



**FLOUTING OF CONVERSATIONAL MAXIM USED IN  
STAND UP COMEDY INDONESIA IN KOMPAS TV**

**UNDERGRADUATE THESIS**

**BY**

**SITI HARDIYANTI**

**135110101111085**



**STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH  
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE  
FACULTY OF CULTURAL STUDIES  
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA**

**2017**



**FLOUTING OF CONVERSATIONAL MAXIMS USED IN  
STAND UP COMEDY INDONESIA IN KOMPAS TV**

**UNDERGRADUATE THESIS**

**Presented to  
Universitas Brawijaya  
In partial fulfillment of the requirements  
For the degree of *Sarjana Sastra***

**BY  
SITI HARDIYANTI  
135110101111085**

**STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH  
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE  
FACULTY OF CULTURAL STUDIES  
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA  
2017**





## DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

Herewith I,

Name : Siti Hardiyanti

NIM : 135110101111085

Address : RT.3 RW.3 Kec. Pamotan Kab. Rembang

declare that:

1. this undergraduate thesis is the sole work of mine and has not been written in collaboration with any other person, nor does it include, without due acknowledgement, the work of any other person.
2. if at a later time it is found that this undergraduate thesis is a product of plagiarism, I am willing to accept any legal consequences that may be imposed upon me.

Malang, 10 July 2017



Siti Hardiyanti  
NIM.135110101111085



This is to certify that the undergraduate thesis of Siti Hardiyanti has been approved by the supervisor

Malang, 10 July 2017

Supervisor

Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.

NIP. 197810172006042001





This is to certify that the undergraduate thesis of **Siti Hardiyanti** has been approved by the Board of Examiners as one of the requirements for the degree of *SarjanaSastra*.

**Yana Shanti Manipuspika, M.App.Ling Chair**  
NIK. 2010028411052001

**Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.**  
NIP. 197810172006042001

Acknowledge by,  
Head of Study Program of English

**Juliati, S.S, M.Hum.**  
NIP. 197209292006042001

Sighted by,  
Head of Department of Languages  
and Literature



**Ismatul Khasanah, M.Ed., Ph.D.**  
NIP. 197505182005012001

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, the writer wants to express the highest gratitude to Allah SWT for all the blessing, opportunity, health, and mercy to complete this thesis entitled “Flouting of Conversational Maxim Used in Stand up Comedy Indonesia Kompas TV”.

Second, the writer wants to express the deepest gratitude to the supervisor Istiqomah Wulandari, M. Ed. for the guidance, advice, and correction in finishing this thesis. The writer also wants thank to Yana Shanti Manipuspika, M.App.Ling as the examiner who has helped the writer to qualify the fulfilment of *Sarjana Sastra* in Faculty of Cultural Studies, Universitas Brawijaya.

Then, as the biggest gratitude, the writer sincerely thanks to parents and siblings who always be the best motivation. Thank for the support until this time.

The writer also wants to express the gratitude to Fina for all the help and support during the process of finishing this thesis.

Hopefully, God always blesses all of the people who have helped in finishing this thesis. This thesis is far from being perfect, but the writer hopes that it can be useful for readers and give a contribution to the Faculty of Cultural Studies especially the students of English Literature majoring Linguistics.

Malang, 13 June 2017

The Writer





## ABSTRACT

Hardiyanti, Siti. 2017. **Flouting of Conversational Maxim Used in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV**. Study of English, Department of Language and Literature, Faculty of Cultural Studies, Universitas Brawijaya. Supervisor: Istiqomah Wulandari

Keywords: Cooperative Principle, flouting of cooperative principles, implicature, Stand up Comedy Indonesia.

Generally, people do communication in everyday life for some reasons, like asking and giving information, sharing information, and etc. So that, people should be cooperative in communication in order to achieve their communication purpose. Grice proposed a general principle guiding people in using language. These principles is known as cooperative principles which is introduced by Grice (1975); Neo-Gricean theory. The writer conducted a reasearch about flouting of cooperative principles to solve the problems of the study, namely: (1) What type of conversational principles flouted in Stand-up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV. (2) What the implicature of cooperative principles being flouted in Standup Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV.

This study used qualitative approach in relation to the use of clear and systematic description about the phenomena being studied. The analysis of this research is document analysis because the data from YouTube videos are transcribed into textual data.

Based on findings, the writer found 32 times the comics flouted the maxim in grice's cooperative principle's theory. There were 9 times the comics flouted maxim of quantity, 9 times flouted maxim of quality, 4 times flouted maxim of relation, and 10 times flouted the maxim of manner. In Neo-Gricean theory, the writer found there were 13 times the comics flouted Horn's Q-Principle, 10 times the comics flouted Horn's R-Principle, 14 times the comics flouted Levinson's Q-heuristic, 8 times the comics flouted I-heuristic, and 1 time the comics Levinson's I-heuristic.

Based on the analysis, the writer concluded that in amusing the audiences, the comics of Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV flouted the cooperative principles to crate humor. Finally, the writer suggested the next researcher to relate the topic about cooperative principle with another topic, like Politeness Principle.





## ABSTRAK

Hardiyanti, Siti. 2017. **Flouting of Conversational Maxim Used in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV**. Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Jurusan Bahasa dan sastra, fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Brawijaya. Pembimbing: Istiqomah Wulandari

Kata Kunci: prinsip kerjasama, pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama, implikatur, Stand up Comedy Indonesia.

Secara umum, manusia berkomunikasi karena beberapa alasan, seperti meminta dan memberi informasi, berbagi informasi, dan lain-lain. Oleh karena itu, manusia harus bersikap kooperative dalam berkomunikasi agar mencapai tujuan komunikasi. Grice mengusulkan sebuah prinsip yang menuntun manusia dalam menggunakan bahasa. Prinsip ini dikenal sebagai prinsip kerjasama Grice (1975); teori Neo-Gricean. Penulis melakukan sebuah penelitian mengenai pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama untuk menjawab pertanyaan: (1) tipe prinsip kerjasama apa yang dilanggar di Stand up Comedy Indonesia di Kompas TV. (2) implikatur apa yang muncul dari pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama di Stand up Comedy Indonesia di Kompas TV.

Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif karena fenomena yang diteliti berhubungan dengan deskripsi data yang jelas dan sistematis. Analisis penelitian ini adalah analisis dokumen karena data yang diperoleh dari video di youtube di transkrip menjadi data tekstual

Berdasarkan hasil penelitian, peneliti menemukan 32 kali para komika melanggar maksim yang ada di teori Grice (1975). Ada 9 kali para komika melanggar maksim kuantitas, 9 kali melanggar maksim kualitas, 4 kali melanggar maksim relevansi, dan 10 kali melanggar maksim manner. Dalam teori Neo-Gricean, peneliti menemukan ada 13 kali para komika melanggar prinsip Q dari Horn, 10 kali melanggar prinsip R dari Horn, 14 kali melanggar heuristic Q dari Levinson, 8 kali melanggar heuristic I dari Levinson, dan 1 kali melanggar heuristic I dari Levinson.

Berdasarkan analisis, peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa untuk menghibur penonton, para komika di Stand up Comedy Indonesia di Kompas TV melanggar prinsip kerjasama untuk menciptakan humor. Terakhir, peneliti memberikan saran kepada peneliti selanjutnya agar menghubungkan topik mengenai prinsip kerjasama dengan topik lain, seperti prinsip kesopanan.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TITLE PAGE .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>ABSTRAK.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLE .....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>xi</b>

### CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Problem of the Study .....	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study .....	4
1.4 Definition of Key Terms .....	5

### CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Pragmatics .....	6
2.2 Context .....	7
2.3 Implicature.....	8
2.4 Grice's Cooperative Principle Theory (1975) .....	9
2.5 The Conversational Maxims.....	10
2.6 Neo-Gricean Theory.....	11
2.7 Flouting of the Maxims .....	12
2.8 Previous Studies .....	14

### CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Research Design .....	18
3.2 Data Source .....	18
3.3 Data Collection.....	19
3.4 Data Analysis.....	20

### CHAPTER IV FINDING AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Finding.....	22
4.1.1 Flouting of Maxim of Quantity.....	23
4.1.2 Flouting of Maxim of Quality.....	28
4.1.3 Flouting of Maxim of Relation .....	31
4.1.4 Flouting of Maxim of Manner .....	34
4.2 Discussion.....	39

### CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion .....	44
----------------------	----

5.2 Suggestion ..... 45

REFERENCES ..... 47

APPENDIX ..... 49





## LIST OF TABLE

**Table 3.4.1 Data Categorization of Flouting CP..... 20**



## LIST OF APPENDIX

### Utterances Containing Flouting of Cooperative Principle ..... 49





## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the writer explains the background of the study, which includes background of the study, problems of the study, objectives of the study, and definition of key terms.

#### 1.1 Background of the Study

Communication with others is one of human's basic needs. Chojimah (2014) says that as a social creature, human can not live well without relate to others. Such problems like psychological, social, academic and cultural problems can be resolved or answered through communication. Generally, people do communication in everyday life for some reasons, like asking and giving information, sharing information, and etc. Effendy (2007) argues that an effective communication occurs when the speaker delivers an utterance to the hearer then the message is understood by the hearer.

According to Widjaja (1986) communication is contact between human as individual or group. Communication is also part of human life. Moreover, Widjaja (1986) states that human starts to communicate begins from birth because first movement and cry of baby is one of communication signal.

In doing communication, both the speaker and the hearer should give a good contribution in order to get successful communication and to avoid misunderstanding. Yule (1996) states that to get successful communication,





people do not need to have a mastery good grammar or same language, but they need to know how to start, maintain, and end a conversation.

Chojimah (2014) says that someone is cooperative if the conversation reaches the maximally efficient communication. Grice proposed a general principle guiding people in using language. These principles is known as cooperative principles which is introduced by Grice (1975); Neo-Gricean theory. For example, when A asks B “where are you going to go?”, then B replies “I am going to go to supermarket”. A gives an appropriate answer to B. A does not give less, much, irrelevant, or ambiguous information. It means that B is being cooperative in the conversation.

According to Yule (1996, p.37) “The cooperative principle make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”. It means that speaker should give information as is required in order to achieve interlocutor’s goal in communication. Furthermore, Yule says that there are four maxims in Grice’s Cooperative Principle theory (1975). Those maxims are: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner.

Apparently, not all people in doing a communication always obey the conversational maxims. The maxims are being flouted when people deliberately conceal the intention and say other words. It is usually called as flouting of the maxims. Birner (2013) states that when people flout the maxim, people also violate it simultaneously, but people do this intentionally in order to make the





reader knows about this. People may deliberately say another word because they have an intended meaning or implicature. Griffiths (2006, p.134) states “Conversational implicature is inferences that depend on the existence of norms for the use of language, such as the widespread agreement that communicators should aim to tell the truth. Horn and Ward (2016, p.3) state “Implicature is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker’s utterance without being part of what is said.” So that, implicature is the hidden meaning of an utterance which is beyond of what is actually said by the speaker.

One of the phenomena in which maxims are being flouted can be found in Stand up Comedy. Stand up Comedy, according to Yandi (2016, para 2) is an art jokes which is delivered in front of the live audience. Sometimes the comic performs a few minutes. This genre uses their knowledge to tell the funny story. The performer of stand up comedy usually called as a comic or stand-up comedian. The comic stands in front of a live audience and starts the monolog until he or she gets immediate laughs from the audience.

The writer chooses Stand up Comedy Indonesia because Stand up Comedy is one of the real act program which is so popular nowadays. It reveals language phenomena to create humor in monologue way. Specifically, the writer chooses Stand Up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV as an object because according to Bryan (2016, para 9) states that Stand up Comedy Indonesia from Kompas tv is the pioneer of stand up comedy in or this program is the first program of Stand Up Comedy Indonesia on television which induce the same program on another





television. From season one until six of Stand Up Comedy Indonesia from Kompas TV, the writer chooses one video from the winner of Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV from each season as the representation of the other comics. This research focuses on analyzing flouting of the maxim used in Stand up Comedy Indonesia from Kompas TV based on Grice's Cooperative Principle Theory (1975). Furthermore, the writer adds Neo-Gricean theory as the additional information about cooperative principles.

This research hopefully can enrich the knowledge about flouting of cooperative principles. The finding of this research is expected to make the readers apprehend the humorous sense which is generated by flouting of maxims. Also, this study is aimed to enrich the knowledge about cooperative principle which was taught in pragmatic study.

## 1.2 Problems of the Study

There are some problems that are formulated for the use of the flouting of the maxims in achieving humor. The following problems are stated as follows:

1. What type of cooperative principle flouted in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV?
2. What is the implicature of cooperative principle being flouted in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV?

## 1.3 Objectives of the Study

Related to the problems of the study above, the objectives of the study are focused:





1. To find out the types of flouting of cooperative principle in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV.
2. To investigate the implicature of cooperative principle being flouted in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV.

#### 1.4 Definitions of the Key Terms

In order to avoid some misunderstanding in interpreting the terms used in this research, the definitions are given as follows:

1. **Cooperative Principle:** make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. (Yule, 1996, p. 37)
2. **The flouting of the maxims:** to flout a maxim is also to violate it - but in this case the violation is so intentionally blatant that the hearer is expected to be aware of the violation. (Birner, 2013, p.49)
3. **Implicature:** a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. (Horn and Ward, 2016, p.3)
4. **Stand-up comedy:** an art jokes which is delivered in front of the live audience. Sometimes the comic performs a few minutes. (Yandi, 2016, para 2)





## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter discusses the related literature of this study. This chapter consists of the discussion on pragmatics, context, implicature, Grice's Cooperative Principle Theory (1975), the Conversational Maxims, Neo-Gricean Theory, and flouting of the maxims. This chapter also deals with previous studies as the references of related study.

#### 2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of human communication using language in the context of society. According to Yule (1996, p.3) "Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)." Moreover, Yule (2010, p.128) states "Pragmatics is the study of 'invisible' meaning, or how we recognize what is meant even when it is not actually said or written." It means that pragmatics not only talks about the literal meaning, but also meaning which is related with context and its meaning as a particular way for its interpretation. It also means that pragmatics is the study of meaning behind the literal meaning. So, it can be concluded that pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.

Birner (2013) argues that pragmatics is the study of meaning based on context. Yule (1996) states that pragmatics is necessarily involves the particular context and how the context influences the information from what is delivered by the speaker. Yule (1996) says that in pragmatics, the speaker should take a





consideration about the particular context like with who they are talking to, where, when, and also the situation. Yule (1996) says that pragmatics is when the hearer listen about a statement which stated by the speaker then the hearer understand about the speaker's implicit meaning. From that definition, people know between language and context has an important role in pragmatic study.

According to Yule (1996, p.4) "Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms". It means that pragmatics deals with the speaker's meaning rather than sentence meaning literally or the linguistic form. So that, pragmatics is the study of meaning implicitly not only explicitly. When people use verbal communication, people need to be cooperative to maintain their relationship in having a conversation. Therefore, here the researcher uses pragmatics to investigate whether the speaker and the hearer are cooperative or not in a conversation.

## 2.2 Context

Correlated with pragmatics, context has an important role in understanding what people say implicitly. Grundy (2000) argues that context will help the hearer to understand the speaker's utterance implicitly not only explicitly.

Example : inside of class in a hot weather, a teacher says : "Today the weather is so hot."

From the example above, based on certain situation or the context, the hearer can interpret the utterance is only used as an information that the weather is actually hot or may be the teacher has an intended meaning that is he/she wants the student to open the window. Context will help someone to determine what is conveyed





implicitly, but not explicitly stated by the speaker. So, the hearer will understand the hidden meaning of an utterance based on the context.

### 2.3 Implicature

Horn and Ward (2016) says that implicature is part of speaker meaning which produces the intended meaning of the speaker implicitly. According to Kreidler (1998, p.29) "Implicature is a bridge constructed by the hearer (or reader) to relate one utterance to some previous utterance, and often the hearer or reader makes this connection unconsciously." It means that what speaker wants to communicate is usually richer than what is expressed explicitly, so that usually the speaker uses pragmatics principle to know the implicit meaning. By knowing these principles, the hearer will be able to draw inferences and the implied meaning of utterances. These implicit meaning is called as implicature which is indirectly stated by the speaker so that the implicature will help to connect the previous and the following utterance. According to Mey (2001, p. 45), "A conversational implicature is, therefore, something which is implied in conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use". It means that implicature is the meaning which is unstated directly by the speaker to the hearer so that the hearer should infer it by him/herself. Flouting of maxim is an interesting way to make the hearer draws an inference and then emerge an implicature. For example :

Rick : Hey, coming to wild party tonight?

Tom : My parents are visiting. (Yule, 1996, p.43)





In the conversation above, it can be assumed that Tom will spend his evening with his parents, and time spent with parents is quiet so that Tom is not at the party. It is sufficient to notice that the context is very important in determining what someone means by what they say even implicitly. The example shows how important context in helping us to understand an utterance. Context help someone to determine what is conveyed implicitly, but not explicitly stated by the speaker. From the example above, it can be concluded that context is important to find the implicature of someone's utterance.

#### **2.4 Grice's Cooperative Principle Theory (1975)**

When communicating, people have something to tell each other. Generally, when people communicate to each other, people will be cooperative by giving an appropriate answer of the question. According to Mey (2001, p.48) "Normally, what we expect when asking a question is that people cooperate by giving us an answer, and whatever comes our way, following a question, will normally be taken for an answer. It means that when speaker asks question to hearer, the hearer will give appropriate answer so that the participants is being cooperative in communicating, and the following words from the hearer is normally considered as the answer from the hearer to the speaker.

According to Yule (1996, p.37) "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." Here, the speaker's utterances should be clear, unambiguous, and relevant to the topic under discussion and should contain the appropriate amount of information for the





purposes of the interlocutors' current goals. So that, what should people know is the cooperative principle which covers four maxims, that are the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner.

## 2.5 the Conversational Maxims

Based on Grice (1975, cited in Birner, 2013) there are four maxims in conversation. Those are:

### 1. Quantity.

- a. Make your contribution as informative as is required.
- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

For example:

"The students are making progress" (Grundy, 2000, p.74)

being all the information the speaker provides, gives rise to the implicature that the students aren't doing brilliantly.

### 2. Quality

- a. Do not say what you believe to be false.
- b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

For example:

"Pragmatics is difficult". (Grundy, 2000, p. 74)

The example above is being assumed to be well founded, gives rise to the implicature that the speaker believes or has evidence that pragmatics is difficult.

### 3. Relation

Be relevant.

For example:





A : what time is it now?

B : it is at 7 'clock

From the example above, B gives a relevance answer toward A. So that B's answer does not make B confuse or misunderstanding.

#### 4. Manner

a. Avoid obscurity of expression

b. Avoid ambiguity

c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)

d. Be orderly

For example:

A : whose phone is this?

B : it is phone of Ellis's father.

B gives a clear answer to A by mentioning the owner of the phone which is asked by A. That is why B is fulfilling the maxim of manner.

From the example above, can be concluded that to get a successful conversation, both the speaker and the hearer should be cooperative in fulfilling the maxims. As the result, cooperative principle can cover meaningful contribution and gives benefits to the hearer when the speaker tries to say something clearly.

#### 2.6 Neo-Gricean Theory

There are two theories in this Neo-Gricean:

1. Horn's Theory (1984).





According to Horn (1984, cited in Birner, 2013) there are only two principles in which these principles are traced from Grice:

- a. The Q-Principle: Say as much as you can.
- b. The R-Principle: Say no more than you must.

The Q-Principle maps onto Grice's first submaxim of Quantity, while the R-Principle subsumes Grice's second submaxim of Quantity, the maxim of Relation and the maxim of Manner.

## 2. Levinson's Theory (2000).

According to Levinson (2000, cited in Birner, 2013) there are three principles:

- a. The Q-heuristic: What isn't said, isn't.
- b. The I-heuristic: What is simply describes is stereotypically exemplified.
- c. The M-heuristic: A marked message indicates a marked situation.

Q-heuristic is related to both Grice's first submaxim of Quantity and Horn's Q-Principle. The I-heuristic draws its name from "informativeness" and is related to Grice's second submaxim of Quantity and Horn's I-Principle. Finally, the M-heuristic is related to Grice's maxim of Manner, specifically the first and the third submaxims ("avoid obscurity of expression" and "be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)").

## 2.7 Flouting of the Maxims

Flouting of the maxims occurs when the speaker deliberately ignore the maxim. As Chojimah (2014) says that flouting is done by the speaker to make the





hearer aware that the maxims are disobeyed. Besides, it is done because what is said is something which is less or much informative, false information, or something which is irrelevant. Leech and Thomas (1998, cited in Mey, 2001, p.78) general observation remains :

“we can make a blatant show of breaking one of the maxims . . . in order to lead the addressee to look for a covert, implied meaning”.

Thus drive the listener or reader to the assumption of one or more conversational implicature.

It may be done in order to obtain a hidden meaning. Flouting of the maxims is usually performed by saying something which is different with what actually occur. For example:

1. Flouting of maxim of quantity :

“You are the older”

The utterance is stated by a father. He got mad when he saw his son come home too late in the night. By saying that, the father seems to disobey the maxim of quantity because the information does not appear to be informative enough. He does not tell further what is wrong of being the older. Nor does he explain what should be done by the older. Thus, the father flouts the maxim of quantity by giving less information. Then, what does the father implicate? He simply implies that he is made because his son is coming too late in the night and it will give the bad effect for him and his younger brother.

2. The flouting of the maxim of quality:

“Statistics is the easiest course for me.” (Chojimah, 2014, p.34)





The utterance above flouts the maxim of quality because the fact is truly different from what is said. In fact, the speaker is allergic with numbers, so he is not happy with mathematic course. The implication is perhaps mathematic is the most difficult subject.

### 3. The flouting of the maxim of relation:

A: Where is my box of chocolates?

B: The children were in your room this morning. (Smith and Wilson, (1979), cited in Leech (1981)).

B's contribution in the first example flouts to the maxim of relation, since an indirect and inappropriate answer to the question is given. B's answer in the second example appears not to be relevant to the question at first sight. However, the example could still be relevant to the speaker. A will infer that a specific implied meanings are being conveyed. In the example given, such implicatures could be that the children may have eaten the chocolate, or that the children may know where the chocolate is, as they were in A's room.

### 4. The flouting of the maxim of manner :

"Semua akan dikupas secara tajam setajam SILET". (Chojimah, 2014, p.36).

This utterance is uttered on the TV program entitled SILET. The utterance flouts the maxim of manner because the information is ambiguous. The word SILET here has two meanings. It can be the real meaning of silet that is something sharp blades or it is the name of the program itself.





## 2.8 Previous Studies

The study of pragmatics especially on maxims has attracted the attention of many researchers. So that, there can be found many researchers analyze about pragmatics. This subchapter will explain about the previous studies that are used by the writer as the basis in conducting this research.

For previous studies the writer uses two studies as the references of the related studies. First, was done by Santosa (2015) in his thesis entitled “the Flouting of Conversational Maxims to Create Humor in *Get Smart* movie”. Here, the researcher revealed that there are 27 utterances which flout the maxims, that are the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of manner, and the maxim of relation. The most maxims which are flouted is the maxim of relevance. There are 10 times maxims of relevance is being flouted. All of the maxims are being flouted to create humorous sense. Flouting the maxim of relevance is done when they are giving irrelevant response to the question or the topic to generate humor. The creation of the maxim of relevance is done when they want to change the topic, being misunderstood, feeling desperate, teasing and annoying the interlocutor, and also when they are not being connected to the topic of speaking as they are not clear with the interlocutor’s previous statement. His research is aimed to make the readers apprehend the humorous sense which is generated by flouting the maxims. Here, the researcher chooses *Get Smart* movie as his object because it has a comedy genre and it is common in most comedies, one of the characters favorably and expectedly has the most loquacious trait, and there is a great chance that he/she repeatedly flouts the conversational maxims.





Then, a second study about maxim is done by Firma (2014) in his thesis entitled “the Flouting of the Conversational Maxims by Opera Van Java’s Players in “Hadidi dan Maimun” Episode Trans 7”. Here, the researcher reveals there are 32 utterances containing the flouting of the maxims from OVJ players. In accordance to the research problem, there are only 24 utterances which cause laughter of the audiences. The data being analyzed by using the theory of the flouting maxim proposed by Grice and theory of humor via the flouting of the maxim proposed by Raskin. There are four kinds of maxims being flouted in these 2 scenes. They are maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. There is no double of flouting of the maxims in the data. His research is aimed to investigate language phenomena in order to reveal how the application of the cooperative principle via humorous utterances is. Here, he chooses Opera Van Java’s Player in “Hadidi dan Maimun” Episode Trans 7 as the object of his research because this television program often involves speakers, interlocutors, and audiences in applying and responding utterances to create humorous effect.

From these two examples, the writer finds some similarities and differences between those previous studies and recent study which being conducted. The similarities between the previous studies and recent study is on the main theory used, that is the theory of the Cooperative Principle by Grice (1975). It also focuses on the same topic that is find out the flouting of the maxims. Other similarities are on the focus of the study that both studies concerns on the humorous utterances.





Besides some similarities, the previous studies and recent studies also have some differences. In the first previous studies, the object of the research is a movie entitled *Get Smart* movie and the second previous study, the object of the research is Opera Van Java's Players in "Hadidi dan Maimun" Episode Trans 7" which is not only about the utterances but also the dialogue, setting, and characters. However, the first and the second previous study deal with conversational way in flouting the maxim while in the recent study the object is Stand up Comedy Indonesia which deals with monologue way. The writer emphasizes the differences of the two previous studies with the recent study based on the reason of selecting the object of this research that is to reveal language phenomena to create humor in monologue way.



## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter discussed the methods in conducting the research. It covered research design, data source, data collection, and data analysis.

#### 3.1 Research Design

Based on the problems and objectives of the study, the writer used qualitative methods in conducting the study. Mack et. al (2011) stated that qualitative research was a type of research which tried to answer the research problem or a topic on it. It was also preferable to get an information about values, opinions, behaviors, and social context of the populations.

Here, the writer analyzed the flouting of the maxims in Stand up Comedy Indonesia from Kompas TV by using Grice's Theory. The analysis of this research was document analysis because the data which was from YouTube was transcribed into textual data.

#### 3.2 Data Source

Here, the writer obtained the data from video of Stand up Comedy Indonesia from Kompas TV from YouTube. The writer chose video in Stand Comedy Indonesia from Kompas TV as the object of the study because there were many cases in which flouting of cooperative principles occurred to create humorous effect. It was also correlated with the objectives of the study that was to find what cooperative principles were flouted and the implicature. The data of this





research were the transcription of Stand Up Comedy Indonesia from Kompas TV video which flouted the cooperative principles. From season one until six of Stand Up Comedy Indonesia Kompas TV, the writer chose the video of the winner of Stand up Comedy Indonesia from Kompas TV from each season as the representation of the other comics. So that, here the writer used purposive sampling in determining the object. Wahyuni (2015) said that purposive sampling was one of sampling type in which the consideration of choosing a certain sample was based on the criteria which was relevant to the research problem.

### 3.3 Data Collection

In this study the writer collected the data mainly from the utterances of the comics in Stand up Comedy Indonesia from Kompas TV. In collecting the data, the writer did the following activities :

1. Finding the video of Stand Up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV.

First, the writer downloaded the video of Stand Up Comedy Indonesia Kompas TV from [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com). The writer chose to download the video from YouTube because YouTube was the most site where many people uploaded, downloaded and visited video. Beside, this site also provided many videos and it was easy to be downloaded.

3. Transcribing the video. It was done in order to make the data analysis easier.

4. Selecting the utterances containing the flouting of cooperative principles by marking the utterance.





Here, the writer needed to make sure whether the humor was caused by flouting the cooperative principles or not. In Stand up Comedy Indonesia, the creation of humor was not always from the flouting of cooperative principles.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, the writer did several procedures as follows:

1. Categorizing the utterances which flout the maxims and then analyzed them using Grice's theory (1975); Neo-Gricean Theory.

**Table 3.4.1 Data Categorization of Flouting Coopertaive Principle (CP)**

Datum No.	Utterances	Flouting Grice's Maxim				Flouting of Neo-Gricean Principle				
		QT	QL	R	M	Horn's Q-P	Horn's R-P	L's Q-h	L's I-h	L's M-h

Note :

QT : Quantity

QP : Q-Principle

QL : Quality

QR : R-Principle

R : Relation

L's Qh : Levinson's Q-heuristic

M : Manner

L's Ih : Levinson's I-heuristic

L's Mh : Levinson's M-heuristic

2. Explaining the flouted cooperative principles based on Grice's theory of the Cooperative Principle (1975); Neo-Gricean Theory.

3. Explaining the implicature.







## CHAPTER IV

### FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presented the finding and the discussion of the study based on the two problems of the study. The finding covered two sections. The first section was the analysis of flouting of the cooperative principle theory by Grice (1975); Neo-Gricean theory. The second was the analysis of implicature. The discussion was the elaboration of the results of the analysis.

#### 4.1 Finding

This part illustrated the findings derived from two problems of studies in which the first question concerned on the analysis of flouting of cooperative principle based on Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle (1975) supported by Neo-Gricean theory, and the second one concerned on the implicature.

Based on Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle or Conversational maxims, there were four maxims. They were the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner. Here, the writer found there were 32 times the comic flouted the conversational maxims. There were 9 times the comic flouted the maxim of quantity, 9 times the comic flouted the maxim quality, 4 times the comic flouted the maxim of relation, and 10 times the comic flouted the maxim of manner. The most maxim being flouted was the maxim of manner because many of the comic's utterances were ambiguous and obscure. The little maxim being flouted was the maxim of relation because many of the comics' utterances were relevant.





Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the writer found that there were 13 utterances which flouted Horn's Q-Principle and 10 utterances which flouted Horn's R-Principle. Besides, based on Levinson's heuristic, the writer found there were 14 utterances which flouted Q-heuristic, 1 utterances which flouted M-heuristic, and 8 utterances which flouted I heuristic. Some utterances which flouted cooperative principle would be explained below:

#### 4.1.1 Flouting of Maxim of Quantity

##### Datum 3

Tapi gue tumbuh di Jakarta rasanya aneh buat gue. Kenapa? Karena nilai-nilai moral yang dikasih ke gue waktu masih kecil kelihatan ambigu. Dulu gue tinggal sama tante gue, dan gue paling suka nonton acara pertandingan gulat tengah malam di tv. Abis itu ketahuan, sama tante gue dilarang. Dia bilang, "Ryan, kamu nggak boleh nonton pertandingan gulat kayak gini. Ini kasar." Dia bilang kayak gitu, gue heran padahal dia setiap hari dia bilang, "Ryan, kamu sekarang bersihkan kamar kamu atau tante gampar kamu!"

*(It felt strange for me growth in Jakarta. Why? Because the moral values given to me as a child seems ambiguous. I used to lived with my aunt, and I like to watch the midnight wrestling match on tv. After being caught by my aunt, she forbade me to watch it again. She said, "Ryan, you can not watch a wrestling match like this. It's rude." "She said like that, I was surprised because everyay she said, "Ryan, you are now cleaning your room or you want me to slap you!")*

##### Analysis :

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quantity because the utterance contained many informations. It should explain about the ambiguity of rising in Jakarta rather than explain about the chronology of his life. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's R-Principle and Levinson's I-heuristic because the information was too much. The comic wanted to make his utterances more clear because he wanted to





tell that he thought the moral values given to him when he was child seems ambiguous.

### **Datum 10**

Dia ngepost video yang nggak ada cahayanya dan dia bilang betapa serunya event itu.

*(She posts a video which is lightless, but she said how great this event)*

### **Analysis :**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quantity because the information was not enough. The question like why was the event run smoothly in lightless was not answered. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the utterance contained little information. Here, the comic wanted to say that the event occurred in the night club so that the event would run smoothly even though it was occurred in the place which was lightless because it used disco light.

### **Datum 18**

Aku paling bingung itu sama peran antagonis. Ada peran marah, tapi dia nggak ngomong tapi ada suaranya.

*(I'm confused about the role of antagonist. There is an angry role, but he does not talk but there is a voice)*

### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quantity because the information was not as informative as was required. The comic said that there was mad character in a play in which the actor did not said anything but could produce a voice. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the utterance did not contain enough information. The voice that was meant by





the comic was inner voice or something in mind so that it would be heard even though it was in mind.

### **Datum 21**

Lu kebayang nggak gue bikin show dibalai kartini. Biasanya tempat duduk berdasarkan harga tiket, gue beda. Berdasarkan barang bawaan. Yang bawa beras duduk di depan. "Mas, saya nggak bawa beras." "Bawa apa mas?" "Buah dan sayur." "Duduk diatas mas." *(Can you imagine if I show in Balai Kartini? usually seating based on ticket price, but I am not. It based on the luggage. The one who brings rice sits near to the stage. "I'm sorry I do not bring rice." "What do you bring?" "Fruit an vegetable". "You sit on the upper seat")*

### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quantity because the comic's utterance did not contain enough information since the comic just stated that the seat arranged by something which was brought by the audiences. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the utterance did not contain enough information. The comic wanted to say that the one who brought rice got lower seat which was close with the stage whereas the one who brought vegetable or fruit got upper seat which was far from stage. Rice was identical with basic need than vegetable or fruit, so that it was such an analogy.

### **Datum 22**

Stand up comedy indonesia, let's make laugh. Lha ini udah make laugh. *(Stand up comedy Indonesia, let's make laugh. It already makes laugh)*

### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quantity because what the comic said was too much. Firstly he said let's make laugh





but then he said that it already make laugh. The information was already contained in the first statement so that the comic did not need to tell it again. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's R-Principle and Levinson's I-heuristic because the utterance was too much. The comic deliberately shared the same information to make the audience laugh.

#### **Datum 24**

Menurut aku, iklan itu harus lebay biar yang nonton mau membelinya.  
(According to me, the advertisement should be exaggerating so that the people who watch will buy it)

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic fouted maxim of quantity because the comic did not give the reason why he said that an advertisement should be exaggerating. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the comic did not say as much as he can. The comic wanted to said that ususally an exaggerated advertisement would be easily to be remember than the ordinary advertisement.

#### **Datum 25**

Kita makan mie instan, "Mie instan lagi mie instan lagi."  
(When we ate instant noodle, we said, "Instant noodle again, instant noodle again")

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quantity because the comic repeated his utterance which was just same. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's R-Principle and Levinson's I-heuristic because the information was too much. The comic exaggerated his





utterance by saying too much information because he wanted to show the ennui of eating instant noodle.

#### **Datum 26**

Gini nih nasib anak kos.

*(This is the fate of living in boarding house)*

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory, the comic flouted maxim of quantity because the comic did not give enough information about being students who lived in boarding house. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the comic did not make his utterance clear. Here, the comic wanted to tell that students who lived in boarding house usually prefer to choose instant or cheap food, so that instant noodle was usually as the choice.

#### **Datum 31**

Iklan itu dimuat ditempat yang banyak orang lihat. Makanya sekarang iklan ada di TV, instagram, youtube. Tapi, nggak semua tempat yang banyak orang lihat itu bisa dijadikan iklan. Contohnya rumah kebakaran. Itu yang ngelihat rame cuma jangan dijadikan iklan.

*(An advertisement is usually posted in a place that many people see. So, now many advertisements are posted on TV, instagram, youtube, etc. But, not all the places that many people see it can be advertised. For example a house fires. Many people see it, but do not be advertising)*

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted quantity because the comic did not give the reason or the next information about house fires which could not be used as an advertisement, so that for the common hearer who did not really understand with the condition, they would be confused. It flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the comic





did not say as much as he can to explain his utterance. Here, the comic did not give more informations about house fires which could not be used as an advertisement because the comic expected the hearer understand with the situation. Then, the comic wanted to tell that we could not make burning house as an ad because it would be dangerous. Besides, we should pity because someone gets a calamity.

#### 4.1.2 Flouting of Maxim of Quality

##### Datum 5

Dan gue heran, kenapa ilmuwan-ilmuan diluar sana tidak ada yang menciptakan popok untuk burung.

*(I wonder why there is no scientist that created diapers for birds)*

##### Analysis:

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quality because the comic knew that a bird did not need to wear a diaper because it was too difficult and peculiar. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic did not flouted the principles. The comic deliberately said another word to create humor.

##### Datum 9

Instagram, snapchat, nggak ada yang salah. Lu bisa foto-foto makanan, lu bisa foto selfie. Nggak ada yang salah. Yang salah adalah kalau kualitas gambarnya jelek.

*(Instagram, snapchat. It is okay to uses these application. Here, you can take a picture of a food and selfie. Nothing wrong. The wrong thing is if the picture in bad quality)*

##### Analysis:

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quality because the comic gave an information that took a picture in bad quality was wrong,





but he did not give more information why it was so. So that the information was not informative enough. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic did not flouted the principles. It was done by the comic to suggest social media users to post a good quality picture in order to make the picture more interesting.

#### **Datum 14**

Ngomong2 soal film, jelas aku tu sukanya film warkop. Kenapa film warkop? Ya namanya basa basi sama om indro ya.

*(Talking about movie, of course I like Warkop movie. Why should Warkop movie? Just to be respect to Mr. Indro)*

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory, the comic flouted maxim of quality because actually the comic did not really like Warkop movie so that he said that it was to respect one of the actor in Warkop movie. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic did not flouted the principle. Here, the comic wanted to tease Indro who was one of the actor in Warkop movie and also on of the jury in Stand up Comedy Indonesia Kompas TV.

#### **Datum 16**

Perhatikan cewek2 seksi yang main di film warkop, itu kalo diciumin, wiw bulu keteknya rimbun, lebat. Saking lebatnya itu bulu2 keteknya bisa dijadikan kemoceng.

*(Pay attention to sexy girls who play in the Warkop movie. The armpit hair was too dense. Because it was too dense, it can be used to make a duster)*

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quality because the comic actually knew that armpit hair would not be used as feather duster. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic did not flouted the principle. The comic did not try to be truthful because the comic's utterance





was used as an allusion toward the girl that it was rather odious if a girl had dense armpit hair.

#### **Datum 19**

Ini agak kreatif ini soalnya bulu keteknya dipakein bandana jadinya enak.  
(*it is creative because she uses a bandana on her armpit hair*).

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim quality because actually the comic knew that bandana would not be used in armpit so that the comic's utterance flouted maxim of quality because he said what he believed to be false. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic did not flouted the principles. It was used as an emphasis that the armpit hair was too dense.

#### **Datum 20**

Tau gitu gue bawa monyet dari luar aja. Di dalem mahal.  
(*If I know about it, I bring a monkey from outside of this place because inside was too expensive*)

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quality because the comic knew that we could not brought our own monkey or other animals into the ragunan. So that the comic's utterance flouted maxim of quality because the comic's utterance was not true. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic did not flouted the principles. It was used to show that the price of the things inside the ragunan was too expensive than the outside.

#### **Datum 28**

Contohnya iklan yang aneh menurut aku adalah iklan coklat deng deng.  
(*An example of freakish ad is an ad of deng deng chocolate*)





### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quality because actually the comic wanted to say one of the chocolate brand but he did not say the brand correctly. He blatantly said another word. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, did not flout the principles. Here, the comic flouted maxim of quality when he did not mention the name of the chocolate brand correctly because the comic wanted to protect the chocolate brand because it was forbidden to say it bluntly.

### **Datum 30**

Jumpa sama aku, berantem sama aku d sini ya.  
(*If I meet him, I will fight with him*)

### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quality because actually the comic did not want to fight with other people so that here he delivered an information which was he believed to be false. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic did not flout the principles. It was used to create humor.

## **4.1.3 Flouting of Maxim of Relation**

### **Datum 2**

Gue tinggal dan tumbuh besar di Jakarta walaupun nggak terlalu terlihat maksimal tumbuh gue ya. Sama stand mic aja tinggian stand mic.  
(*I lived and grew up in Jakarta even though my body growth does not look maximal. Stand microphone is higher than my body*)

### **Analysis :**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic's utterances flouted the maxim of relation because there was no relation between rise in Jakarta and his body tall. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's R-





Principle and Levinson's I-heuristic because the information was irrelevant between the previous and the following sentence. Because of that, the comic gave information more than he must. The comic compare his body tall with the stand mic to exaggerate his statement. Here, the comic wanted to say that his tall was very short.

#### **Datum 15**

Film warkop itu identik dengan tiga mahasiswa kos-kosanan, cewek cantik yang suka main ke pantai, yang ke tiga apa? bulu ketek.  
(*Warkop movie is identical with three students who lived in a boarding house, beautiful girl who likes to play to the beach. What are the three? Armpit hair.*)

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory, the comic flouted maxim of relation because the comic did not give an explanation more about the characteristic of warkop movie. When the comic said that warkop movie was identical with students who lived in boarding house and beautiful girls who liked to play to the beach, it was heard that the sentence was fine, but then the comic said about armpit hair. It seems like irrelevant for the hearer who did not familiar with the movie. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the information was not enough or not really clear, so that it made the hearer hard to get the actual information about the comic's utterance. The comic just wanted to give information about the characteristics of warkop movie.

#### **Datum 23**

Dan ini parah banget bilang gue nggak terkenal, tapi emang iya sih gua nggak terkenal.  
(*It is bad that I am not famous, but it is true that I am not famous*)





### Analysis:

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of relation because what the hearer expected when the comic firstly stated that it was excessive to claim himself as not popular was the opposition which was the comic was popular. But in the following sentence, he agreed with his friend that he was not popular. So that it was irrelevant. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's R-Principle and Levinson's I-heuristic because the utterance was repeated since it was delivered in the first statement. Here, the comic confirmed his friend's statement that the comic was not popular.

### Datum 32

"Tolooong!! Rumah saya kebakaran." "Ibu kenapa?" "Rumah saya kebakaran." "Uh, nafas ibu kurang segar. Coba pakai ini biar nafas ibu jadi tambah segar."  
(*Help!! My house is on fire.*) (*What is happening, Ma'am?*) (*My house is on fire.*) "Uh, your breath is not fresh. Try to use this to make your breath fresh."

### Analysis:

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of relation because there was no relation between house fires and breath which is not fresh. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's R-Principle and Levinson's I-heuristic because the utterance was irrelevant, so that comic said more than the hearer actually needed to be heard. Here, the comic wanted to tell that made disaster as an advertisement was impolite.





#### 4.1.3 Flouting of Maxim of Manner

##### Datum 1

Hallo jakarta  
(*Hello Jakarta*)

##### Analysis:

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of Manner because the comic's utterance was ambiguous. The comic said "Hello Jakarta" to greet the audiences not the city. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the comic did not give information as much as he can. Because of that, the information became ambiguous. Here, the comic generalized the audience as Jakartanese because the audition held in Jakarta so that many of the audiences would be Jakartanese people.

##### Datum 4

Gue pecinta binatang tapi gue paling ngga suka burung, karena mereka buang kotoran sembarangan  
(*I'm animal lover but I do not like birds because they do defecation in every where*)

##### Analysis :

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of quality because firstly the comic stated that he was animal lover but then he said that he did not like bird. As people knew, bird was an animal. So that, the comic did not to be truthful in the first statement. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic did not flouted the principles. The comic said that he was an animal lover, but not for bird. Here, the comic actually know that he was not an animal





lover as well because there was animal that he did not like. The comic wanted to say that actually he was animal lover but not all of animals.

### **Datum 6**

Misalkan gue pesen gitu ya gue bilang, “Mbak, saya mau pesen meja.” “Atas nama bapak siapa?” Gue bilang, “Ryan.”  
(*For example if I order, I said, “Excuse me, I want to book a table.” “On whose behalf?” I said, “Mr. Ryan.”*)

### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice’s theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of manner because the information was ambiguous and mislead. When the comic said that he ordered a table, the hearer would think that the comic wanted to buy table. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn’s R-Principle and Levinson’s Q-heuristic because the comic did not give enough information so that it seems ambiguous. Book a table meant by the comic was table reservation in a restaurant.

### **Datum 7**

Ajaibnya adalah gue mau ngaku nama gue siapa dia tetep manggil gue dengan nama itu.  
(*The strange is when I say whatever I like as my name, she still calls me by that name*)

### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice’s theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of Manner, because the utterance was not clear. The meaning of the word ‘that’ was seems ambiguous. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn’s Q-principle and Levinson’s Q-heuristic because the information was too little. So that, it could mislead the hearer. Here, the comic wanted to short his utterance. The meaning of the word ‘that’ was the name used by the people when they booked a table in restaurant.





### Datum 8

Gue pernah lagi ngantri di restoran mewah gitu. Ada seorang bapak-bapak. Dia ngantri dia bilang ke mbaknya, "Mbak, saya mau pesen meja." "Atas nama Bapak siapa?" "Bapak Susilo." "Nama panggilannya siapa?" "Ya masa Susi. Panggilannya Lo." "Oh baik, Bapak." Begitu mejanya udah siap waitresnya bilang, "Atas nama Bapak Lo!" terus Bapaknya nanya. "Atas nama siapa?" "Atas nama Bapak Lo." "Heh, kamu jangan kurang ajar!"  
(*I have been queuing up at a fancy restaurant. There is an old man. He said to the waitress, "Mis, I want to book a table." "On whose behalf, Sir?" "Mr. Susilo." "What is the nickname?" "It is impossible if Susi. Call me Lo." "Oh well, Sir." As soon as his table was ready, the waitress said, "Mr. Lo!" The man asks, who?" "Mr. Lo." "Hey, you! Do not be insolent!"*)

### Analysis:

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of manner because when the comic said "Bapak Lo" in Indonesian language, it had two meanings. Bapak Lo could be the name of people or it could be your father. So that it was ambiguous. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the utterance contained little information. The comic did not explain more about what Bapak Lo was. So that it would make the utterance ambiguous. The words Bapak Lo meant by the comic was the translation of the words your father, so that in the comic utterance he said that it was impolite.

### Datum 11

Jadi pas musiknya jedak-jeduk yang gue liat cuma orang-orang selfie gelap.  
(*When the music is played, I just see the dark selfie people*)

### Analysis :

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted the maxim of manner because the meaning of phrase of dark selfie people was not clear enough. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the utterance was not clear enough so that it





became ambiguous. Phrase of dark selfie people meant by the comic was people who were selfie in the place which was lightless so that the picture would be in dark condition.

#### **Datum 12**

Terus kan kalo snapchat kan bisa dikasih tulisan-tulisannya gitu.

*(Snapchat, it can be given text)*

#### **Analysis :**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of manner because his utterance was not clear. People would be confused about what the actual meaning of the word 'text' in his utterance. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the utterance was not clear enough so that it became ambiguous. The text on a snapchat that was meant by the comic was a caption.

#### **Datum 13**

Laron-laronan adalah sebuah kelompok manusia yang di mana kalo manusia lainnya itu mengejar cita-cita, ada yang mengejar pendidikan, ada yang mengejar kesuksesan, atau harta, atau kaya raya. Nah, laron-laronan adalah sekelompok manusia yang mengejar cahaya.

*(People who are like a flying white ant is a group of people who if other people pursue their dreams, education, success, wealth, etc. Then, people who are like a flying white ant is a group of people who pursue a light)*

#### **Analysis :**

Based on Grice's theory, the comic flouted maxim of manner because the information given by the comic was too much and prolix since when he tried to explain about the meaning of people who are like a flying white ant, he has not directly talked about it but he talked about human being. So that, the information was prolix because it did not contain new information. Just





talked about what people who are like a flying white ant without talked about human being first since it did not change the main idea. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, flouted Horn's R and Levinson's I-heuristic because the utterance was mor than the comic must delivered. Here, the comic talked about human being first because the comic wanted to give the information about the meaning of people who were like a flying white ant clearly. Also, the comic wanted to make the audiences know the difference between people who were like a flying white ant and human in general.

#### **Datum 17**

Itu film dono.

*(That's Dono movie)*

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of manner because the comic's utterance was ambiguous. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the comic flouted Horn's Q-Principle and Levinson's Q-heuristic because the information was not enough so that the utterance became ambiguous. Dono movie here meant a movie in which Dono played as one of the main actor.

#### **Datum 27**

Sampe kelihatan itu tulisan S-E-L-U-U-U-R-U-P.

*(Untill the word S-E-L-U-U-U-R-U-P is very clear)*

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the comic flouted maxim of manner because the comic gave an information which was not clear and prolix since he spelled the word slurup one by one. Based on Neo-Gricean theory, the





comic flouted Horn's R-Principle and Levinson's M-heuristic because the information was prolix. Here, the reason why the comic spelt the word was because the comic wanted to emphasize the act of sipping.

#### **Datum 29**

Diiklannya ada pasangan putus cuma beda cara makan coklat. "Kamu siapa anak saya?" "Saya pacarnya. Saya dokter, masa depan anak om pasti bahagia ditangan saya." "Makan coklatnya dingin atau langsung?" "Saya makan dingin om." "Keluar! Kelurga di sini makan langsung." *(In the advertisement, there is a couple broke up just because of different ways to eat chocolate. "Who are you?" "I am boyfriend of your daughter, Sir. I am a doctor, the future of your daughter would be happy in my hands." "How is the the way you eat chocolate? Cold or direct?" "Cold, Sir." "Get out! The family here eat right away.")*

#### **Analysis:**

Based on Grice's theory, the comic flouted maxim of manner, because the information was prolix since it contained same information that was about the way to eat chocolate differently. Based Neo-Gricean theory, it flouted Horn's R and Levinson's I because it contained many sentences that just shared about same information so that it seems irrelevant in the utterance. Here, the comic said prolix information because the comic wanted to show that the advertisement was freakish.

### **4.2 Discussion**

In this discussion, the writer discussed the findings and the analysis of flouting of cooperative principle which were used by the comics of Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV by using Grice's theory (1975) supported by Neo-Gricean theory. The writer took one video of the winner of Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV from season one until six as the representation. After





analyzed the data have been collected, the writer found an interesting fact which related with flouting of cooperative principle used in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV that was in order to amuse the audiences, the comics of Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV flouted the cooperative principle to create humor. The writer found there were 32 times the comics flouted Grice's conversational maxims. In flouting the Neo-gricean theory, the writer found there were 23 utterances flouted Horn's principles and Levinson's heuristics. The comic's utterances contained too much information, but sometimes also too little information. The utterances were also ambiguous, prolix, and irrelevant. Sometimes the comic said what they believed to be false. Those were suitable with flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle theory (1975); Neo-Gricean theory.

From these result, the writer found that there were 9 times the comics of Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV flouted the maxim of quantity. It could be seen when the comics were using flouting of the maxims of quantity to say information which not as informative as was required or it was lack of information which made the hearer did not really understand what was actually the comics talked about. Many of their utterances was not as much as or precise as might be expected. The comic just gave the information shortly or less information. Second, the writer found that there were 9 times the comics flouted the maxim of quality. They flouted the maxim of quality to show that they were not to be truthful when communicating. Third, the writer found 4 utterances which flouted the maxim of relation. The comics gave an information which was irrelevant with their previous or next utterances in which it made the hearer





confused. The last, the writer found that there were 10 times of the comics in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV's utterances which flouted the maxim of manner. It was done by the comics because they did not explain the information of their utterances clearly and many of their utterances were ambiguous and obscure. In flouting the maxim of manner, the comics used utterance which has more than one meaning. Also, sometimes their utterances were obscure. Based on these results, the comics did not try to be cooperative in delivering an information. It based on the Grice Cooperative Principle Theory (1975), cited in Yule (1966) which stated "The cooperative principle make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged".

It meant that the speaker's utterances should be clear, unambiguous, and relevant to the topic under discussion. It also, should contain the appropriate amount of information for the purposes of the hearer's goal. Based on the findings, the writer knew that the comics were not being cooperative when delivered the information since the comics flouted the cooperative principles or conversational maxims.

Related with Grice's theory (1975), the writer also found that there were 23 times the comics flouted Horn's principle and Levinson's heuristic in Neo-Gricean theory. In flouting of Horn's Q-Principle, the comics did not say as much as they can. Many of their utterances were not informative enough. In flouting of Horn's R-Principle, the comics gave many informations than the comics must gave. Moreover, in flouting of Levinson's Q-heuristic, the comics did not say as much as they can. Many of their utterances were not informative enough. In



flouting of Levinson's I-heuristic, the comic gave many informations. In flouting of Levinson's M-heuristic, the comics delivered a message which was prolix.

In relation to previous studies, Santosa and Firman's research were different with the writer's results. First, was done by Santosa (2015) in his thesis entitled "the Flouting of Conversational Maxims to Create Humor in *Get Smart* movie". Based on Santosa's result of research, there were 10 times maxims of relation was being flouted of 27 utterances. The creation of the maxim of relation was done when they wanted to change the topic, made misunderstanding, and also when they were not being connected to the topic with the interlocutor's previous statement.

Then, a second study about maxim was done by Firma (2014) in his thesis entitled "the Flouting of the Conversational Maxims by Opera Van Java's Players in "Hadidi dan Maimun" Episode Trans 7". Here, the most maxim being flouted was maxim of relation which was occurred 11 times of 32 utterances. Maxim of relation was flouted when the OVJ players said something which was irrelevant to the topic of conversation to make audiences laugh. The OVJ players flouted the maxim of relation when they attempted to play a joke, felt annoyed, gave warning, performed self-defense, self-mockery, used word playing, and called away their interlocutors' attention.

Similar with both Firma (2014) and Santosa (2015), flouting of maxim in this study were also from the character's utterances which contained lying, denying, less or more informative utterances, said something which had no relation to the topic of conversation, and emphasized the ambiguity of expression.





On the contrary, the current study had some differences with the previous studies. First, the current study found the most maxim flouted was maxim of manner which was done because many of the comics utterances were ambiguous while the previous studies found the most maxim flouted was maxim of relation. Second, the current study used the newer theory of cooperative principle that was Neo-Gricean theory to support the main theory which made the exploration about cooperative principle richer than the previous studies. The last, the current study analyzed stand up comedy which was one of popular real act program nowadays. Besides, the previous studies used monologue way object in finding flouting of conversational maxim, while the current study used monologue way object in finding flouting of conversational maxim which made the current study more interesting than the previous studies.





## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter covered conclusion and suggestion which aimed to infer the result of the study and gave suggestion for the next researchers who wanted to conduct a similar study in the field.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

Generally, people do communication in everyday life for some reasons, like asking and giving information, sharing information, and etc. So that, people should be cooperative in communication in order to achieve their communication purpose. Grice proposed a general principle guiding people in using language.

These principles is known as cooperative principles which is introduced by Grice (1975). However, there were some people who still flouted these principles. The

writer conducted the research about flouting of cooperative principles. The purpose of this research was to find the types of flouting of cooperative principles

used in Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV and the implicature. After the writer did the analysis of the data that have been collected on the previous chapter,

the writer found that there were 32 times the comics flouted the cooperative principles. Based on Grice's theory (1975); Neo-Gricean theory, the writer found

that all of the maxims were flouted. They were the maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner. The most frequently

appeared was flouting of maxim of manner which occurred 10 times. The second





was the maxim of quantity which occurred 9 times. The third was the maxim of quality which occurred 9 times, and the last was the maxim of relation which occurred 4 times.

First, the maxim mostly flouted was maxim of manner in which it was occurred because the comics said something which was ambiguous, mislead, and sometimes obscure. Second, the maxim mostly flouted was the maxim of quantity which was done by the comics when they delivered less information which made the hearer confused. Also, the comics repeated the utterances which contained same information. Third, the maxim mostly flouted was the maxim of quality. Here, the comics flouted the maxim of quality when the comics did not try to be truthful in communicating, annoyed the jury, and teased the other comics. The last maxim being flouted was the maxim of relation which was shown by saying something irrelevant with the previous or the next statement. Based on the analysis, the writer concluded that in amusing the audiences, the comic of Stand up Comedy Indonesia in Kompas TV flouted the cooperative principles to create humor.

## 5.2 Suggestion

This study was limited to the discussion on the flouting maxims, therefore the next researchers were expected to relate the topic about cooperative principle with another topic like politeness principle by Leech (1983). This was important because Politeness Principle functioning to regulate the social balance and hospitality relation, so that people expected that the hearer were cooperative in a conversation. As a result, it would be better if the next researcher related









## REFERENCES

- Birner, Betty. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. United Kingdom: Wiley-Black Well.
- Bryan, E.C.H. (2016). *SUCA Indosiar Vs SUCI Kompas TV, Manakah Ajang yang Terbaik?* Retrieved Agustus 6, 2016, from [http://www.kompasiana.com/bryantvhardi/suca-indosiar-vs-suci-kompas-tv-manakah-ajang-yang-terbaik\\_57a5a362c923bd671109eb9c](http://www.kompasiana.com/bryantvhardi/suca-indosiar-vs-suci-kompas-tv-manakah-ajang-yang-terbaik_57a5a362c923bd671109eb9c)
- Chojimah, Nurul. (2014). *Uttarances an Their Meanings. Department of Languages and Literature*, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia.
- Effendy, Onong Uchjana. (2007). *Ilmu Komunikasi*. Banung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Firma, Mohammad Aden. (2014). *The Flouting of the Conversational Maxims by opera Van Java's Players in "Hadii dan Maimun" Episode Trans 7*. Unpublished Thesis, Malang: Brawijaya University.
- Griffiths, Patrick. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.
- Grundy, Peter. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Horn and Ward. (2006). *The Handbook of Pagmatics*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kreidler, Charles W. (1998). *Introduction English Semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1981). *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*. Great Britain: The Chaucer Press.
- Mack, Natasha; Woodsong, Cynthia; Macqueen, Kathleen M; Guest, Greg; Namey, Emily. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide*. USA: Family Health International.
- Mey, Jacob L. (2001). *Pragmatics*. United Kingdom : Athenaem Press.
- Santosa, Inka. (2015). *The Flouting of Conversational Maxims to Create Humor in Get Smart Movie*. Unpublished Thesis, Malang: Universitas Brawijaya.
- Wahyuni, Sari. (2015). *Qualitative Research Methode : Theory and Practic*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.





Widjaja, A.W. (1986). *Komunikasi dan Hubungan Masyarakat*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.

Yandi, Lee. (2015). *Sejarah Awal Berdirinya Stand up Comedy di Dunia*. Retrieved September 8, 2016, from [http://www.academia.edu/15492980/SEJARAH\\_AWAL\\_BERDIRINYA\\_STAND\\_UP\\_COMEDY\\_DI\\_DUNIA](http://www.academia.edu/15492980/SEJARAH_AWAL_BERDIRINYA_STAND_UP_COMEDY_DI_DUNIA)

Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yule, George. (2010). *The Study of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.



## APPENDIX

### Utterances Containing Flouting of Cooperative Principle

Datum No.	Utterance	Flouting of Grice's Maxim				Flouting of Neo-Gricean				
		QT	QL	R	M	Horn's QP	Horn's RP	Levinson's Qh	Levinson's Ih	Levinson's Mh
1.	Hallo Jakarta.	-	-	-	√	√	-	√	-	-
2.	Gue tinggal dan tumbuh besar di Jakarta walaupun nggak terlalu terlihat maksimal tumbuh gue ya. Sama stand mic aja tinggian stand mic.	-	-	√	-	-	√	-	√	-
3.	Tapi gue tumbuh di Jakarta rasanya aneh buat gue. Kenapa? Karena nilai-nilai moral yang dikasih ke gue waktu masih kecil kelihatan ambigu. Dulu gue tinggal sama tante gue, dan gue paling suka nonton acara pertandingan gulat tengah malam di tv. Abis itu ketahuan, sama tante gue dilarang. Dia bilang, "Ryan, kamu nggak boleh nonton pertandingan gulat kayak gini. Ini kasar." Dia bilang kayak gitu, gue heran padahal dia setiap hari dia bilang, "Ryan, kamu sekarang bersihkan kamar kamu atau tante gampar kamu!"	√	-	-	-	-	√	-	√	-
4.	Gue pecinta binatang tapi gue paling ngga suka burung, karena mereka buang kotoran sembarangan.	-	-	-	√	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Dan gue heran, kenapa ilmuan-ilmuan diluar sana tidak ada yang menciptakan popok untuk burung.	-	√	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.	Misalkan gue pesen gitu ya gue bilang, "Mbak, saya mau pesen meja." "Atas nama bapak siapa?"	-	-	-	√	-	√	√	-	-



Table Continued. . .

Datum No.	Utterance	Flouting of Grice's Maxim				Flouting of Neo-Gricean				
		QT	QL	R	M	Horn's QP	Horn's RP	Levinson's Qh	Levinson's Ih	Levinson's Mh
	Gue bilang, "Ryan."									
7.	Ajaibnya adalah gue mau ngaku nama gue siapa dia tetep manggil gue dengan nama itu.	-	-	-	√	√	-	√	-	-
8.	Gue pernah lagi ngantri di restoran mewah gitu. Ada seorang Bapak-bapak. Dia ngantri dia bilang ke mbaknya, "Mbak, saya mau pesen meja." "Atas nama Bapak siapa?" "Bapak Susilo." "Nama panggilannya siapa?" "Ya masa Susi. Panggilannya Lo." "Oh baik, Bapak." Begitu mejanya udah siap waitresnya bilang, "Atas nama Bapak Lo!" terus Bapaknya nanya. "Atas nama siapa?" "Atas nama Bapak Lo." "Heh, kamu jangan kurang ajar!"	-	-	-	√	√	-	√	-	-
9.	Instagram, snapchat, nggak ada yang salah. Lu bisa foto-foto makanan, lu bisa foto selfie. Nggak ada yang salah. Yang salah adalah kalau kualitas gambarnya jelek.		√	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10.	Dia ngepost video yang nggak ada cahayanya dan dia bilang betapa serunya event itu.	√	-	-	-	√	-	√	-	-
11.	Jadi pas musiknya jedak-jeduk yang gue liat cuma orang-orang selfie gelap.	-	-	-	√	√	-	√	-	-
12.	Jadi pas musiknya jedak-jeduk yang gue liat cuma orang-orang selfie gelap.	-	-	-	√	√	-	√	-	-
13.	Terus kan kalo snapchat kan bisa dikasih tulisan-tulisannya gitu.	-	-	-	√	-	√	-	√	-



Table Continued. . .

Datum No.	Utterance	Flouting of Grice's Maxim				Flouting of Neo-Gricean				
		QT	QL	R	M	Horn's QP	Horn's RP	Levinson's Qh	Levinson's Ih	Levinson's Mh
14.	Laron-laronan adalah sebuah kelompok manusia yang di mana kalo manusia lainnya itu mengejar cita-cita, ada yang mengejar pendidikan, ada yang mengejar kesuksesan, atau harta, atau kaya raya. Nah, laron-laronan adalah sekelompok manuasia yang mengejar cahaya.	-	√	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15.	Film warkop itu identik dengan tiga mahasiswa kos-kosanan, cewek cantik yang suka main ke pantai, yang ke tiga apa? bulu ketek.	-	√	-	-	√	-	√	-	-
16.	Perhatikan cewek2 seksi yang main di film warkop, itu kalo diciumin, wih bulu keteknya rimbun, lebat. Saking lebatnya itu bulu2 keteknya bisa dijadikan	-	√	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17.	Itu film Dono.	-	-	-	√	√	-	√	-	-
18.	Aku paling bingung itu sama peran antagonis. Ada peran marah, tapi dia nggak ngomong tapi ada suar	√	-	-	-	√	-	√	-	-
19.	Ini agak kreatif ini soalnya bulu keteknya dipakein bandana jadinya enak.	-	√	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20.	Tau gitu gue bawa monyet dari luar aje. Di dalem mahal.	-	√	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21.	Lu kebayang nggak gue bikin show dibalai kartini. Biasanya tempat duduk berdasarkan harga tiket, gue beda. Berdasarkan barang bawaan. Yang bawa beras duduk di depan. "Mas, saya nggak bawa	√	-	-	-	√	-	√	-	-



Table Continued. . .

Datum No.	Utterances	Flouting of Grice's Maxim				Flouting of Neo-Gricean				
		QT	QL	R	M	Horn's QP	Horn's RP	Levinson's Qh	Levinson's lh	Levinson's Mh
	beras." "Bawa apa mas?" "Buah dan sayur." "Duduk diatas mas."									
22.	Stand up comedy indonesia, let's make laugh. Lha ini udah make laugh.	√					√		√	-
23.	Dan ini parah banget bilang gue nggak terkenal, tapi emang iya sih gua nggak terkenal.			√			√		√	-
24.	Menurut aku, iklan itu harus lebay biar yang nonton mau membelinya.	√				√			-	-
25.	Kita makan mie instan. "Mie instan lagi mie instan lagi."	√				√			√	-
26.	Gini nih nasib anak kós	√				√			-	-
27.	Sampe kelihatan itu tulisan S-E-L-U-U-R-U-P				√		√			√
28.	Contohnya iklan yang aneh menurut aku adalah iklan coklat deng deng.		√						-	-
29.	Diiklannya ada pasangan putus cuma beda cara makan coklat. "Kamu siapanya anak saya?" "Saya pacarnya. Saya dokter, masa depan anak om pasti bahagia ditangan saya." "Makan coklatnya dingin atau langsung?" "Saya makan dingin om." "Keluar! Keluarga di sini makan langsung."				√		√		√	-
30.	Jumpa sama aku, berantem sama aku d sini ya.		√						-	-



Table Continued. . .

Datum No.	Utterance	Flouting of Grice's Maxim				Flouting of Neo-Gricean				
		QT	QL	R	M	Horn's QP	Horn's RP	Levinson's Qh	Levinson's Ih	Levinson's Mh
31.	Iklan itu dimuat ditempat yang banyak orang lihat. Makanya sekarang iklan ada di TV, instagram, youtube. Tapi, nggak semua tempat yang banyak orang lihat itu bisa dijadikan iklan. Contohnya rumah kebakaran. Itu yang ngelihat rame cuma jangan dijadikan iklan.	✓	-	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	-
32.	"Tolooong!! Rumah saya kebakaran." "Ibu kenapa?" "Rumah saya kebakaran." "Uh, nafas ibu kurang segar. Coba pakai ini biar nafas ibu jadi tambah segar."	-	-	✓	-	-	✓	-	✓	-



**KEMENTERIAN RISET, TEKNOLOGI DAN PENDIDIKAN TINGGI  
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA  
FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA**

Jalan Veteran Malang 65145 Indonesia  
Telp. (0341) 575875 Fax. (0341) 575822  
E-mail: fib\_ub@ub.ac.id <http://www.fib.ub.ac.id>

**BERITA ACARA BIMBINGAN SKRIPSI**

1. Nama : Siti Hardiyanti
2. NIM : 135110101111085
3. Program studi : Sastra Inggris
4. Topik Skripsi : Pragmatics
5. Judul Skripsi : Flouting of Conversational Maxim Used in Stand up Comedy  
Indonesia in Kompas TV
6. Tanggal Mengajukan : 17/Februari/ 2016
7. Tanggal Selesai Revisi : 27/ Juli /2017
8. Nama Pembimbing : Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.

**Keterangan Konsultasi \*)**

No.	Tanggal	Materi	Pembimbing	Paraf
1	17Feb. 2017	Pengajuan judul baru kepada dosen pembimbing	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
2	3Mar. 2017	Pengumpulan BAB 1-3	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
3	10 Mar. 2017	Revisi BAB 1-3	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
4	20 Mar. 2017	ACC BAB 1-3	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
5	24 Mar. 2017	Pelaksanaan Seminar Proposal	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
6	30 Mar. 2017	Revisi BAB 1-3 setelah seminar proposal	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
7	14 Apr. 2017	Pengajuan BAB 4-5	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
8	28 Apr. 2017	Revisi BAB 4-5	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	





9	8 Mei 2017	Revisi BAB 4-5	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
10	22 Mei 2017	Revisi BAB 4-5	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
11	2 Juni 2017	ACC BAB 4-5	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
12	16 Juni 2017	Pelaksanaan Seminar Hasil	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
13	21 Juni 2017	Revisi BAB 4-5 setelah Seminar Hasil	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
14	10 Juli 2017	ACC Ujian Skripsi	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
15	24 Juli 2017	Revisi Setelah Ujian Skripsi	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	
16	27 Juli 2017	ACC Penjilidan skripsi	Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.	

Telah dievaluasi dan diuji dengan nilai

B+

Malang, 22 Juli 2017

Mengetahui,  
Ketua Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra

Dosen Pembimbing

Ismatul Khasanah, M.Ed., Ph.D  
NIP. 19750518 200501 2 001

Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.  
NIP. 197810172006042001



**KEMENTERIAN RISET, TEKNOLOGI DAN PENDIDIKAN TINGGI  
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA  
FAKULTAS ILMU BUDAYA**

Jalan Veteran Malang 65145 Indonesia  
Telp. (0341) 575875 Fax. (0341) 575822  
E-mail: fib\_ub@ub.ac.id <http://www.fib.ub.ac.id>

**FORMULIR PERENCANAAN PEMBIMBINGAN SKRIPSI**

**Nama Mahasiswa** : Siti Hardiyanti  
**Nomor Induk Mahasiswa** : 135110101111085  
**Prodi** : Sastra Inggris  
**Topik** : Pragmatics  
**Nomor Telp/HP** : 08862788753  
**Alamat e-mail** : sh3788360@gmail.com  
**Pembimbing** : Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.  
**Pelaksanaan Skripsi** : semester ganjil dan genap tahun akademik 2016/2017

No.	Kegiatan	Waktu Pelaksanaan	Keterangan
1	Perencanaan skripsi dan memahami latar belakang, rumusan masalah, dan penulisan deskriptif	Februari 2017	Terlaksana
2	Memahami tinjauan pustaka dan teori	Maret 2017	Terlaksana
3	Memahami metode penelitian	Maret 2017	Terlaksana
4	Pengarahan penelitian	April 2017	Terlaksana
5	Pengajuan kerangka penelitian	April 2017	Terlaksana
6	Penulisan BAB 4-5	April 2017	Terlaksana
7	Pemantapan keseluruhan skripsi	Juni 2017	Terlaksana
8	Tahap penyelesaian skripsi	Juli 2017	Terlaksana

Malang, 22 Juli 2017

Mengetahui  
Penasehat Akademik

Scarletina Vidyayani Eka, M.Hum  
NIP. 840123 13 1 2 0059

Mahasiswa

Siti Hardiyanti  
NIM. 135110101111085





Menyetujui  
Pembimbing

Istiqomah Wulandari, M.Ed.  
NIP. 197810172006042001