidote his worry or frustration.

The following conversation is a conversation in which relation maxim flouting occurs. This conversation happened when Phil, Stu, and Alan finally found Doug. The relation maxim flouting was performed by Doug. After a very long search and journey, they found Doug in an unexpected place. Phil, Stu, and Alan found Doug at the rooftop of the villa where they did a toast the night before. Doug laid down helpless and seemed so weak. He was still wearing his bathrobe and was not really conscious because of the hangover effect. Phil, Stu, and Alan were really happy.

- (21) Phil : Hey, bud. You okay?
 Doug : No. Not okay.
 Phil : You got some color. I'm jealous.
 Doug : **I'm getting married today.**

Based on the conversation (21), Doug flouted the maxim of relation because he gave an irrelevant response towards Phil's utterance. Through his

response, Doug might imply that he did not want to hear a joke because he needed to get ready for his wedding. This relation maxim flouting creates humor since Doug used his utterance to release his frustration of Phil.

The third relation maxim flouting that creates humor in *Hangover* movie was performed by Stu. The conversation occurred in Doug and Tracy's wedding. While Stu and Alan were eating the cupcakes at Doug's wedding, Melissa came near to them with her angry face. She already knew that Stu did not go to Napa Valley. She realized that Stu was avoiding her since he did not answer her call.

- (22) Melissa : Stu? You avoiding me?
 Stu : Hey, Melissa
 Melissa : What happened to your tooth?
 Stu : **Have you met Alan? Tracy's brother.**

In conversation (22), relation maxim flouting is performed by Stu when he ignored Melissa's question and changed the subject of the conversation. Melissa saw there was something wrong with Stu's tooth. When Melissa asked him what had happened to his tooth, Stu changed the subject by asking whether Melissa had met Alan. Stu deliberately flouted the maxim of relation because he provided irrelevant response. According to his response, he might imply that he did not want to talk about his missing tooth. The further implicature of Stu's utterance is that he did not want to argue with Melissa at his friend's wedding. Release humor was established because Stu tried to use his utterance to neutralize his frustration towards Melissa. He did not want to talk about how he lost a tooth and every problem he got on the bachelor party at the wedding. He did not want to have a fight with Melissa since he lied to her about Las Vegas.

4.2.3.4. Humor Created by Manner Maxim Flouting

Manner maxim flouting happens when one of the participants in a conversation creates obscurity, ambiguity, and perplexity. In manner maxim, speakers are expected to be clear, order, and brief in delivering information.

The first manner maxim flouting that creates humor is taken from a conversation between Phil, Stu, Alan, and the cops. The manner maxim flouting was performed by Phil. Phil, Stu, and Alan were arrested because they stole the police car when they were drunk. The cop informed them that they had to stay until Monday, so they could face the judge. Knowing the fact that the wedding was on Sunday, Phil, Stu, and Alan tried to persuade the cop to let them go. After some trial failed, Phil tried to make a deal with the cop.

(23) Phil: Look, I'm not a cop. I'm no hero. I'm a schoolteacher. But if one of my kids went missing on a field trip..that would look really bad on me.

Cop : What are you getting at?

Stu : Yeah, Phil, what are you getting at?

Phil : No one wants to look bad. We gotta get to a wedding... and you guys don't need people talking about.....how some obnoxious tourists borrowed your squad car last night. But look, the point is, I think we can work out a deal.

In conversation (23), Phil was trying to make a deal with cops. However, in delivering his intention, he deliberately flouted the maxim of manner. He

created prolixity by saying “Look, I'm not a cop. I'm no hero. I'm a schoolteacher. But if one of my kids went missing on a field trip...that would look really bad on me.” Phil’s manner maxim flouting produces humor that includes to hostility humor. The humor lies in Phil’s utterance that can be interpreted as a threat for the cops. Phil felt superior as he had an idea that he could lead people think the cop might not work properly since there were some hangover tourists could take the police car.

The second example is taken from a conversation between Alan, Stu, Phil, and Doug. Alan was back from buying drink and entered the bedroom. He suddenly joined Phil, Doug, and Stu who were already at the bedroom.

- (24) Alan : **Hey, guys. You ready to let the dogs out?**
- Phil : What?
- Stu : Do what?
- Alan : **Let the dogs out. You know. Who let the dogs out.**

According to conversation (24), Alan delivered a strange question as he entered the bedroom. Alan asked his three friends if they were ready to let the dogs out. Alan’s utterance left Phil, Doug, and Stu in silence. By delivering that question, Alan flouted the maxim of manner because he Alan created obscurity for his interlocutors. The obscurity can be seen from the responses delivered by Phil and Stu. The manner maxim flouting performed by Alan creates humor situation based on incongruity humor theory proposed by Attardo. Incongruity humor occurs when a speaker creates ambiguity or punch line as the settlement of the incongruity. In the dialogue above, the incongruity lies in the word ‘dog’ that

might be interpreted either as dog, animal's name, or Doug. The humor occurred when Alan gave a punch line to resolve the incongruity. He uttered his previous utterance in line with a song entitled *Who Let the Dogs Out* by Baha Men.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter states the conclusion and the suggestion of this study. The conclusion concludes the analysis in the previous chapter while the suggestion consists of some suggestions for the future researchers and also the readers of this research.

Based on the finding and the discussion for the first objective, it can be noted that all types of humor are performed by the characters in this movie. Incongruity humor is the most dominant humor performed by the characters in this movie. This type of humor appeared 13 times. The second most dominant humor performed in this movie is release humor with 11 number of occurrence. The number of occurrence of hostility humor in *Hangover* movie is 7.

According to the finding and the analysis for the second objective, it can be noted that all types of maxim are flouted by the characters in this movie. Maxim of quality is the most dominant maxim flouted by the characters in this movie. This maxim flouting appeared 12 times. The second most dominant maxim flouting performed in this movie is quantity maxim flouting with 11 number of occurrence. The number of occurrence of relation and manner maxim floutings in *Hangover* movie are same that is 3 occurrences. The writer concluded that the conversations containing maxim flouting in this movie still run effectively. The main component of communication is not merely the conformity to conversational rules, but it is more tend to the effectiveness of communication. In *Hangover* movie, even though the speakers flouted the maxims, the intended meanings could still be delivered successfully to the interlocutors.

For the finding and the analysis for the third objective, it can be concluded that most of all maxim floutings found in *Hangover* movie create humor. Humor is perceived through maxim flouting when the utterance fullfils one of the criteria of the three types of humor. However, not all maxim floutings found in *Hangover* movie create humor. Among 29 data of maxim floutings, there are 4 data of

maxim flouting that do not create humor in this movie because those four maxim flouting do not fulfill any criteria of the three types of humor.

Some suggestions for other researchers who are willing to conduct a comprehensive study in *Hangover*, they could examine other non-observance maxims such as infringing maxims, opting out maxim, or violating maxims. For the researchers who are more interested in humor in *Hangover*, they can perhaps initiate an in-depth research in many aspects of humor such as forms of humor and functions of humor.

REFERENCES

- Andresen, Niclas. (2013). "Flouting the Maxims in Comedy: An analysis of flouting in the Comedy Series "Community"". Sweden: Karlstads University.
- Anggraini, S.D. (2014). "A Pragmatic Analysis of Humor in Modern Family". Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.
- Attardo, Salvatore. (1994). *Linguistics Theories of Humor*. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

- Blake, Barry J. 2007. *Playing with Words: Humour in the English Language*.
London: Equinox Publishing.
- Cutting, Joan. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students*.
London: Routledge.
- Destrianto, Bagus. (2018). "Humorous Effects on Flouting Conversational Maxims
Found in Indonesian Drama Comedy: A Study of Humor in Language".
Malang: Maulana Malik Ibrahim Islamic State University.
- Grice, Paul. (1991). *Studies in the Way of Words*. London: Harvard University
Press.
- Levinson, C Stephen. (1983). *Pragmatics*. United States of America: Cambridge
University Press.
- Marczyk G, David D.M., and David F. (2005). *Essentials of Research Design and
Methodology*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Mey, Jacob L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Ross, Alison. (2005). *The Language of Humour*. New York: Taylor & Francis e-
Library.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta:
Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Thomas, Jenny. (2013). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*.
United States of America: Routledge.
- Wardhana, A. P. (2015). "The Violation of Gricean Maxim as Verbal Humor in
"The Big Bang Theory"". Bali: Udayana University.
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Internet Sources

<http://www.springfieldspringfield.co.uk/movie_script.php?movie=hangover-the
> (Accessed in February, 2nd 2019)

<<http://www.script-o-rama.com/table2.shtml> > (Accessed in February, 2nd 2019)

APPENDIX

Note:

Ql	: Quality maxim flouting	Inc	: Incongruity humor
Qn	: Quantity maxim flouting	Hos	: Hostility humor
Rl	: Relation maxim flouting	Rel	: Release humor
Mn	: Manner maxim flouting		

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
01/Ql/Inc	<p>Alan: I want you to know, Doug. I'm a steel trap. Whatever happens tonight, I will never, ever, ever, speak a word of it.</p> <p>Doug: Okay. Yeah, I got it. Thank you.</p> <p>I don't think that...</p>	<p>Doug and Alan were having a conversation when they had their last suit fitting before Doug's wedding.</p>	<p>Alan flouted the maxim of quality as he said something that was lack of evidence. He might imply that he really meant it when he told Doug that he would not tell anyone about what happen in Vegas.</p>	<p>This flouting maxim creates humor situation in accordance with incongruity humor. Alan delivered the humor with a hyperbole expression. Doug and Alan were having bachelor party why they would kill someone.</p>

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
	<p>Alan: Seriously. I don't care what happens. I don't care if we kill someone.</p> <p>Doug: What?</p> <p>Alan: You heard me. It's Sin City.</p>			
02//QI/Inc	<p>Phil: How much you got on you?</p> <p>Max: Like 20 bucks</p> <p>Phil: Well, gimme the 20 and I'll cover the rest.</p>	<p>Phil was talking to one of his student, Max. He asked him about the money Max needed to give him for a school activity.</p>	<p>Phil deliberately flouted maxim of quality when he said something he believed to be false. He did not cover the rest of the money, he used the money for the bachelor party instead.</p>	<p>Phil's utterance creates incongruity humor because he did not fulfill the audience's expectation. The audience might expect that Phil would help Max, but Phil used the money for the bachelor party.</p>
03//Mn/Inc	<p>Doug: Why is that, Alan?</p> <p>Alan: I'm not supposed to be within 200 feet of a school.</p> <p>Doug: What?</p> <p>Alan: Or a Chuck E. Cheese.</p>	<p>Doug and Alan were about to go to Vegas. They picked Phil at the school where he teaches. Doug</p>	<p>Alan created manner maxim flouting as he led Doug into obscurity. Alan did not explicitly reveal what he meant. His utterance implies that he did not like crowded place especially with children in it.</p>	<p>Incongruity humor was established when what Alan expected was in contradiction with what actually occurs at that time. Through his utterance, Alan implied that he did not like kids.</p>

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
		parked the car close to the school.		However, at that time he was in a school in which there were many kids.
04/QI/Inc	Melissa: I don't know. I hope you're not gonna go to some strip club when you're up there. Stu: Melissa, we're going to Napa Valley. I don't even think they have strip clubs in wine country.	While waiting for Doug, Phil, and Alan come, Stu had a conversation with Melissa, his girlfriend.	Stu flouted the maxim of quality because he delivered an utterance that he believed to be false. He told Melissa he was going to Napa Valley while the truth is he went to Las Vegas.	Stu's maxim flouting created incongruity humor. He told Melissa he went to Napa Valley, a quiet place that is known by its winery. Meanwhile, he went to Las Vegas and stayed in a very glamorous villa.
05/QI/Rel	Stu: What? Melissa: I will fucking kick your ass Stu: Thank you, thank you for that. That is exactly what I need to hear.	Melissa was worried about Stu who might go to strip club during the bachelor party.	Stu delivered something untrue. He said that Melissa's threat about the strip club was something he exactly needed to hear. The meaning implied was the other way. Stu did not expect to hear that from Melissa.	Release humor was created when Stu said Melissa's threat was something he really needed to hear. This expression shows that Stu was releasing his personal tension.

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
06/Ql/Rel	<p>Stu: True. Don't forget, Phil was always our designated drunk driver.</p> <p>Doug: Yeah. You wanna explain it to them, Alan?</p> <p>Alan: Guys, my dad loves this car more than he loves me, so, yeah.</p> <p>Phil: I left my wife and kid at home so I could go with you guys.</p>	<p>Phil wanted to drive the car since he saw everybody was passing them. He asked Doug to let him drive the car just till Barstow, but Doug refused.</p>	<p>Phil flouted the maxim of quality since he gave an untrue thing. The utterance makes Phil seemed sacrifice his family time just for the bachelor party. Meanwhile, Phil was actually really excited for this bachelor party. He was happy since he could have a short get away from work and father-husband things. Phil was being sarcastic through his utterance.</p>	<p>Phil was established release humor through his utterance. He used his utterance to neutralize his emotion.</p>
07/Qn/Hos	<p>Alan: It says here we should work in teams. Who wants to be my spotter?</p> <p>Doug: I don't think you should be doing too much gambling tonight, Alan.</p>	<p>Phil, Stu, Doug, and Alan were on a ride to Vegas. After read a book about tips and trick about gambling, Alan started a conversation.</p>	<p>Doug performed a quantity maxim flouting since he was not being informative. He did not answer if he wanted to be Alan's spotter, he told Alan not to gamble instead.</p>	<p>Hostility humor was created by Doug's utterance. His utterance shows that Doug, who was marrying Alan's sister, felt superior to Alan and forbade Alan to gamble.</p>

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
08/Qn/Hos	<p>Phil: Dr. Price? Stu, you're a dentist, okay? Don't try and get fancy.</p> <p>Stu: It's not fancy, it's true.</p> <p>Phil: He's a dentist. Don't get too excited. And if, uh, someone has a heart attack, you should still call 911.</p>	<p>Phil, Stu, Doug, and Alan arrived at the villa. They approached the receptionist desk to check in. The reservation was made under Stu's name.</p>	<p>The maxim of quantity was flouted by Phil as he gave too much contribution. He thought that Stu tried to get fancy by putting the reservation under 'Dr. Price'.</p>	<p>Hostility humor was created in Phil's utterance. Phil used Stu's profession. Phil said that it was too much when Stu used 'Dr. Price' for the reservation while he is just a dentist. Even Phil continued the humor situation by telling the receptionist that she should still call 911 if someone has a heart attack.</p>
09/Qn	<p>Doug: It's a beautiful ring.</p> <p>Stu: It's my grandmother's. She made it all the way through the Holocaust with that thing.</p>	<p>Stu told his friends that he would propose Melissa when he got back from Vegas. He showed the proposal ring.</p>	<p>Stu's contribution was so informative that he flouted the maxim of quantity. Instead of saying thank you as his response for Doug's compliment, he explained the story behind the proposal ring.</p>	<p>The flouting maxim performed by Stu did not create humor situation because it did not fulfill any humor theories proposed by Attardo. Stu's utterance did not produce incongruity humor nor release humor. The utterance also did not establish hostility humor as Stu did not use someone's bad</p>

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
				fortune for the target of joke.
10/Mn/Inc	<p>Alan: Hey, guys. You ready to let the dogs out?</p> <p>Phil: What?</p> <p>Stu: Do what?</p> <p>Alan: Let the dogs out, you know.</p>	<p>Phil, Stu, and Doug were in the bedroom having a conversation. Alan was back from shopping and joined them.</p>	<p>In Alan's utterance, the maxim of manner is flouted because Alan created obscurity for his interlocutors. The obscurity can be seen from the responses delivered by Phil and Stu.</p>	<p>The incongruity humor lies in the word 'dog' that might be interpreted either as dog, animal's name, or Doug. The humor occurred when Alan gave a punch line to resolve the incongruity. He uttered his previous utterance in line with a song entitled <i>Who Let the Dogs Out</i> by Baha Men.</p>
11/Qn/Rel	<p>Phil: You're actually gonna wear that or are you guys fucking with me?</p> <p>Alan: It's where I keep all my things. I get a lot of compliments on this. Plus, it's not a man-purse. It's called a satchel. Indiana Jones wears</p>	<p>After all the guys dressed up, they were leaving their room and going to the rooftop of the villa. All men were dressed in suits except Alan. He</p>	<p>Alan deliberately flouted quantity maxim as his contribution was way too informative. Alan might imply that he was actually going to wear the bag by telling Phil that he got many compliments on that. He also added information that the bag he wore was not man-purse but satchel.</p>	<p>Alan's response creates humor situation as it fits release humor theory proposed by Attardo. Because Phil did not really like Alan's bag, Alan was annoyed. He tried to antidote his personal tension by delivering his utterances.</p>

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
	one.	was wearing a t-shirt with washed-off color that was tucked in his jeans, sport shoes, and a sling bag in a match color to his t-shirt.		
12/QI/Inc	Alan: It's where I keep all my things. I get a lot of compliments on this. Plus, it's not a man-purse. It's called a satchel. Indiana Jones wears one. Phil: So does Joy Behar.	The four men were waiting for the elevator came, Alan's weird bag caught Phil's attention.	Phil created quality maxim flouting as he said something that lack of evidence. He said that Joy Behar wore the same bag as Alan.	Phil's utterance fullfills incongruity humor. He countered Alan's defense (Indiana Jones wears one) by saying that Joy Behar also worn the same bag. Joy Behar is a 77 year old American comedian.
13/Qn/Hos	Phil: Because we obviously had a great fucking time. Why don't you just stop worrying for one minute. Be proud of	Phil, Stu, and Alan were in the elevator. They wanted to get	Stu blatantly flouted the maxim of quantity because of his excessive contribution. Stu would be considered cooperative if he stopped	Stu's utterance creates humor situation. The humor belongs to hostility humor since Stu used his bad fortune as the butt of the

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
	yourself. Stu: I don't know, Phil. Maybe because I'm missing a tooth, or maybe because a tiger in our hotel room. Oh oh, no wait, I know, maybe it's because we found a baby. A human baby. That's it.	some breakfast after the huge mess they got.	after he said that he did not know. However, Stu explained all of the problems that Phil already knew.	joke. The three men woke up and found the hotel room was in a mess. It was a big problem for Stu since the reservation of the room was under his name. They even found a tiger and a human baby in the hotel room. Moreover, Stu is a dentist and he lost his tooth at that night.
14/Qn/Hos	Stu: Do you mind if I look? I'm actually a doctor. Doctor: Yeah, you said that several times last night. But really, you're just a dentist.	Phil, Stu, and Alan met the doctor who handled Phil the night before.	Quantity maxim flouting lies on the doctor's response towards Stu's request. Instead of telling whether Stu could see the medical record or not, the doctor said that Stu is just a dentist.	The hostility humor lies on the doctor's rejection when Stu asked to take a look at Phil's medical record. The word 'just' in the doctor's utterance showed that he felt superior to Stu.
15/Qn/Inc	Phil: Best Little Chapel, do you know where that is? Doctor: I do. It's at the corner of Get A Map and Fuck Off.	Phil was trying to get another clue to find Doug from the doctor.	The doctor established quantity maxim flouting by giving too little information in the conversation.	In this conversation, incongruity humor is created as Phil and friends' expectation was not fulfilled. The doctor seemed

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
	<p>I'm a doctor, not a tour guide. Figure it out yourself, okay? You're big boys.</p>			<p>going to answer Phil's question, but he ended up drive the three men away.</p>
16/Q1	<p>Melissa: So how was it last night? Stu: Ah, it was really fun, actually. It was quiet, but it was a good time. I'm learning all kinds of vino factoids. Melissa: That sounds nice.</p>	<p>Stu and Melissa were in the phone. Melissa asked about the bachelor party.</p>	<p>Stu gave a response that flouted the maxim of quality by saying something he believed to be false. He replied that the previous night was fun, and it was a good time while the reality was Stu did not remember anything from the night before.</p>	<p>Stu's utterance does not create humor situation because it does not fulfill one of the three humor theories. People might think it belongs to incongruity humor. However, Attardo stated that incongruity humor occurs when what is expected by the speaker is contradictory with what occurs. In the dialogue above, Stu expected Melissa believed him and his expectation was fulfilled because Melissa believed that the bachelor party at the previous night ran well.</p>

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
17/QI/Inc	Melissa: What the fuck, Stu? Is that a baby? Stu: Why would there be a baby? We're at a winery. That's a goat. Sir, can you please start the tractor so we can get out of here.	Stu, Phil, and Alan were in the car with the baby when suddenly some people attacked them. Melissa heard the baby cried.	Stu delivered a quality maxim flouting as he said something he believed to be false. He said he was at the winery while he was not. He also said that the baby cried was a goat.	The incongruity humor situation happened because what Stu expected was not the same as what happened at that time. Stu expected his girlfriend ended the conversation, but in reality Melissa started curious when she heard a baby cried.
18/Qn	Jade: Okay, what's up? Phil: Look, it's Jade, right? Jade: Very funny, Phil.	Phil, Stu, and Alan met Jade. The mother of the baby that they found in the hotel room.	Jade's response flouted quantity maxim. Instead of saying yes that she was Jade, she answered the question by saying "Very funny, Phil."	Jade's utterance creates neither hostility humor nor incongruity humor. Jade's response also does not create release humor since she delivered her utterance without any tension.
19/QI/Inc	Phil: Hey, Tracy! It's Phil. Tracy: Hey, Phil. Where are you guys?	Phil called Tracy to inform that he and the three men	Phil produced a quality maxim flouting when he said something untrue. He told Tracy that he and his	Incongruity humor occurred since what Phil said was different with the real condition at the time it is

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
	Phil: We are at the spa at the hotel.	would spend one more night in Vegas.	friends were at the spa at hotel while the reality was not what it said.	said. He said that he and his friends were at the spa at the hotel while the reality was they were in police office.
20/Q1	Tracy: Okay. What's up? Phil: Uh, you are not gonna believe this. We got comped an extra night at the hotel. Tracy: You did?	Phil called Tracy to inform that the guys got comped an extra night.	Phil flouted the maxim of quality as he told Tracy that he and the guys got an extra night. Phil delivered information that he believed to be false.	This quality flouting maxim did not produce hostility humor or release humor. It also did not create incongruity humor because what speaker's expected (Phil) was in accordance with what actually occurred at that time.
21/Mn/Hos	Phil: Look, I'm not a cop. I'm no hero. I'm a schoolteacher. But if one of my kids went missing on a field trip...that would look really bad on me. Cop: What are you getting at?	Phil tried to ask the cops to let he and his friends go.	Phil was trying to deliver an offer to the cops, but he flouted the maxim of manner by creating prolixity for his interlocutors.	The humor lies in Phil's utterance that can be interpreted as a threat for the cops. Phil felt superior as he had an idea that he could lead people think the cop was not work properly since there were some hangover tourists could take the police car.

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
22/Qn/Hos	<p>Bodyguard: Mr. Tyson would like to know why is his tiger in your bathroom.</p> <p>Phil: Hold on, that was completely unnecessary. I'm a huge fan. When you knocked out Holmes, that was...</p>	<p>Mike Tyson came to <i>Caesar Palace</i> to find his tiger. Mike's bodyguard asked Phil why the tiger was in the bathroom.</p>	<p>Phil did not give enough contribution and ended up flouting the quantity maxim.</p>	<p>Hostility humor can be seen from the Phil's utterance. It shows that Phil felt inferior to Mike Tyson. Phil also tried to divert the conversation through his utterance.</p>
23/Qn/Rel	<p>Someone in the lift: What do you guys get under there?</p> <p>Phil: Just a whole bunch of mind your own business.</p>	<p>Phil, Stu, and Alan were in their way to send the tiger back. In the elevator, they met a family.</p>	<p>Phil deliberately flouted the maxim of quantity because he did not give enough information for the question.</p>	<p>Release humor lies on Phil's response. He released his personal tension by saying that what they got under them was a whole bunch of mind your own business.</p>
24/Rl/Rel	<p>Alan: I think he's mean.</p> <p>Phil: All right. I think it's officially time we call Tracy.</p>	<p>After managed to bring the tiger back, Phil, Stu, and Alan were talking about Mike Tyson.</p>	<p>Phil flouted the relation maxim by giving a response that irrelevant with the context of the conversation.</p>	<p>Phil's response creates humor situation. At that time, they run out of clue to find their friend, Doug. They did not know where they headed to. Phil was the one who really upset. The release</p>

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
				humor lies on Phil's utterance is used to that antidote his worry.
25/QI/Rel	Stu: Alan, where's his purse? Alan: I don't know. Stu: What do you mean? It's in the hotel room.	Phil, Stu, and Alan were having a conversation with a mafia whose purse was swapped with Alan's.	Stu blatantly created a quality maxim flouting when he said something that lack of evidence. He said the purse was in the hotel room while actually he did not even know where the purse was.	Stu's utterance contains release humor. Stu used his utterances to neutralize his panic. He wanted to make the mafia believed that he and his friends had the purse.
26/Qn/Rel	Drug dealer: We were at the Bellagio? We were shooting craps. You don't remember? Stu: No. No, we don't remember. Because some dick drug dealer sold him Ruphylin and told him it was ecstasy.	Stu and his friends asked the drug dealer how he could be kidnapped by the mafia.	Stu flouted the maxim of quantity by being sarcastic. Stu's contribution would be considered cooperative if he simply replied that he did not remember.	Release theory was established in Stu's utterance. He was being sarcastic and trying to liberate his personal tension.

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
27/QI/Inc 01:29:16	Tracy: Where's Doug? Stu: He is paying the bill.	Tracy was worried because Doug and his friends had not come back from Vegas. He called Phil and Stu.	Stu flouted the maxim of quality by giving an untrue answer. He said that Doug was paying the bill while the reality they had not found Doug yet.	The incongruity humor occurred when what Stu said was different with the real condition at the time it was said. He said Doug was paying the bill while actually they had not found Doug yet.
28/R1/Rel	Phil: You look good, you got some color. I'm jealous. Doug: I'm getting married today.	Phil, Stu, and Alan found Doug at the rooftop of the hotel they stayed.	Doug deliberately flouted the maxim of relation since he responded Phil's statement irrelevantly by saying "I'm getting married today."	Doug irrelevantly replied Phil's statement because he wanted to liberate his personal tension by saying that he was getting married. He might be very depressed waiting for his friends to come since he had to go back for his wedding with Tracy.
29/R1/Rel	Melissa: What happened to your tooth? Stu: Have you met Alan? Tracy's brother.	Stu was eating some cupcakes at Doug and Tracy's wedding when Melissa suddenly	Stu's contribution would be considered cooperative if he explained why he lost his tooth. However, he flouted the maxim of relation since he tried to change the	Release humor was established because Stu tried to use his utterance to neutralize his frustration towards Melissa. He did not want to talk about how he

Data Code	Conversation	Context of Situation	Explanation of Maxim Flouting	Explanation of Humor Created
		came up.	subject of the conversation.	lost a tooth and every problem he got on the bachelor party at the wedding. He did not want to have a fight with Melissa since he lied to her about Las Vegas.