



THE HUMOUR TRIGGER IN SPY MOVIE:

A Study of Pragmatics

A FINAL PROJECT

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement
For S-1 Degree in Linguistics
In English Department, Faculty of Humanities
Diponegoro University

Submitted by:

Aifida Resyana Palupi

13020115120032

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY

SEMARANG

2022

PRONOUNCEMENT

I state truthfully that this project is compiled by me without taking the results from other research in any university, in S-1, S-2, and S-3 degree and diploma. In addition, I ascertain that I do not take the material from other publications or someone's work except for the references mentioned in the bibliography.

Semarang, 19 July 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Aifida Resyana Palupi', written in a cursive style.

Aifida Resyana Palupi

THE HUMOUR TRIGGER IN SPY MOVIE: A Study of Pragmatics

Written by

Aifida Resyana Palupi

NIM: 13020115120032

is approved by the project advisor

On 28th June, 2022

Project Advisor



Dr. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum.

NIP. 196710041993031003

The Head of the English Department



Dr. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum.

NIP. 196710041993031003

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata 1 Project Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanity Diponegoro University

On 8 August, 2022

Chair Person



Dra. Wiwiek Sundari, M.Hum

NIP 195906071990032001

First Member



Dr. Drs. Catur Kepirianto, M.Hum

NIP 196509221992031002

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

“Sufficient for us is Allah, and [He is] the best Disposer of affairs.”

(Qur’an 3:173)

*I sincerely dedicate this project to my precious father, my mother, my little brother and sister, my grandparents and everyone who supported me in finishing
this project*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Praise belongs to God Almighty, who always gives strength and spirit so that this project entitled “The Humour Trigger in Spy Movie: A study of Pragmatics” comes to a completion. On this occasion, I would like to thank everybody who have contributed to the completion of this research project.

Deepest gratitude and appreciation are extended to Dr. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum – my project advisor who has patiently given his advice, suggestion, helpful correction, and moral support without which it is doubtful that this project came into completion

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to:

1. Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum., the Dean of Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University;
2. Dr. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum., the Head of English Department, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University;
3. All lecturers of the English Department in Diponegoro University, who have shared their knowledge and experience;
4. My parents, Dwi Utomo and Dwi Astuti, who always give their endless moral support, encouragement and affection;
5. My grandparents, for cheering me up during my academic year.
6. My beloved, Elsa and Ranita, for encouraging me during my project
7. My beloved best friend, Maudina Eka, Rizka Laksmi and Budi Setya for the cheerful pleasant environment you all gave to me.

I realize that this project is still far from perfect, therefore, I am so glad to receive any constructive criticism and recommendation to make this project better. Finally, I expect that this project will be useful to the readers who want to do the same research on pragmatics

Semarang, 19 July 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a final flourish, positioned above the printed name.

Aifida Resyana Palupi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| TITLE..... | i |
| PRONOUNCEMENT | ii |
| APPROVAL..... | iii |
| VALIDATION..... | iv |
| MOTTO AND DEDICATION | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT..... | vi |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | viii |
| ABSTRACT..... | ix |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 2. THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK..... | 2 |
| 2.1 Implicature | 3 |
| 2.1.1 Conversational Implicature | 3 |
| 2.1.2 Conventional Implicature..... | 4 |
| 2.2 The Cooperative Principles | 4 |
| 2.3 Theory of Humour..... | 5 |
| 2.4 Humour and the Maxims..... | 7 |
| 3. RESEARCH METHODS..... | 7 |
| 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION..... | 9 |
| 5. CONCLUSION | 21 |
| REFERENCES | |

ABSTRACT

Humour has a role in human life as it is a feature of language that can bring a tense atmosphere to life become more interesting. The purpose of this study are to reveal how humorous effect is constructed by the characters of Spy movie and to know what kinds of speech act that the characters used to create humour situation. The type of this study is descriptive qualitative research. In this study, non-participant observation is used to collect the data. Purposive sampling technique is also used to collect the sample data. The writer uses pragmatic identity to analyse the data. The result of the study shows that there are two trigger that can construct humorous effect. They are illocutionary acts consisted of assertive “Informing, claiming, and speculating”, expressive “thanking and sarcasm”, and directives “requesting”. In addition, the writer found that those speech acts are also flouting the cooperative principle. The maxim that mostly violated to construct humorous effect is the maxim of manner because of the ambiguity by the speakers while convey their message.

Keywords: implicature, cooperative principle, flouting maxim, humour, speech act

1. INTRODUCTION

A movie is an audio-visual media that represents the social life of a human. Therefore, it cannot be separated from dialogues representing the interaction of the characters in the movie. In the interaction, people need to be more cooperative to make their conversation run smoothly while interacting with each other. People obey the sub-principle of cooperative principle named maxim to avoid misunderstanding (Grice, 1991:28). Despite obeying the cooperative principle, people violate the maxims for some purposes such as in criticism, sarcasm and humour. This research reveals how these maxims are violated to create humour in an action-comedy movie.

There are five previous studies related to this study. The first study was conducted by Tupan and Natalia (2008), discussing the multiple violations of conversational maxims in lying from some episodes of *Desperate Housewives*. They conclude that violating the maxims was meant to eliminate the interlocutor's chance to respond. The second study was conducted by Amianna and Putranti (2017) entitled, "Humorous Situations Created by Violations and Flouting of Conversational Maxims in Situation Comedy entitled *How I Met Your Mother*", revealing how humorous effect appeared in the situation comedy. The third study was conducted by Pan (2012) entitled, "Linguistic Basic of Humour in Use of Grice's Cooperative", intending to reveal the relation between creation of humour and violation of cooperative principle. The fourth study was conducted by Maulidya Ayu Puspasari and Lisetyo Ariyanti (2019) entitled, "Flouting Maxim in Creating

Humour: A Comparison Study Between Indonesian and American Stand Up Comedy”, intending to compare the flout of maxims done by an Indonesian comic and an American comic. The fifth study conducted by Hameed Yahya A. Al-Zubeiry (2020), entitled “Violation of Grice’s Maxims and Humorous Implicatures in the Arabic Comedy *Madraset Al Mushaghbeen*”. His study shows that 61 instances of maxims violation were identified in the play. Maxim of Manner receives the highest percentage of violation i.e., 24 (39.3%) compared to the other maxims. Maxims of Relevance and Quality come next, i.e., 14 (22.9%) and 13 (21.4%). Maxim of Quantity constitutes 10 number of violations (i.e., 21.4%).

This study is about to find out how the humourists construct humorous effect in the movie. Hence, there are research questions as a base of this study.

- 1) What kinds of speech act do humourists use that can trigger a humorous effect?
- 2) What are the kinds of Grice’s conversational maxim violation in *Spy* movie?
- 3) How do conversational maxim violated to create humour in the movie based at conversational implicature?

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study conducted using the theory of cooperative principle and Grice’s conversational maxims to analyse what the purposes of utterance produced by speakers in the event of conversation.

2.1 Implicature

According to Grice (1991: 24-26), implicature is an utterance that conveys meaning beyond its proposition. Basically, implicatures are often encountered and carried out in everyday conversation. In a conversation, a speaker can choose to convey his message directly or indirectly. Furthermore, conveying the message directly means that what is conveyed by the speaker in his speech has the same meaning as what the speaker means. Besides, conveying the message indirectly means that what is said by the speaker in his speech has a hidden meaning that must be understood by the hearer. Thus, there is a problem when the speaker chooses to deliver the message indirectly then the hearer failed to observe and misinterpret the speaker's intention. Hence, any implied meaning is risked being misunderstood by the hearer. Moreover, Grice divided implicature into two types that are conversational implicature and conventional implicature.

2.1.1 Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature is used to explain what is meant by the speaker, because the implicature contains an implied meaning that is different from what the speaker actually says. Conversational implicature divided into two types:

1) Generalized Implicature

Generalized Implicature occurs when special knowledge is not required in the context to find out additional conveyed meaning (Yule, 1996:41)

2) Particularized Implicature

Particularized Implicature occurs when special knowledge is required in the context to convey the implied meaning (Yule, 1996:45).

2.1.2 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature are not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. They do not have to occur in conversation, and they do not use special contexts for their interpretation (Yule, 1996:45). It means that conventional implicature arises from words or phrases used in sentence or speech. For example, “Kath is poor but happy”, the use of “but” in this sentence implies that poverty and happiness are not compatible. Thus, this sentence implies “Surprisingly Kath is happy in spite of being poor”.

2.2 The Cooperative Principles

According to Grice’s theory of Cooperative Principle, people give contributions that required by the situation, for instance, giving a sufficient amount of information in a conversation. In other words, the interlocutors will be cooperative in making a conversation run smoothly. Furthermore, Grice developed four conversational maxims as the sub-principles of the cooperative principle that well known as Grice’s four conversational maxims (Yule, 1996: 37).

1) Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity, the speakers should give sufficient information, relatively adequate, and as informative as possible. The speakers will violate the term of the maxim of quantity if they give the information less or more than it is required.

2) Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality, the interlocutors are expected to convey something tangible and accordance with the facts. On the other words, the speaker can call it the act of telling the truth. The given information that the speaker wants to say must have measurable evidence. Hence, the utterances will be having a good quality if it does not deviate from the actual fact.

3) Maxim of Manner

According to Yule (1996:37), speakers need to consider that the speaker must be avoiding obscurity of expression while giving information to the interlocutors. Furthermore, the information must be clear and orderly to avoid misunderstanding between the interlocutors.

4) Maxim of Relation

According to Yule (1996), in the term of the maxim of relation, the speaker gives relevant information to make the conversation more cooperative.

2.3 Humour

Humour is something that can make someone smile and laugh. Examining language is helpful to explain why people laugh. Grice, as cited by Attardo

(1994: 271-276), suggests that jokes or humor are non-cooperative. It means that humorous situations exist because there is non-cooperative interaction among the interlocutors. It occurs because the interlocutors do not obey the CP and its maxims by violating the rules. Hence, the humorous situation is created between the speakers and the hearers as the product of violating or flouting the maxims. Raskin in Attardo (2017: 49-50) classifies the theory of humour into three categories.

1. Incongruity Theory

Humour is created by a conflict between what is expected and what happens in the jokes (Ross, 1998:7-8). Ross said humour will often have the following elements, they are:

- 1) there is a conflict between what is expected and what happens in the joke.
- 2) the conflict is caused by an ambiguity at some level of language.
- 3) the punchline is surprising.

2. Superiority Theory

Hobbes in Ross (1998:51) characterized laughter as a ‘sudden glory at a triumph of our own or at an indignity suffered by someone else. Meaning to say, this theory explains that humiliating, disparaging, and ridiculing others inferiority or misfortune is used to construct humour.

3. Release Theory

This theory explains that physical event or emotional tension can trigger a laughter. According to Freud in Krikman (2006:28), humour

is one of the so-called substitution mechanisms which enable to convert taboo topics to acceptable ones. Some taboos situation such as sex, death, and religion. This kind of humour is easily considered offensive since listeners/readers have a different response. However, explicit language or satire is used to construct a humour. As a note, the listeners/ readers will not understand the intention of the humour if they do not share the same knowledge about the context of the joke.

2.4 Humour and the Maxims

As a social human being, people cannot be separated from language since it is a human system of communication using voice sounds, gestures, or written symbols. Grice in Yule (1996: 37), speaker obey a guideline called cooperative principle since it is a basis that makes conversation run effectively and efficiently. However, Ross (1998: 7) stated that humour breaks an important rule of language use that is people should try to communicate as clearly as possible. Moreover, flouting maxims can be one of great tools to construct a humour. Thus, a speaker might flout the maxim by giving less or more information, using ambiguous words, giving unrelated topics, and exaggerating things to create humorous effect. Accordingly, the flouting of cooperative principle has a relation with constructing humour.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

The type of this study is a descriptive qualitative since the writer only explains and analyses the data. The data are taken from movie *Spy* 2015. The writer used non-participant observation or *Simak Bebas Libat Cakap* (Sudaryanto,

2015:135) as the method of collecting the data. Furthermore, note-taking technique is used to collect the data since the data were taken from the movie. The population of the data is the whole utterances from the characters in the Spy 2015 movie. Besides, purposive sampling technique is also used to collect the sample data since the sample data are utterances which construct humorous effect (Supardi, 1993: 107-108).

The writer uses pragmatic identity method to analyse the data to reveal the trigger of humour in this movie. The method is used since this study is concerns about speaker's utterances that result in an action or emotional effect (Sudaryanto, 2015: 15). The writer does these steps below to collect and analyse the data:

1. Download the movie
2. Watch Spy movie
3. Download the movie script from https://www.springfieldspringfield.co.uk/movie_script.php?movie=spy-2015
4. Match the transcription with the download transcription as it has slightly different wording
5. Identify the utterances containing a laughter effect
6. Analyse the utterances containing laughter effect using conversational implicature and cooperative principle.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the writer will reveal the result of data analysis about the trigger of humorous effect in Spy movie. The writer has analysed the data taken from the utterance between the characters in ‘Spy’ movie. The writer found three illocutionary act that used to trigger humorous effect in “Spy” movie, they are assertive, expressive and directive. Besides, the writer also found three violation of cooperative principle that also can constructing humorous effect in this movie such, flouting maxim of manner, maxim of quantity, and maxim of quality.

1) Assertive

Assertive is dominantly used to create humorous effect by the characters of spy movie. The writer found some speech act of assertive that can lead a humorous effect, they are consist of “Speculating”, “Informing”, “claiming”. The writer will reveal how speech act can trigger humour in the event of conversation between the characters of spy movie bellow.

- a. **Nancy** : “I thought they were chocolate sprinkles, which I would eat,
normally, by the fistful but this tasted like. There's no other way to say it, really. “Like a rat's arse.”
Nancy : “Unfortunately, there's vermin in the ceiling again, and I hate to say it, but they've pooped all over your cake.

The data above is indicated as assertive illocutionary act of “speculating”. According to the context, Nancy and her colleague were talking about a chocolate cake that they would eat together at the office. When Nancy was talking about the topping that sprinkles in the cakes, there is one of her colleagues who eat a spoonful of cake before she

finishes her statement. Assertive illocutionary act “speculation” can be seen in Nancy utterance *“I thought they were chocolate sprinkles, which I would eat, normally, by the fistful but this tasted like. There's no other way to say it, really. Like a rat's arse.”* Nancy is speculated about the topping in her chocolate cake. She thought that the topping was a delicious chocolate sprinkle which she would eat. Unfortunately, the tasted of the cake was so weird and disgusting. On last statement, she finally said that there’s vermin in the ceiling again and it implied that the toppings on the cakes was a rat’s arse. assertive speech act “speculating” that happened in this utterance can lead a humorous effect since Nancy was build up an expectation to the audience of the movie that the chocolate topping on the cakes would taste delicious. Unfortunately, the audience’s expectation was broken by the last statement of Nancy *“I hate to say it, but they've pooped all over your cake.”* Thus, this gap between audience expectation and the reality can lead a huge laughter effect of audiences.

- b) Susan Cooper : These look delicious. I don't wanna be critical, but this is very chewy.”
Bradley Fine : “Coop. You're eating a hand towel.”
Susan Cooper : “Just cleansing my palette. Jeez. You had to
take me to such a dump? Come on, cheapskate!

According to the context, Susan and Fine is having a dinner in a luxury restaurant. There is a tiny piece’s thing around the table that looks like a marshmallow. Susan though it was such snack that serve before the

main course. She ate it and it was hard to chew. “*These look delicious. I don’t wanna be critical, but this is a bit chewy*” this utterance is considered as assertive illocutionary act since Susan is trying to inform about the fact that the snack is a bit chewy and hard to swallow. Her statement built the audience expectation that the tiny pieces was a chewy “marshmallow” but a bit hard to swallow. Unfortunately, the audience’s expectation was broken by Fine’s response. He said that what she ate is a hand towel. This gap of expectation and the reality can lead a humorous effect of the audience.

- c) Patrick : “Finally, every agent gets a night vision scope hidden in their watch.”
- Susan Cooper : “I have heard about this. I've been looking...
Who's that? That is Bette Midler and Barbara Hershey. From Beaches. How much am I supposed to like Beaches?”
- Patrick : “I would imagine a lot, if you have the watch.”

There is illocutionary act that found in this utterance, “*Finally, every agent gets a night vision scope hidden in their watch.*” It considers as assertive illocutionary act, “claiming”. Patrick using *every agent* to represent that every agent he has ever met always have a night vision scope hidden in their watch. He claiming it since Patrick’s job is to provide all items that can support the agents on the field. Moreover, secret agent is always depicted with a cool dignified appearance, using a super high-technology items. Thus, Susan has a high expectation about her sophisticated watch.

2) Expressive

There are three kind of speech act of expressive that found in this movie, they are “Teasing”, “thanking”, “Sarcasm”.

- a) Bradley Fine : “Hey, I've been thinking. Yeah. I couldn't do
what I do without you and I've been thinking about **doing something special for you** So...
Susan Cooper : “Good gravy, Fine. That's...
Bradley Fine : “**It's a crazy cupcake! You love cakes**”

According to the context, Fine and Susan is a partner in the CIA who have been worked together for a long time. Then they have a fine dining together in a luxury restaurant after they finish their mission. Fine is asking Susan for a dinner in order to thank her for being a good partner for him as an agent. The atmosphere from both of them is so romantic which makes Susan thinks that Fine has same feeling for her as she has a feeling for him. “*Yeah. I couldn't do what I do without you and I've been thinking about doing something special for you, so*”, it considered as expressive illocutionary act since his utterance is represents that he was so grateful having a good partner like Susan and he want to thank her by giving a special gift. Nevertheless, there is an ambiguity in Fine’s utterance. Saying “doing something special for you” while giving a ring box can be misinterpreted as he will propose to his lover. Thus, Susan fails to know the intention of Fine’s utterance. This situation can lead humorous effect to the audience as there is a gap between Susan’s

expectation and the reality that cause by fine's expressive illocutionary act "thanking".

- b) Patrick : "This anti-fungal spray can freeze and disable any security system."
Susan : "**Wow. That is quite an image to be carrying all over Europe.**"
Patrick : "**It's also a pepper spray.**"
Nancy : "Why not just make it look like pepper spray?"
Patrick : "That's a pretty good idea. Well, next time."
Susan : "I can wait, if you want to print up a new label."
Patrick : "No, I'd have to turn the printer on again. I don't really want to."

Susan's utterance in this conversation is considered as expressive illocutionary act "sarcasm". "*Wow. That is quite an image to be carrying all over Europe.*" She implicitly said that the item is not common for a woman to bring while travel to Europe. She expressed her disappointment to Patrick sarcastically. Her utterance implies "can't you give me a common stuff for a woman who travelling alone".

- c) Nancy : "You look amazing, Susan."
Susan Cooper : "I look like someone's homophobic aunt."

According to the context, Susan is appointed to be an agent to investigate an illegal bomb-selling syndicate. She expects to be a cool agent with the charming suit and equipment's. However, he appointed to be a single mother for four children which is temporary relocated to work in Paris. Thus, she is dressing as a usual mom would wear. In this conversation, Nancy utterance is considered as expressive "teasing". In this situation Nancy is trying to cheer up the situation by teasing her

appearance. It can be seen from this utterance “*you look amazing, Susan*”.

3) Directive

Bradley Fine : “**Come here. Come here. Close. I think you're getting pinkeye.**”

Susan Cooper : “What? No.”

Bradley Fine : “Right there.”

Susan Cooper : “No, that's not...”

According to the context Susan and Fine has a fine dining in a luxury restaurant. The atmosphere in the restaurant is so romantic. Having candle light dinner with Fine in such romantic place makes Susan expecting something romantic moment. Fine’s utterances can be considered as directives illocutionary act “requesting”. It can be seen from this utterance “*Come here. Come here. Close*”, it represents that he asked Susan to come closer to him. Moreover, Susan was coming closer to him with a high expectation. Furthermore, Fine’s utterance and Susan’s gesture made the audience expect a romantic kiss scene. Nevertheless, the audience expectation was broken by Fine’s last statement. He states that Susan has a pinkeye. This conflict between expectation and reality that fine built can lead humorous effect.

2. Flouting Maxim

In this study, the writer found that the characters of spy movie also flout maxims to create humorous effect. They are flouting maxim of manner, maxim of quality, and maxim of relation.

1) Maxim of Manner

- 1) **Nancy** : “I thought they were chocolate sprinkles, which I would eat, normally, by the fistful but this tasted like.
There's no other way to say it, really. “Like a rat's arse.”
- Nancy** : “Unfortunately, there's vermin in the ceiling again, and I hate to say it, but they've pooped all over your
cake.”

Nancy is flouting maxim of manner since she was not delivering the message orderly. she can say “your cake was pooped by the rats; the taste is so awful” but she chooses to flout the maxim of manner to build such expectation to the audience that the topping on the cake was delicious. Since she was flouting maxim of manner, there’s a colleague who thought that the sprinkle is kind of Choco chips and eat a spoonful of cake before Nancy finish her words. To conclude, flouting maxim of manner in this utterance has also important rule to create humorous effect since there is conflict between audience expectation and the reality that built by flouting the maxim of manner.

- 2) **Bradley Fine** : “Hey, I've been thinking. Yeah. I couldn't do
what I do without you and I've been thinking about **doing something special for you** So...”
- Susan Cooper** : “Good gravy, Fine. That's...”
- Bradley Fine** : “**It's a crazy cupcake! You love cakes**”

According to the context, Fine and Susan is a partner in the CIA who have been worked together for a long time. Then they have a fine dining together in a luxury restaurant to celebrate their last success

mission. There is an ambiguity in Fine's utterance. Saying "doing something special for you" while giving a ring box can be misinterpreted as he will propose his fiancé. His utterance makes Susan having a high expectation that Fine will confess his feeling to her. Besides, Fine expects that Susan will know when he said "doing something special for you" is only to thank her loyal since they work together as an agent. However, Susan fails to observe the implied meaning. She thought that Bradley Fine has a feeling for her and he will propose to her at that fancy restaurant. Thus, in this utterance, Fine flouts maxim of manner since he uses an ambiguous sentence while talking to Susan. To conclude, there is a gap between Susan's Expectation and reality that cause by flouting maxim of manner can lead a laughter of the audience.

- 3) Bradley Fine : **"Come here. Come here. Close. I think you're getting pinkeye."**
 Susan Cooper : "What? No."
 Bradley Fine : "Right there."
 Susan Cooper : "No, that's not..."

Fine's utterance is considered as flouting maxim of manner since his utterance mislead the hearer. He is not giving information about the Susan's pinkeye orderly. It can be seen from this utterance "Come here. Come here. Close", He gives less information that can lead an ambiguity and misinterpretation. Then, Susan fails to observe the intention of Fine's intention. She is expecting a romantic kiss scene with Fine while she come closer to him. Unfortunately, Fine asked her

to come closer to him in order to inform her that she got pinkeye. To conclude, Fine can convey about Susan's pinkeye directly but it cannot construct a humorous effect. Then, he was flouting maxim of manner to build a gap between Susan's expectation and the reality that can lead the audience to laugh in incongruous way of humour.

- 4) Bradley Fine : "It'll be right when we get Rayna behind bars and that nuke back in our hands."
 Susan Cooper : "Yeah, sure. I just. I don't know. All my alarm bells are going off with this one."
 Bradley Fine : "**Really? Well, then, it's okay 'cause I have a plan. You and I gotta stop going on these awful missions. Run off together.**"
 Susan Cooper : "**Do you mean that?**"
 Bradley Fine : "What? Do I mean that? You got me. You kidder."
 Susan Cooper : "You sucker! No. You should have seen your face! You were like..."

In this utterance Fine is violating maxim of manner. He is intentionally violating the maxim in order to calming down her assistant. *You and I gotta stop going on these awful missions. Run off together*; *run off together* seem have a double meaning in this context since Susan has a feeling for fine, saying that word can give her a high expectation that he has a same feeling for her. It can be shown in "**Do you mean that**", she got misunderstanding here. To conclude, based on incongruity theory, the conflict of what is expected and what is happened can construct humorous effect.

2) Maxim of Quality

- 1) Miss Walker : “You. Can I have an Old Fashioned, please?
Nancy : **The service is really slow.**
Susan Cooper : **Super slow.**
Nancy : **“Good luck getting that in the next hour.**
Bartender : “Here you go, Miss Walker.
Miss Walker : “Thank you.”
Susan and Nancy : “Wow.”
Miss Walker : “Alan and I go way back. I come here all the
time.
Susan Cooper : “So do we. Right, Alan? Hey, Alan. Alan!”
Nancy : “Big A, Big A!”

This conversation is happened at the bar. Susan and Nancy have been come to the bar quite often, so they know how about the service. In these utterances humorous effect is construct by flouting the maxim of quality. It can be seen from these utterances, “*The service is really slow; super slow; Good luck getting that in the next hour*” both Nancy and Susan said that since they have experienced about the service. However, these utterances flout the maxim of quality since the response of the bartender is absolutely different from what they are talking about the service. Miss Walker got her order only a few second after she ordered it. Thus, it can be implied that there is a different service. The bartender was served the order as fast as possible if the customer have a good-looking appearance. This is completely opposite with what Susan and Nancy claimed before. Thus, the differences between Susan and Nancy’s expectation and reality can lead a humorous effect to the audience.

- 2) Nancy : “You look amazing, Susan.”
Susan Cooper : “I look like someone's homophobic aunt.”

According to the context, Susan is appointed to be an agent to investigate an illegal bomb-selling syndicate. She expects to be a cool agent with the charming suit and equipment's. However, he appointed to be a single mother for four children which is temporary relocated to work in Paris. In this situation Nancy is trying to cheer up the situation by teasing her appearance. It can be seen from this utterance “*you look amazing, Susan*”. Furthermore, this is flouting the maxim of quality since she is intentionally making a joke by teasing her appearance as an agent using a compliment word “you look amazing”. To conclude, make a joke about Susan's appearance in this scene can lead a humorous effect.

- 3) Susan : What are you doing?
Nancy : **I'm just tying up my shoelaces.**
Susan : You're wearing a loafer.

According to the context, Reyna is almost knowing the identity of Susan and Nancy while they discuss about Karen as double agent. Both of them is so scared and nervous to see her. “*I'm just tying up my shoelaces*”, it is considered as flouting maxim of quality since what she says is not true. She is trying to tying up her shoelaces meanwhile she is just wearing a loafer. Nancy unintentionally flouts maxim in order to release the tense situation by her silly act. To conclude, it indicates incongruous way of humour since there is punch line such Nancy trying to tie up her shoelaces while wearing a loafer.

3) Maxim of Quantity

- 1) The waiters : “So, do you like to have a look at the wine list?”
Rayna : “Yes. Penny, you can order.”
Susan : “Okay. Has some heft. Okay. I'm feeling a red. Kind of a red. I like a lot of noise. I like a little bit of... kind of a barky finish. I tend to like a white with the grit of a hummus...that's, of course, been thinned out. Just kind of jump up in the front of your palate and then rip back and sizzle. Almost a mineral kind of dirt finish... if we're having meat. Okay, here, this is looking... promising. Something with. This one has nice hints of toast... and dogwood, I assume? **I will have the Saponi e Delizie.**
- The waiters : “Right. That is the name of this restaurant.”**

According to the context, Susan is an agent who really do not know how to order wine. Susan is flouting the maxim of quantity since she is talking to much information in order to cover her true identity in front of Rayna. Thus, instead of asking for the recommendation by the waiter, she is randomly choosing “the Saponi e Delize”. She is assuming that it will be one of a good wine. Unfortunately, the Saponi e Delize is the name of the Casino. There is a gap between Susan’s expectation and reality. To conclude, the gap between Susan’s expectation and the reality after she found out that she had mistaken the name of the restaurant as the name of the wine giving surprising effect to make the audience laugh.

- 2) Nancy : “Wow. Oh My God. This is so exciting!”
Nancy : “You're a spy!”
Susan : “I know! I know!”

Nancy : “Oh My God! You’re gonna get one of those!”
 Susan : “No, I’m not! Look at that!”
 Nancy : “That looks high-tech.”
 Susan : “It’s like the future.”
Patrick : “I was given specific instructions by Elaine to tailor these gadgets to you.”
 Susan : “Wow. Wow, look at that watch.”
 Patrick : “These are not yours.”
 Susan : “Is that a rape whistle?”
 Patrick : “Elaine wanted you to only be carrying items a single woman travelling through Europe would have.”

This utterance “... *these gadgets to you.*” is flouting maxim of quantity as Patrick gives less contribution on giving information. These gadgets that Patrick have mentioned before were items that normally a single woman would have while travelling alone, but Susan had high expectation since Patrick show her high-tech items while saying his words. Based on incongruity theory, this flouting maxim cause a humour since it creates a conflict between Susan’s expectation and the reality.

Thus, in this study the writer found two triggers that construct humorous effect in spy movie. First, the utterance that conveyed by the speaker in this study use illocutionary acts consisted of assertive, expressive, and directive. Moreover, those speech act also flouted conversational maxim. They are flouting maxim of manner, maxim of quality, and quantity to create humorous effect.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, the writer found that there are illocutionary acts and flouting maxim of cooperative principle as the trigger of humorous effect in

Spy movie. The writer found three categories of illocutionary acts that consisted of assertive “Informing, claiming, and speculating”, expressive “thanking and sarcasm”, and directives “requesting” from the conversation of *Spy* characters which construct a humorous effect. The type of illocutionary act dominantly used to trigger humour is assertive. In using assertive illocutionary act, the speaker conveys his beliefs that some proposition is true. Indirectly, the speaker hope that their statement can affect the audience.

Furthermore, these data are also contained flouting of maxim which are also a great tool to create a humorous effect. Flouting maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of manner can create a surprising punchline to make the hearers laugh in this movie. However, it was done to construct humorous effect in this movie because of the ambiguity and the lack of required information or more information than required. Besides, based on the processes of constructing humour, there are three theories leading the humorous utterances. As the result, the incongruity theory has dominant role in constructing humour in this movie. The characters of this movie used incongruous way of humour by setting up an expectation in the hearers and surprise them with a surprising punchline which they did not expect.

REFERENCES

- Amianna, J. N., & Putranti, A. (2017). Humorous Situations Created by Violations and Floutings of Conversational Maxims in a Situation Comedy Entitled How I Met Your Mother. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(01), 97-107.
- Al-Zubeiry, H. Y. (2020). Violation of Grice's Maxims and Humorous Implicatures in the Arabic Comedy Madrasat Al-Mushaghbeen. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 16(02), 1043-1057.
- Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic Theories of Humor*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Attardo, S. (2017). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Humor*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Grice, P. (1991). *Studies in the Way of Words*. United State of America: First Harvard University Press.
- Krikmann, A. (2006). Contemporary Linguistic Theories of Humour. *Folklore: Electronic journal of folklore*, 27-58.
- Pan, W. (2012). Linguistic Basis of Humor In Uses of Grice's Cooperative Principle. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(6), 20-25.
- Puspasari, M. A., & Ariyanti, L. (2019). Flouting Maxims in Creating Humor: A Comparison Study Between Indonesian AND American Stand Up Comedy. *Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris Universitas Trunajaya* Vol. 13, No 2, 75-88.
- Rose, A. (1998). *The language of Humour*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *METODE DAN ANEKA TEKNIK ANALISIS BAHASA: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistic*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.

Supardi. (1993). Populasi dan Sampel Penelitian. *Jurnal UNISIA, No 17 Tahun XIII Triwulan VI*, 107-108.

Tupan, A. H., & Natalia, H. (2008). The Multiple Violations of Conversational Maxims in Some Episodes of Desperate Wives. *K@ta Lama, 10(1)*, 63-78.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.