

LINGUISTICS AND VIETNAMESE LINGUISTICS

**A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF HUMOR
IN MOVIE SCRIPT MONSTERS INC****TRAN THI LE DUNG* - NGUYEN THANH BINH****

ABSTRACT: In this article, humor in Movie Script Monsters Inc is examined conceptually in the framework theory of Grice's conversational maxims which are based on Grice's cooperative principle. The research is mainly carried out through the support of qualitative, quantitative and descriptive approach. Data contexts were conversations in movie script Monsters, Inc. The movie's footage and the script's transcript served as the study's data sources for Monsters Inc. According to the study's findings, this research reveals two findings. First, the characters in the movie script Monsters Inc. disobey all kinds of rules in an effort to make funny. The maxims of quantity flouting, relation flouting, manner flouting, and quality flouting are listed here. Second, in the Monsters Inc. movie script, humor is portrayed through jokes and unintentional conversational comedy. Since this style of humor predominates in everyday speech, it is the main sort of humor in the Monsters Inc. script. This includes irony sarcasm, hyperbole and understatement, teasing, wise responses to serious remarks, responses to rhetorical questions, puns and metaphors. Each of these types of spontaneous conversational humor has its own distinct view of what life is. Finally, the study concluded by demonstrating the benefit of humor in daily life. Thus, it is helpful to learn and apply humor in daily life.

KEY WORDS: humor; conversational maxims; framework theory ; script; jokes; daily life.

RECEIVED: August, 19th, 2023.

EDITED: November, 20th, 2023

1. Introduction

Throughout daily life, humor plays a significant role. Humor is a universally understood language. It lowers barriers between people.

Since humor may be used to ease tension, weariness, and fatigue in modern situations, it is crucial to understand its uses. A speaker can express the truth subtly and gracefully while employing comedy without upsetting anyone by doing so. Every hilarious circumstance should try to amuse viewers and make them laugh as this is the main purpose of humor. Felsch [4], comedy frequently differs by locale and is difficult to translate across cultural boundaries.

Over the years, there has been a lot of work done on the linguistics of comedy. In this case, a few possible approaches to look at are the semiotic approach, sociolinguistic approach, stylistic approach, and pragmatic approach. Humor is viewed by the pragmatic community as an infringement on Grice's Cooperative Principle. A computer-animated comedy film about monsters called Monsters, Inc. was made by Pixar Animation Studios for Walt Disney Pictures and released in the United States in 2001. Monsters, Incorporated is another name for Monsters, Inc. The film's screenplay was written by Andrew Stanton and Daniel Gerson, and it was directed by Pete Docter. The two monsters at the core of the movie are Mike Wazowski (Crystal), Mike Wazowski's one-eyed sidekick and the hairy James P. "Sulley" Sullivan (Goodman), who both work for the energy-producing factory Monsters, Inc, which terrifies children to create power. Monsters are required to terrify children and elicit screams from them so that additional electricity may be generated for the metropolis. However, the children are poisonous to the monsters, and after one of the children escapes, two of the monsters have the realization that things might not be as they think they are. In this film, there is a mixed variety of humorous examples. Verbal sarcasm and comedic circumstances were two strategies employed to

* Dr; Hanoi Open University; Email: tranledung1975@gmail.com

** Hanoi Open University; Email: binhhou@hou.edu.vn

demonstrate funny effect in the movie. As a result, we may use these when studying, instructing, and utilizing the English language in daily life, particularly in conversations. If students like learning English through movies, they might not feel bored. From the research background above, the researcher has decided to choose the topic “A Pragmatic Analysis of Humor in Movie Script Monsters Inc”.

2. Literature review

2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of how language and meaning change depending on the specifics of a given situation. According to Leech [8], pragmatics is just one of several subfields of linguistics that have existed for about twenty years but have just recently gained widespread attention. The growing recognition among linguists that a grasp of pragmatics is required as a basis for exposing the nature of language, specifically how language is used in communication, is driving the current surge of interest in the field of pragmatics. Leech [18] and Osisanwo [10] said that the field of study known as pragmatics investigates how context influences the interpretation of words.

According to Trask [13], the field of linguistics known as pragmatics explores how utterances convey meaning in context. A linguistic expression can have one of two meanings. Linguistic expressions with the first kind of meaning are inseparable from the word and cannot be removed. Semantics is the study of the meaning of this form. The second type of meaning, which is not dependent on the specific linguistic expression that it conveys, is the form of meaning that emerges as a result of the interaction between the specific linguistic expression and the context in which it is used. It is not specific to the linguistic expression it conveys. Pragmatics is the field that studies this type of meaning.

Finally, Levinson [9] concluded that pragmatics is the study of the interaction between language and context, which serves as the basis for understanding and explaining language. Pragmatics is the study of how language and context interact. The phrase "language comprehension" in this definition refers to the notion that an utterance of a language necessitates knowledge that extends beyond the word's literal meaning and the context in which it is used. Another definition of pragmatics is the ability to use language to connect utterances or sentences to contexts that correspond to those utterances or sentences. Another way to think of pragmatics is as an analysis of language use.

With the help of the definitions given, it is feasible to draw the conclusion that studying language through the prism of pragmatics enables one to talk about the intended meanings, presumptions, purposes, and types of activities that individuals engage in when speaking.

2.2. Pragmatic of humor

Humor is viewed pragmatically as a breach of Grice's cooperative principle. It is socially unacceptable to use certain communication techniques that violate the cooperative principle, including lying. Humor, though, is unique. Even though a speaker normally violates the cooperation principle when creating humor, it is generally accepted because the goal is amusement.

Wijana [15] argued that as comedy involves contradiction and conflict, it may be studied using linguistics. The standards of both textual and interpersonal pragmatics are used in linguistics to explain aspects of incongruity and conflict. Interpersonal incongruity is caused by breaking the politeness principle, whereas textual incongruity is caused by breaking the cooperation principle.

While humor may involve some degree of violating the cooperative principle, as argued by Raskin and Attardo [12], information may be shared through cooperation.

Raskin [11, p.87] suggested that “The cooperative principle still governs the joke-telling mode of communication because humor has communicative functions”. In summary, jokes and other forms of humor can arise in discussion when one party violates the cooperative principle, and their primary purpose is to make the other person laugh

2.3. Cooperative principle

2.3.1. Observance of maxim

a. Maxim of quality

Speakers are asked to talk truthfully and share their honest opinions. Grice [6, p.46] claimed that the maxim of quality forbids the speaker from making claims that are deemed to be untrue or inadequate. In other words, it is expected that the speaker will be real and honest. For instance:

A: *Why didn't you attend the party the previous night?*

B: *I attended my niece's wedding.*

In this conversation, speaker B freely acknowledges that she was obligated to attend the wedding of her niece and had to miss the party.

b. Maxim of quantity

Based on Grice [6], the maxim of quantity states that a speaker should only contribute as much information as is required for the discussion at hand. For instance:

A: *Where are you headed?*

B: *I'm heading to the mail facility.*

In this case, speaker B correctly answers the query of speaker A. She immediately replies the query of speaker A and includes all pertinent details in their contribution.

c. Maxim of relation

Grice [6] also said that the maxim of relation requires the speaker to say something that is relevant to what has been said before. For example:

A: *Where is my wallet?*

B: *It is your room.*

In the example, speaker B's reply relates to the question. She/he is not talking about something else.

d. Maxim of manner

According to Cutting [8], the maxim of manner requires speaker to describe things orderly and clearly. Besides, Grice [13] said that it asks the speaker to talk clearly, eliminate ambiguity, be clear and keep order. For instance:

A: *This morning, where was Ann?*

B: *She went to the store to pick up some supplies for tonight's barbecue party.*

The example illustrates how speaker B should have responded and commanded since they make it quite apparent where Ann was

2.3.2. Non-observance of maxim

Cutting [3] identified these four methods of maxim defiance as choosing out, breaking, infringing, and flouting. When the speaker disregards the maxim, it is considered non-observance of the maxim.

a. Opting out

When a speaker chooses not to use a maxim, it conveys that they are unwilling to cooperate, despite the fact that they do not wish to appear uncooperative. Sometimes, due to legal or ethical considerations, they are unable to respond in the manner that is anticipated, and when this occurs, they explain why (for example, *"I'm afraid I can't give you that information"*).

When requested to divulge the identity of an accident victim before alerting the families, a police officer may respond with *"I'm afraid I can't give you that information"* or *"no comment,"* which is a violation of the maxims.

b. Violating a maxim

Cutting [3] said that violations of the quantification principle occur when the speaker does not provide the listener with sufficient information about the topic being discussed or the big picture being presented. If the speaker is dishonest and misinforms the listener, even if it is a lie, this is considered a violation of the quality principle. Cutting [3] said that speakers can be dishonest and prone to misleading listeners, thus violating quality principles. Additionally, when a speaker changes the subject in order to avoid an answer or a topic brought up by another interlocutor, they are breaching the relational principle. Cutting [3] characterized a violation of the relational principle as

when speakers attempt to divert attention by changing the subject. The last one goes against the manners maxim. Cutting [3] claimed that evading giving a direct and acceptable response during a discussion by using vague or indirect allusions is against the etiquette norm.

Thomas claims that this adage is violated when the speaker knowingly withholds facts or makes a false, irrelevant, or confusing claim, and the listener wilfully assumes that they are complying. Below is an illustration of a violation.

A: *Does your dog bit people?*

B: *No, A (stoops to stroke it and is bit). You said that your dog doesn't bite. B: That's not my dog.*

Cutting [3, p.40]

c. *Infringing a maxim*

Thomas in Cutting [3, p.41] stated that, A speaker infringing a maxim fails to observe a maxims because of their imperfect linguistics performance. Below is an example of infringement.

English speaker: *Would you want strawberry or chicken?*

Non-English speaker: *Yes.*

Just by having a poor mastery of the language, the speaker violates the principle. She/he does not comprehend the question and is unable to provide a meaningful response.

d. *Flouting a maxim*

Black [1] claimed that there are times when people communicate for their own aims or motivations without using cooperative principles. Speakers have an option between violating and disobeying the maxims if they receive no cooperative response in their speech. Contravening the maxims is not the same as flouting them. According to Finch [5, p.160], "Flouting is more likely to be understood than actual infringement because it incorporates certain components of communication failure". Contrary to flouting, which is done purposely to help listeners understand the meaning of the neglected maxim. Violation of a maxim is something a speaker does.

Maxim flouting, in other words, occurs when the speakers don't seem to be adhering to the maxims but nevertheless expect the listeners to understand the underlying meaning. It is also possible to disregard each of the four cooperation principle maxims.

Thus, when a speaker of a dialogue flouts a maxim, there will be a good cause for it, and the speaker himself or herself will already have believed that the hearer will get the meaning of what he or she is doing. According to Cutting [3, p.37-39], flouting the precept means:

- *Flouting maxim of quality*

The speakers repeatedly violate various quality maxims. First, the speaker may simply say something that clearly does not reflect his or her thoughts. Second, people can exaggerate something and go against the maxim, as when they say, "I might eat a horse." Third, speakers sometimes ignore quality maxims by using metaphors like "Don't do that." "Wet blankets, we just want to have fun,"

Irony and sarcasm are the last two methods to break the quality rule. When you say something that completely contradicts what you intend, such as "The cobbler's children have no shoes". It is irony because a cobbler is a professional shoemaker, so the expectation is that her own children would have many shoes, not zero. Sarcasm is an unkind form of irony that is frequently employed to do harm. Sarcasm, on the other hand, displays a negative attitude while implying a favorable one. For example

A: *Mm. What's the point of this?*

B: *Well, he is unable to pay for his apartment now that I can't live with him. I therefore wondered whether it would be acceptable for him to stay with us for a few weeks.*

A: *Sure. You know what, though? Why not use our room, you guys?*

B's remark is met with sarcasm from A. Sarcasm is a type of conversational humor. A's statement implies the inverse. Since A uses sarcasm to make fun of and humiliate B, it fulfills a social management purpose.

- *Flouting maxim of quantity*

The speaker who violates the quantity requirement looks to deliver either insufficient or excessive information. As an example:

A: *How do I seem, then?*

B: *I like your sneakers.*

B doesn't say explicitly that the hoodie and pants don't look good together; nonetheless, he is aware that A will infer this from his silence due to the fact that A asks about B's overall appearance but is only told about a portion of it. If we take a second look at the elderly woman living in the retirement community who served as the starting point for this lesson, we can see that she violates the principle of quality by contradicting herself when she says "Oh sure, you'll hear other things, but that's what I think". The person being interviewed is aware that she is withholding some of the information that he requires to have a complete understanding of what is being stated. Because of this, he will inquire in the future, "What would the other people say?" The elderly woman was aware that the interviewer would find out that she had further information, but it's possible that she wanted to be pushed into providing it anyhow. It's comparable to saying "I had an incredible time last night," which begs the follow-up question, "Go on-tell me what happened then!".

- *Flouting maxim of relation*

When speakers ask listeners to imagine what they do not say and to draw connections between their current statement and previous ones, they are violating relational maxims. When a speaker deviates from the relation maxim, it is an indication that they are giving unrelated information. For instance:

A: *What do you think of David?*

B: *His flat mate is an excellent chef.*

Cutting [3]

B doesn't say out loud that she wasn't pleased with Mark, but by excluding him from her response and ostensibly expressing something irrelevant, she suggests that she wasn't.

- *Flouting maxim of manner*

When a speaker responds in an ambiguous manner, it happens. It indicates that the dialogue has more than one meaning. According to Cutting [3, p.39], people who violate the precept of manners by acting mysteriously are frequently attempting to exclude a third party, as in:

A: *Where are you going to?*

B: *I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for someone*

A: *Alright, but don't delay; the dinner is almost ready.*

Cutting, [3, p.39]

In order to prevent his little daughter from becoming interested and asking for the ice cream before her lunch, B avoids saying "ice cream" and "Michelle" and instead uses the ambiguous phrases "that funny white stuff" and "someone." In order to emphasize an idea, writers will occasionally use ambiguity in their writing to their advantage. The purpose of this analysis is to place disobeying a rule in the context of the film *Monsters, Inc.* Quality, quantity, relation, and manner are the four categories of ignoring a rule. Four of these rules are broken throughout the film, and by examining them we may identify issues with the dialogue between the leads.

3. Methodology

This study was carried out using a mixed methodology. Descriptive, quantitative, and qualitative approaches are all combined in a mixed method. This study's objective was to investigate and evaluate the comedic techniques utilized by the various characters in the film *Monsters, Inc.* As a result, the qualitative descriptive method is utilized in the analysis of the comedy included in the film. Creswell [2] explains that qualitative descriptive research is a technique that can be utilized to determine the significance of a social phenomenon that takes place in a society. This is in line with the goal of this study, which is to investigate a social phenomenon known as linguistic comedy, thus this finding is appropriate. The cooperation principle theory was applied in this study to assist researchers in the process of data analysis and in providing answers to the two different problem

formulations. The descriptive-qualitative research approach was utilized throughout the course of this investigation. As stated by Hancock [7], qualitative research is research that is focused on providing explanations of social phenomena. During this time, Vander Step and Johnston [14, p.7] explained that qualitative research results in narrative or textual descriptions of the phenomenon that is being studied. This study utilized a descriptive qualitative approach since it utilized narrative description in both its description and analysis of the phenomena that were the focus of the study. Therefore, it is not just a matter of analyzing and describing the data; rather, it is also a matter of interpreting the data in order to acquire a fuller and more in-depth comprehension of the maxim flouting that occurs in the film *Monsters, Inc.*

To its end, the author needs to answer the following questions: 1.What kinds of maxims are flouted by the characters creating humor in *Monsters Inc* movie? 2.How humor is created by the characters through flouting maxim?

4. Findings and discussions

4.1. Flouting maxim of quality

The maxim of quality can be disregarded in a number of different ways. First, the speakers can just say something that is obviously not reflective of their thoughts. Second, they might exaggerate, breaking the rule. Third, by employing a metaphor, a speaker can go against the rule of excellence. Irony and sarcasm are the final two methods to violate the quality maxim. Irony is the expression of the antithesis of a statement while also implying the contrary. Sarcasm is an unfriendly sort of irony that is typically used to cause harm to other people. All in all, according to Cutting [8] pointed out that speaker may flout the maxim quality by exaggerating as in the irony, overstatement, sarcasm and metaphor.

Data	Utterance	Type	Explanation
1	Ms. Flint: Alright, Mr. Bile, is it? Bile: Uh, my friends call me Phlegm. Ms. Flint: Uh-huh. Mr. Bile, can you tell me what you did wrong? Bile: I fell down? Ms. Flint: No, no, before that. Can anyone tell me Mr. Bile's big mistake? Anyone? Ms. Flint: Let's take a look at the tape. Here we go. Ms. Flint: Right... there. See? The door! <i>You left it wide open.</i> (scene 1)	I	The entire event is revealed to be a training exercise for novice monsters, during which they are judged on how effectively they scare people. This situational irony of a cowardly, clumsy, naive-looking monster is getting scared by the screams of a child. The fact that he is designed to scare is delightfully underlined by the incongruity of the character's name, which is Bile, and his naive statement, which is "My friends call me Phlegm" representing his laid-back personality. Irony is used in this situation, so it is called flouting the maxim of quality.
2	Mr. Waternoose: Our city is counting on you to collect those children's screams. Without scream, we have no power! Yes, it's dangerous work, and that's why I need you to be <i>at your best.</i>	I	Mr. Waternoose identifies "confident, tenacious, tough, and intimidating" as the four most important characteristics of an excellent scarer. He asserts that the monster James P. Sullivan exemplifies all four of these characteristics. The purpose of such a description is to heighten the audience's anticipation of what Sullivan might appear to

	<i>I need scarers who are confident, tenacious, tough, intimidating. I need scarers like... like... James P. Sullivan!</i> (scene 1)		be like and to conjure up the image of a rough and frightening creature. This anticipation is heightened by linguistic features such as "at your best" and the repeated use of "scarers" and "like," with a pause inserted in between the two instances of "like" to create an additional sense of sarcasm through the use of suspense. It is called flouting the maxim of quality.
3	Mike: One-eighteen. Do you have one-nineteen? Do I see one-twenty? Oh, <i>I don't believe it!</i> Sulley: <i>I'm not even breaking a sweat.</i> Mike: Not you! Look! The new commercial's on. (scene 2)	I	Sullivan and the audience are led to believe that Mike is expressing his surprise that Sullivan can work out so vigorously without breaking a sweat. However, the audience quickly discovers that Mike's statements are not in relation to Mike at all, but rather to a television commercial in which he will appear. What matters most is his phrase, "I can't believe it," followed by "I don't mean you." Suley then opts for negative and idiomatically communicates ease with "I'm not even breaking a sweat!" By substituting a comparable target phrase on the same level or with the same aim, chunking sideways is used once more. In this example, the irony is shown successfully. Sulley floats maxim of quality.
4	Mike: Hey! Good morning, Monstropolis. It's now five after the hour of 6:00 A.M. in the big monster city. Temperature's a balmy 65 degrees, which is good news for you reptiles, and it looks like it's gonna be a perfect day to maybe, hey, just lie in bed, sleep in, or simply... <i>(gets annoyed)</i> WORK OUT THAT FLAB THAT'S HANGING OVER THE BED!!! GET UP, SULLEY!!!! (scene 2)	I	Verbal irony is present in this conversation when Mike makes the remark, "it looks like it's going to be a perfect day to just lie in bed, sleep in..." It is obvious that Mike is making fun of Sullivan for sleeping in, meaning that he is unfit and lazy, and that he should rather get up and exercise. Departing from the idea that "terrific weather" and "lazing in bed" are equivalent in meaning in order to emphasize the irony that is intended. It is further supported by the movements, intonation, and facial emotions that Mike demonstrates. Mike floats maxim of quality.
5	Mike: I'm telling you, big daddy, you're gonna be seeing this face on TV a lot more often. Sulley: <i>Yeah, like on</i>	I	The use of parody as a kind of irony is demonstrated in this conversation by Sullivan's reference to the title of a well-known comedic television series. This creates a contradiction between appearing on

	"Monstropolis' Most Wanted"? Mike: Ha, ha, ha, ha. You've been jealous of my good looks since the fourth grade, pal. (scene 3)		television for the purpose of fame, as Mike believes, and embarrassment, as evidenced by Sullivan's use of the parody. Here, parody is being used as a device to express ironical disbelief which flouts maxim of quality
6	Randall: What do you know? It scares little kids <i>and</i> little monsters. Mike: <i>I wasn't scared, I have... allergies</i> (scene 5)	OU	In fact, Mike is extremely afraid of the kids, however when talking to Randall he refuses to let Randall know he was afraid, he uses his boldly voice with confident gesture in order that Randall does not have chance to taunt him. He said "I have... allergies" instead of "I was scared". So, he flouts the maxim of quality and he exaggerates her statement which is an example of the category known as hyperbole. He provides information that is quite misleading in comparison to the reality.
7	Randall: Shh, shh, shh, shh, shh. Do you hear that? Randall: It's the winds of change. Randall: Uh-huh, sure. Mike: "You hear that? <i>You hear the winds of cha--?</i>" What a creep. One of these days, I am really... gonna let you teach that guy a lesson. (scene 5)	I	This is a conversation between Randall and Mike. Randall threatens Sully and Mike as they are in the locker room by telling them that "winds of change" are on the way. After that, everyone goes into the fright floor, and the task of the day, which is collecting scream, starts. The Randall scene, on the other hand, does provide the story with the appropriate tone and rhythm, and it does show the audience what the conflict is all about. Mike made a hilarious imitation of Randall's saying by utilizing parody, which is contrary to the maxim of quality.
8	Claws' assistant: What happened? Claws: The kid almost touched me! She got this close to me! Claws' assistant: She wasn't scared of you?! She was only six! Claws: I could've been dead! I could've <i>DIED!!!!</i> (scene 6)	OU	This situation is very humorous because all monsters run a business which relies on scaring children, they themselves are afraid of a child. Seeing a child makes them so horrible. Since Claws exaggerates his response, This remark is classified as a quality maxim that has been broken. He makes an overstatement humor because he may die when being touched by the kid.
9	Mike: You know, I am so romantic, sometimes <i>I think I should just marry myself!</i> (scene 8)	Me	It is Mike's utterance when talking to Sully about borrowing odorant. Instead of being praised by someone else, Mike praises himself. He is so proud of his romance. The metaphor is used in the utterance "I should just marry myself". It is further understood

			that if he were a girl, he would marry to the husband like him because he is so romantic. Mike uses more information that situation requires, he uses insufficient words in conversation. It is called flouting the maxim of quality.
10	Roz: Hello, Wazowski. Fun filled evening planned for tonight? Mike: Well, as a matter of fact-- Roz: And I'm <i>sure</i> you filed your paperwork correctly... for once! Roz: <i>Your stunned silence is very reassuring.</i> (scene 8)	I	In this conversation, irony is used successfully. When Roz inquires about Mike's paperwork, she uses the word "correctly," which runs counter to what would transpire later when Sullivan goes through Mike's paranoia-inducing reports. In this instance, Roz says, "Your stunned silence is very reassuring," which is an antiphrasis and phonological irony marker that instructs the listener to take her message in an ironic light. Strong adjectives like "stunned" and "reassuring" are used to emphasize the irony in her statements as having a distinct meaning. She builds her position inside the organization as a fearsome authority figure who terrifies Mike with her dry, deadpan line of questioning that oozes with irony. Mike's suspicions weren't too far off, as Roz subsequently proved to be more than she first appeared to be.
11	Photographer: Look happy. Okay, on three. One, two... Photographer: <i>AAAAAAH HHH!!!!!! A KID!!!</i> (scene 10)	I	This scene happened in the restaurant where Mike and Celia were having a sweet dinner. The photographer smiled happily while the he was taking photos for everyone. Suddenly some people realized that a kid was on photographer's shoulder. They screamed so loudly that everyone put their eyes on him. He shouted "AAAAAAHHHHHHH". This situation is very humorous because all monsters run a business which relies on scaring children, they themselves are afraid of a child. Seeing a child makes them so horrible. It is situational irony flouting the maxim of quality.
12	Sulley and Mike: Aaaaaaah! Mike: No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no! Come here, kid! Mike: No, <i>don't touch those</i>, you little--! (scene 11)	I	After Mike and Sulley rescue Boo successfully, they return home. Sulley and Mike hurry toward the window. The location is being surveyed by helicopters outside. They quickly pull the drapes shut. Boo seems quite active. She totters toward them and babbles. They retreat in fear. This situation is very humorous because these cruel monsters like Mike and Sulley are afraid of a child.

			Seeing a child is horrible for them, it's like seeing a ghost. It is situational irony flouting the maxim of quality.
13	Mike: Okay, look, I think I have a plan here. <i>Using mainly spoons, we dig a tunnel under the city and release it into the wild.</i> Sulley: Spoons. Mike: That's it. I'm out of ideas. We're closed. Hot air balloon? Too expensive. Giant slingshot? Too conspicuous. Enormous wooden horse? Too Greek! (scene 12)	I	This scene takes place when Mike, Sulley and Boo are hiding in the apartment so that CDA agent do not find them. However, they cannot hide there forever. If they do not get out, they will be closed. Suddenly, Mike comes up an improbable idea. He imagines that just using a spoon will help them dig a tunnel to get Boo out. On the other hand, it is only his banter in an urgent situation because it is very mythical. So, He disregards the rule of quality and makes an exaggerated claim, which is considered ironic. He provides information that is wildly inaccurate.
14	Sulley: Hey, Mike, this might sound crazy, but I don't think that kid's dangerous. Mike: Really? Well, in that case, let's keep it. I always wanted a pet THAT COULD KILL ME!!! (scene 12)	Sr	When Sulley tries to convince Mike that Boo is not a threat, and Mike has this response with peak level sarcasm "I always wanted a pet THAT COULD KILL ME!!! Mike's opinion about kid is different from Sulley's. Therefore, instead of rejecting Sulley's opinion, Mike refers that Boo is not a threat but it can kill him. Mike ignores the rule of quality and makes an exaggerated claim that can be interpreted as sarcasm.
15	Mike: Roz, my tender, oozing blossom, you're looking fabulous today. Is that a new haircut? Come on, tell me. It's a new haircut, isn't it? That's got to be a new haircut. New makeup? You had a lift? You had a tuck? You had something? Something has been inserted in you that makes you look like... (scene 15)	I	It is Mike's utterance when talking to Roz. Mike wants to borrow the key of the room which Randall is using but he is afraid that Roz will mention to his late report again and she will scold him. Therefore, he gives a series of compliments to Mrs. Roz, he also asks a series of questions so that she does not have time to scold him anymore. He disobeys the rule of quality and makes an exaggerated comment that is considered ironic.
16	Sulley: I can still hear her little voice. Boo: Mike Wazowski! Mike: Hey, I can hear it too. Multiple day-care kids: Mike Wazowski! Mike: <i>How many kids you got in there?</i>	Sr	Sarcasm is employed in this exchange when Sulley thinks Boo is dead and was crushed into a box shape with the rubbish. How many kids you got in there? Mike asks as he approaches the broken trash and overhears several kids laughing. Although Mike is aware that Sulley doesn't have many kids in the garbage can, he nonetheless says it to

	(scene 18)		make a humorous point. This is verbal sarcasm. In addition to that, he said that to lighten the mood because he could tell that Sully was becoming increasingly agitated. In order to achieve a comic effect, the filmmaker relied not only on verbal sarcasm but also on hilarious circumstances. Mike disregards the rule of quality.
	Mike: Look at that big jerk. Ruined my life, and for what? <i>A STUPID KID!!!</i> Because of you, <i>I am now stuck in this frozen wasteland!</i> (scene 23)	OU	Mike says this utterance when Mike and Sully are pushed to the Himalayas because of saving Boo. Mike scolds and yells at Sulley for saving Boo which makes them be banished to an unexpected land which is considered as a frozen wasteland by Mike. In addition, in the time of anger Mike treats Sulley as a stupid kid. Because he exaggerates his statement, he violates the quality maxim. He spreads false information regarding the truth.
18	Mike: No, I'm not attacking you. I'm trying to be honest, just hear me out. Look, you and I are a <i>team</i> . Nothing is more important than our friendship. (scene 25)	OU	The bold words demonstrate the flouting of the quality maxim phenomena. This utterance happens when Mike realizes the importance of their friendship. Their friendship is the most important thing for him. Using comparison is considered as hyperbole. Everything is worthless without friendship. He forgets all his anger and stays with Sulley to overcome all difficulties. There is an undeniable truth that they are always a team.
19	Mike: Hey, Sulley, <i>I am baring my soul here</i> . The least you can do is pay attention! Mike: Hey, look at that, it's Randall. It's... Ohhhhh. (scene 25)	OU	In this dialogue, Invisible Randall attacks Sulley, choking him while he struggles for air. While Sulley tries to attack Randall back, Mike appears with a little bit annoying voice but he always stays with and supports Sulley. Mike expresses his feeling sincerely with his own soul. Mike aims his snowball at Sulley, but the impact reveals Randall's hidden face. Sulley knocks Randall unconscious with a punch. When he flops to the floor, Randall is once again in plain sight. Sulley struggles for air. Fortunately, Mike has unimaginable revenge on Randall. Actually, it's a very funny predicament.
20	Mike: Sulley, what are we doing?! Sulley: We have to get Boo's door and find a station.	Sr	The maxim of quality flouting phenomenon is illustrated by the bold words. This conversation takes place as Mike, Sulley, and Boo sprint onto the busy Scare Floor in search of a deserted station so that Randall

	Mike: What a plan. <i>Simple, yet insane!</i> (scene 27)		can find them. Unfortunately, Randall was eventually successful in breaking through the crowd of people. He moves in the direction of Sulley. It is highly improbable that Randall will arrive at their station before Boo's door does. Sulley activates an emergency system by pressing a bright red button that is situated on the keypad. The door to Boo's Vault, which was situated over the station, slides down into the door vault as an alarm goes off. Sulley makes a beeline towards the platform that is located one station further up. The vault is getting restocked with all of its doors right now. At the end, Sulley has a plan to escape which Mike considers it to be insane. Sarcasm is used in Mike's utterance for Sulley's plan.
--	--	--	---

Table 1. Flouting maxim of quality

No	Types	Frequency	Percentage
1	Irony	11	55%
2	Overstatement	5	25%
3	Sarcasm	3	15%
4	Metaphor	1	5%
Total		20	100%

Table 1 shows that the types of flouting maxim of quality consist of irony, overstatement, sarcasm and metaphor. The most notable example is the use of irony. Out of a total of 20, it appears 11 times. On the other hand, it accounts for 55% of the total of 100%. Overstatement ranks second, occurring 5 times or 25% of the time. Sarcasm ranks third, appearing 3 times or 15% of the time. After that, metaphor is ranked last with only one time receiving 5%.

4.1.2. Flouting maxim of quantity

A speaker violates the quantity maxim when his contribution is both less information than necessary for the current goal of the exchange and more informative than necessary.

Data	Utterance	Type	Explanation
21	Mike: Hey, what's shakin', bacon? Sulley: Did you lose weight? <i>Or a limb?</i> You have her card key, right? (scene 16)	RR	In this dialogue, Sulley flouts maxim of quantity because he uses the rhetorical question to try to be funny. Sulley does not need the answer from Mike because he does know that Mike does not lose weight, he does not also have a limb. These are rhetorical questions in order to tease Mike.
22	Mike: Never mind. You're in kindergarten, right? Oh, I love kindergarten. Best three years of my life.	RR	A child is sleeping in a bed on the laugh floor. The chamber is illuminated by soft moonlight. The bed sheets are slashed by a shadow. When the child sees the monster, he or she screams. Mike arrives out of nowhere as the room fills with the screech of microphone feedback. The

	Mike: Of my life. But I love sports. <i>Dodgeball was the best. Oh, yeah, I was the fastest one out there.</i> Of course I was the ball (scene 31)		young person switches on a light, reveals Mike, and then gets down on a stool holding a microphone. The kid stares at Mike and he was so confused. He tried to make the kid laugh by his witness. His witness is presented by his gestures and voice. He gives the rhetorical question for the kid without getting answer. Mike picks himself up, puts the microphone in his mouth, and sips it down. He waits, his stomach gurgling louder than usual. When he eventually lets out a loud burp, he grabs the microphone with both hands. However the kid does not laugh any more. In this dialogue, Mike flouts maxim of quantity because he uses his witness as well as the rhetorical question to try to be funny.
--	--	--	--

Table 2. Flouting maxim of quantity

No	Types	Frequency	Percentage
1	Replies to rhetorical questions	2	100%
Total		2	100%

Table 2 shows that replies to rhetorical questions is the unique type shown in *Monster Inc* with 2 times. In other words, its percentage is 100%.

4.1.3. Flouting maxim of relation

The relational principle is broken when an individual's input does not have any bearing on the topic at hand. Only provides the necessary amount of information and nothing more than that. The forms of spontaneous conversational humor that they invented include making teasing comments and responding in a witty way to words that are taken seriously.

Data	Utterance	Type	Explanation
23	Mike: Good morning, Roz, <i>my succulent little garden snail. And who would we be scaring today?</i> Roz: Wazowski! You didn't file your paperwork last night. Mike: Oh, that darn paperwork! Wouldn't it be easier if it all just blew away? Mike: Yes, well, uh, I'll try to be less careless. Roz: <i>I'm watching you, Wazowski. Always watching. Always.</i> (scene 6)	T	This dialogue between Mike and Roz happens in the scare floor. Mike flouts maxim of relation because he teases Roz with a humorous phrase “my succulent little garden snail” so that Roz does not mention to him for his late paperwork. Mike makes a grab for the paperwork that's been left on the desk, but Roz's dripping palm touches it before. Then Roz leans forward in her chair in a menacing manner. She appears to be a monstrous slug and wears horn-rimmed glasses. She repeats again that “Don't let it happen again” with a threatening voice and a dangerous look at Mike. Mike takes the papers and

			scuttles off. Roz calls after with a serious tone ‘I’m watching you, Wazowski. Always watching. Always.’ The humor happens not only in Mike’s utterance but also Roz’s voice, gesture, eyes.
24	Mike: I like everything about you. Just the other day, someone asked me who I thought the most beautiful monster was in all of Monstropolis, and you know what I said? Celia: What did you say? Mike: I said.... Mike: Sulley? Celia: <i>Sulley?!</i> Mike: <i>No! No, no! That's not what I was going to say! I mean, well, sure, he's handsome, if you like the big guy, he's rugged.</i> Celia: Mike, you're not making sense. (scene 10)	CR	This conversation happens when Celia and Mike are having a sweet dinner in a restaurant. When Mike was giving his lover sweet gestures and words by a clever question “Just the other day someone asked me who I thought the most beautiful monster was in all of Monstropolis” and asks Celia to guess who she is. Celia had implicitly understood that she is the most beautiful. However, Celia asked Mike again to let Mike answer directly “it is Celia”. It was out of Celia’s expectation, Mike has not replied the lover’s question yet, Sulley suddenly appeared out of the window. Mike saw Sulley and uttered his name in Celia’s surprise because she was asking who was the prettiest, instead of answering Celia, Mike answered Sulley. And when being asked again, Mike changed the topic and he said that Sulley is handsome but a bit rough. In this dialogue, Mike flouts maxim of relation because when Celia asks what he is saying, Mike does not answer according to Celia’s question. He describes Sulley and gives more information that is not necessary for Celia.
25	Mike: What bag? Sulley: <i>WOAHHH!! They don't have anything I like here, so take care, Celia!</i> (scene 10)	CR	In this situation of conversation, Mike has no idea about the bag, he does not also know what bag Sully is talking to. The situation above is about the bag but Sully responds Mike’s question by talking about Celia. Sulley gives untrue respond. Sully’s utterance forms maxim of quality because Sully cannot provide strong

			evidence about the bag.
26	Waternoose: Gentlemen, safety is our number one concern. Now if there's anything that. Not now, not now, I'm. Oh, hello, little one. Where did you come from? Sulley: Mr. Waternoose! Waternoose: Ah, James. Is this one yours? Sulley: Ah, actually, that's my uh, cousin's sister's daughter, sir. Mike: Yeah, it's, ah, <i>"Bring An Obscure Relative to Work Day"</i>. (scene 13)	CR	To get Boo back to her family, Sulley and Mike pretend she is the daughter of Sulley's cousin's sister and bring her to the factory. Nonetheless, they find that the plant is swarming with CDA agents looking for the kid and the person or people responsible for letting her in. Mike and Fungus talk about their position, and Fungus is warned by Randall that "they are dead!" if he ever identifies the perpetrator. So when Waternoose asked Sulley about Boo, Mike unexpectedly said "Bring An Obscure Relative to Work Day." Mike's response here does not correspond with Waternoose's inquiry. He provides an insufficient explanation. Mike disregards the rule of relation by trying to steer the discourse away from the subject at hand. He acts as though he didn't hear the inquiry.
27	Mike: Honey, please. Schmoopsie, I thought you liked sushi. Celia: <i>Sushi? Sushi?! You think this is about sushi?!</i> (scene 16)	CR	This dialogue happens when Celia and Mike were talking about Boo's appearance in the restaurant last night. Mike, on the other hand, attempts to alter the subject of the conversation. He pretends he can't hear what Celia is saying because he doesn't want Randall to overhear their conversation. Therefore, instead of answering about Boo, Mike talked about Sushi. Mike flouts maxim of relation because he makes a clever reply to serious statement.
28	Mike: Psst. Fungus. Fungus! You like cars? Huh? 'Cause I got a really nice car. If you let me go, I'll give you... a ride in the car. Please, Fungus? Fungus: I'm sorry, Wazowski, but Randall said I'm not allowed to fraternize with <i>victims of his evil plot</i>. (scene 20)	CR	Fungus disregards the rule of relation by responding with something unrelated to the question. When being asked for a new car, he should answer it with compliment but he replies that Mike is the victims of his evil plot so he cannot receive the car. Fungus makes a clever reply to

			serious statement.
29	Sulley: I'm glad you came back, Mike. Mike: Somebody's gotta take care of you, <i>you big hairball</i> . (scene 26)	T	Mike disregards the principle of relation by responding with something unrelated to the question. When Sulley announces that he is delighted that Mike is coming, he ought to utter a remark that expresses his happiness. However, he responds to it with a statement that has nothing to do with Sulley's state of contentment. Because Mike makes a hilarious remark, his words can be interpreted as a form of playful teasing. His purpose is to make fun, he teases Sulley as a big hairball which needs to be looked after.

Table 3. Flouting maxim of relation

No	Types	Frequency	Percentage
1	Clever replies to serious statements	5	71.4%
2	Teasing	2	28.6%
Total		7	100%

Table 3 describes that the types of flouting maxim of quality consist of teasing and clever replies to serious statements. Clever replies to serious statements happens 5 times out of the total of 7 data. In other word, the percentage of clever replies to serious statements makes up 71.4%, the left is teasing with 2 times which makes up 28.6%.

4.1.4. Flouting maxim of manner

A speaker violates the principle of manner if his or her contribution is vague, confusing, or disordered.

Data	Utterance	Type	Explanation
30	Mike: Oh, <i>Schmoopsie-Poo</i> ? Celia: <i>Googly Bear</i> ! (scene 4)	P	Their first lines together are Schmoopsie-Poo and Googly Bear, we instantly know that they are overly affectionate with one another. He says Schmoopsie-Poo and she responds Googly Bear as a pun to confirm that they belong together. She is his sweetie, honey-bunny and cute loved one. Both Mike and Celia flouts the maxim of manner because they use pun together.
31	Charlie, Waxford and Frank: Nice job! You took the lead! You did it! Look at those numbers! Sulley: <i>Slumber party</i> . (scene 6)	CR	This dialogue happens in the scare floor. Sulley was always in the 1st place at work but Randall was also quite excellent that day when he always followed Sulley on the board of the most violent monster ranking. Sulley and Randall took turns to take the 1st place.

			However Charlie, Waxford and Frank had to praise Sulley at the last minute because he was always at the top of the charts. The admirers turn their attention to the source of the several shouts. Mike is able to skillfully fill can after can with scream in a matter of seconds. Sulley pops his head through the door and cracks his knuckles as he does so. The scoreboard has been updated, and Sulley is currently in first place. Instead of saying thank you for the admirers, Sulley says “slumber party” to express that It is time for him to relax and sleep more. Sulley flouts maxim of manner because he replies to serious statement.
32	Sulley: There's something else. Mike: What?!! Sulley: <i>Ooklay in the ag-bay.</i> Mike: WHAT??!! Sulley: Look in the bag. (scene 10)	P	Before Mike and Sulley understood that children aren't as deadly as they'd been taught, it was a really huge deal if a kid fled into the monsters' world. Now, however, Mike and Sulley know that children aren't as harmful as they've been told. Because of this, Sulley was shocked to discover that a young girl had made her way out of her chamber and was clinging to his tail. He went into a state of panic, hid her in a gym bag, and dashed off to the restaurant where Mike and his girlfriend were having a romantic evening out on the town. The phrase "ooklay in the agbay" was Sulley's attempt to communicate with Mike in Pig Latin. Because Sulley makes use of puns in this scenario, he disregards the conventional wisdom of manners.
33	Mike: I love you, Schmoopsie-Poo! (scene 26)	P	Mike says this utterance when he is in a funny situation. He is between Sulley and Celia. Mike, Sulley and Boo run out from Randall. They immediately meet Celia. Celia's horrible scream gets Mike's attention. However, Mike cannot explain to Celia about all story at that time. In this situation, Celia does not know what is happening to Mike and Mike does not answer her question which makes Celia so furious and disappointed. Mike does not respond to Celia's question directly, he does not also explain in detail instead of having a clever and sweet respond “I love you, Schmoopsie-Poo! He says Schmoopsie-Poo as a pun to confirm that she is everything to him. She is his sweetie, honey-bunny and cute loved one. Mike flouts the maxim of manner because he uses pun to respond Celia's question.

Table 4. Flouting maxim of manner

No	Types	Frequency	Percentage
1	Puns	3	75%
2	Clever replies to serious statements	1	25%
Total		4	100%

Table 4 shows that clever replies to serious statements and puns are two types found in flouting maxim of manner with total 4 times. Puns are found 3 times as much as clever replies to serious statements. In all in, the percentage of puns makes up 75%, clever replies to serious statements reaches 25%.

4.1.5. Summary

Table 5. Findings of maxim flouting and forms

No.	Types of maxim flouting	Forms of humor		
		Types	Frequency	Percentage
1.	MQL	I	11	33.3%
		OU	5	15%
		Sr	3	9%
		Me	1	3%
				20
2.	MQT	RR	2	6%
				2
3.	MR	CR	5	15%
		T	2	6%
				7
4.	MM	P	3	9%
		CR	1	3%
			4	12.14%
TOTAL			33	100%

Of the four varieties of maxim flouting, the usage of a maxim of quality is the most common. Out of a total of 33 occasions, it happens 20 times. In other words, its percentage is 60.6% of the entire 100%. The characters disobey the quality standard to produce humorous forms and effects. The comedy in this work is improvised and produced by the characters without concern to quality. Irony, sarcasm, metaphor, and overstatement are the four sorts of impromptu conversational humor that result from quality flouting of the dictum. By flouting the quality standard 11 times out of every 100 times, or 55% of the time, irony emerges as the most prevalent phenomena of humor. Overstatement, which happens five times or 25% of the time, comes in second. Sarcasm comes in third place with three occurrences, or 15%. Metaphor comes in last with only one instance, earning 5% after that.

Relation maxim flouting is the second common maxim violation. It happens seven times out of 33 times, or 21.2% of the time. The characters employ the principle of relation to produce spontaneous humor during conversations. The types of spontaneous conversational humor that they create are teasing and clever replies to serious statement. The most frequent occurrence is clever replies to serious statements which occurs 5 times or 71.4%. The left rank is teasing occurs twice or 28.6%.

Following maxim of relation flouting, there is maxim of manner flouting. It occurs 4 times with the percentage of 12.14%. The characters flout maxim of manner to create two forms of humor: clever replies to serious statement and puns. Clever replies to serious statement occurs once times or 25%. Meanwhile, pun occurs 3 times or 75%. Finally, at the bottom of rank is maxim of quantity flouting which occurs 2 times with the percentage of 6.06%. The characters disregard the quantity maxim to develop only one type of spontaneous conversational humor is replies to rhetorical question. Besides the types of maxim flouting, table 4.5 also shows the forms of humor created through maxim flouting. There are only one form of humor that are created through maxim flouting is spontaneous conversational humor. There are 8 types of spontaneous conversational humor found in the movie. They are irony, sarcasm, pun, overstatement, teasing, replies to rhetorical question, clever replies to serious statements and metaphor

This study is unable to analyze any unintentional humor. Accidental physical comedy and accidental verbal humor are the two categories of inadvertent humor. Because the characters' utterances are the sources of data for this study, the first kind of accidental humor cannot be examined. A type of humor that is produced through physical activity is inadvertent physical humor. The second sort of inadvertent humor, called accidental linguistic humor, results from accidentally mispronouncing or spelling a word or phrase that was never meant to be funny. Of course, every amusing line in this movie is said to produce amusing effects. As a result, this study cannot employ incidental linguistic comedy as data.

5. Conclusion

According to the research done on the different categories of floating maxims, the movie *Monsters, Inc.* has four different categories of floating maxims, with a total of 33 utterances by characters in the film. The dominant floating maxim is quality. It is followed by flouting maxims of relation and floating maxims of manner. The last one is flouting the maxim of quantity. The analysis's findings indicate a connection between the flouting maxim and the invention of verbal humor. The research suggests that flouting the dictum can generate humor, especially verbal humor, based on the examples of its use by the characters in *Monsters, Inc.* An irony is the most common verbal humor in *Monster Inc.*, while the rest are sarcasm, overstatement and understatement, teasing, clever replies to serious statements, replies to rhetorical question, pun and metaphor. Maxim of quality flouting is the first most common phenomenon. It is because there are several ways to flout maxim of quality. The ways to flout maxim of quality are also found as the types of humor, such as irony, sarcasm, metaphor and overstatement. The floating maxim of relation produces verbal humor such as clever replies to serious statements and teasing. The floating maxim of manner also produces clever replies to serious statements and pun. The flouting maxim of quantity produces verbal humor of replies to rhetorical question. Therefore, the researcher is able to draw the conclusion that the reason the characters in *Monsters, Inc.* disregard the maxims is to generate a variety of forms of humor so that they can make the audience laugh

REFERENCES

1. Black, E. (2006), *Pragmatics Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
2. Creswell, J. W. (2013), *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design Choosing Among Five Approaches*, (3rd ed). SAGE Publications.
3. Cutting, J. (2002), *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge
4. Felsch, C. (2004), "Blac Humour in British Advertisement", Retrieved on 7 January 2013. <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/29900/black-humourin-british-advertisement>ment of English Education, Yogyakarta State University.
5. Finch. (2000), *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
6. Grice, H. P. (1975), *Logic and Conversation*, in P. Cole & J. L. Morgan. *Syntax and Semantics volume 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.

7. Hancock, B. (1998), *Trent Focus for Research and Development in Primary Health Care: an Introduction to Qualitative Research*. England: Trent Focus.
8. Leech, G. (1983), *Fusions: A Sense of Place*. USA: Center for Book Arts.
9. Levinson, S. C. (1983), *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Osisanwo, W. (2003), *Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics*. Lagos: Femolous - Fetop Publishers.
11. Raskin, V. (1985), *Semantic Mechanism of Humor*. Dordrecht Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company
12. Raskin V., and Attardo, S. (1991), *Script Theory Revised: Joke Similarity and Joke Representation Model*. International Journal of Humor Research, pp.333-365.
13. Trask, R.L. (1994), *Language Change*. London: Routledge.
14. Vanderstoep, Cott W., and Deidre D. Johnson. (2009), *Research Methods for Everyday Life: Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Approach*. New York: John Wiley&Sons.
15. Wijana, I.D.P. (1995), *Wacana Kartun Dalam Bahasa Indonesia. Disertasi Doktor*. Yogyakarta: Program Pasca Sarjana, Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Phân tích tính hài hước trong kịch bản phim Công ty quái vật qua ngữ dụng học

Tóm tắt: Trong bài viết này, sự hài hước trong Movie Script Monsters Inc được xem xét thông qua khái niệm trong lý thuyết khung về các châm ngôn hội thoại của Grice dựa trên nguyên tắc hợp tác của Grice. Nghiên cứu chủ yếu được thực hiện thông qua phương pháp tiếp cận định tính, định lượng và mô tả. Bối cảnh dữ liệu là các cuộc hội thoại trong kịch bản phim Monsters Inc. Đoạn phim của bộ phim và bản ghi của kịch bản đóng vai trò là nguồn dữ liệu của nghiên cứu cho Monsters Inc. Theo kết quả của nghiên cứu, nghiên cứu này cho thấy hai phát hiện. Đầu tiên, các nhân vật trong kịch bản phim Monsters Inc. không tuân theo mọi quy tắc nhằm cố gắng gây cười. Các châm ngôn về việc coi thường số lượng, coi thường quan hệ, coi thường cách thức và coi thường chất lượng được liệt kê ở đây. Thứ hai, trong kịch bản phim Monsters Inc., sự hài hước được thể hiện qua những trò đùa và lối đối thoại hài hước không có chủ ý. Vì phong cách hài hước này chiếm ưu thế trong lời nói hàng ngày nên nó là kiểu hài hước chính trong kịch bản của Monsters Inc. Điều này bao gồm châm biếm mỉa mai, cường điệu và nói giảm, trêu chọc, phản ứng khôn ngoan đối với nhận xét nghiêm túc, phản ứng với câu hỏi tu từ, chơi chữ và phép ẩn dụ. Mỗi kiểu trò chuyện hài hước tự phát này đều có quan điểm riêng về cuộc sống. Cuối cùng, nghiên cứu kết luận bằng cách chứng minh lợi ích của sự hài hước trong cuộc sống hàng ngày. Vì vậy, thật hữu ích khi học và áp dụng tính hài hước trong cuộc sống hàng ngày

Từ khóa: hài hước; châm ngôn hội thoại; khung lý thuyết; kịch bản; truyện cười; đời sống.