

Bagus Detrianto, 2018

Volume 4 Issue 2, pp. 1262-1276

Date of Publication: 17<sup>th</sup> September 2018

DOI-<https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2018.42.12621276>

This paper can be cited as: Detrianto, B. (2018). *Humorous Effects on Flouting Conversational Maxims Found in Indonesian Drama Comedy: A Study of Humor in Language*. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 1262-1276.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

## **HUMOROUS EFFECTS ON FLOUTING CONVERSATIONAL MAXIMS FOUND IN INDONESIAN DRAMA COMEDY: A STUDY OF HUMOR IN LANGUAGE**

**Bagus Detrianto**

*Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Malang, Indonesia*  
[14320069@student.uin-malang.ac.id](mailto:14320069@student.uin-malang.ac.id)

---

### **Abstract**

*Humor and language cannot be separated one another, because both of them are in one unity. Due to the fact that humor is one of the important aspects of communication through language in order to make communications more relaxed. Thus, to make the conversation become friendly, people sometimes make jokes one another during the conversations. Therefore, people often break the role of cooperative principles by flouting the maxims. This research aimed to observe and investigate the relation of humorous effects with Grice's conversational maxims found in drama comedy Bajaj Bajuri Spesial Lebaran edition, which was broadcasted in Trans TV. In addition, the data was obtained from YouTube which was uploaded by MR WISE on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 with the title "Bajaj Bajuri (Spesial Lebaran, Lebaran Maafkan). After collecting the data, the researcher did the analysis based on the theory which proposed by Grice (1975), then the researcher analysed the relationship between the humorous effects in this drama comedy and the flouting of conversational maxims. The result showed that there were some flouted maxims, but it did not lead the conversations into the end. In fact, it might make the conversation lively and friendly, sometimes the flouted maxims also caused the humorous effects.*

## **Keywords**

Bajaj Bajuri, Flouting Maxims, Humorous Effects, Indonesia Drama Comedy

---

## **1. Introduction**

In human life, humor and language cannot be separated one another, because both of them are in one unity. Due to the fact that humor is one of the important means of communication through language in order to make a communication more relaxed and lively. Thus, to make the conversation become friendly, people sometimes make jokes one another during the conversation. According to Holmes & Marra (2006), humor is very beneficial for human life in social interactions. In daily communication, people will feel enjoy if the conversation goes smoothly and friendly. Further, in order to make the interactions through conversation friendlier, the sense of humor is needed. Thus, humor can be a mean of expressing friendliness, peace, care, solidarity, or positive politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987 as cited in Holmes & Marra 2006). Humor can reduce stress, tension, and maintain relationships with others (Fraley & Aron, 2004; Priest & Thein, 2003). Further, humor can also provoke people to laugh, so it is indeed good for people's health. The report of scientific research shows that laughter is very beneficial for health on immune (Martin, 2006).

In addition, humor can also be used in teaching activities in the classroom. Teacher and students' interaction in the classroom is important component for transferring the knowledge. According to Schmitz (2006), humor should be an important component in learning activities especially in foreign language and translation courses. Thus, the fact shows that if the classroom situation is friendly, students will enjoy the learning process indeed. Therefore, the presence of humor in interaction is very beneficial for human life. Furthermore, humor there two different kinds of stimulus that makes something categorized as funny things. First is when humors are being told, so the readers or listeners get their first perception about the meaning of humor. Another one is when humors are being told suddenly, it is usually in the end of humor. Furthermore, Raskin (1985) classified humor as something funny as follows:

- There is presupposition which is shared by speaker and hearer.

Somehow, when the presupposition is not the same between the speaker and hearer, it is very possible to cause jokes or something funny. Therefore, many jokes can be demonstrated which is based on the knowledge of a presupposition shared by the speaker

and the hearer. Example: This girl reminds me of Dreyfus, the army does not believe in her innocence.

- There is an implicature which is produced by the speaker.

In this case, when the implicature is constructed in the form of sentences or utterances which are not in its literal meaning, it can provoke many jokes and something funny.

- There is a possible world which is evoked by the text,

Possible world is understood as in the usual superficial way as minor from the word “impossible” deviation from the “real” world.

- There is speech act occur in communications or conversations.

Speech acts can be in the form of assertions, questions, promises, etc. Thus, when speech acts occur in the conversation or communication, it is also possible to provoke jokes. Example: She thinks his nose looks like a lump of truffle pate.

Somehow, people often break the role of cooperative principles by flouting the maxims in conversations. Thus, they sometimes break the roles of maxims in order to make the communication friendly. In this case, it is also possible that the flouted maxims cause humorous effects. Before talking deeper about the relation between the humorous effects and cooperative principles, we should understand what actually cooperative principle means. Further, it is a set of roles which should be obeyed by a speaker and hearer in the conversation, in order to have a smooth conversation. In the cooperative principle, there are four maxims, those are: Maxim of Quantity, Maxims of Quality, Maxims of Relation/relevance, and Maxims of Manner (Grice, 1975, as cited in Cutting, 2002; Zhang, 2004).

In this part, the researcher explained more about those four maxims. First is maxim of quantity, it has the rule that people have to make his/her contribution in the conversation as informative as required. Thus, it means that the speakers should not give too much or too little information. Somehow, it may have purpose of misleading another speaker in a conversation (O’Grady, 1993). The second is maxim of quality, it has the rule that people have to tell the truth. Thus, it means that the speakers should not say something which he/she lacks adequate evidence, and they should not say what he/she believes to be false. The third is maxims of relation/relevance, it has the rule that people should say something which is relevant to what has been said before. Thus, it means that the speakers should not change the topic in the middle of the conversation directly. And the fourth is maxim of manner, it has the rule that people should be brief and orderly. Thus, it means that the speakers should not say something which is ambiguous.

Further, in order to have smooth conversation, both speakers in the conversation should follow the rules. If people do not follow the rules, it may lead to misunderstanding. Besides, it may cause humor as stated by (Wijayana, 1996).

In conversation, sometimes, people flout the maxims for some certain reasons. Thus, it does not mean they fail to communicate in their conversations. Therefore, flouting of conversational maxim does not bring the conversation to the end, but it may cause humorous effects on it. Therefore, in this research, the researcher observed and analysed the humorous effects which was found during the conversation when the characters flouted the maxims, whether it caused humorous effects or not. Thus, this research aimed to observe and investigate the relation of humorous effects on Grice's conversational maxims found in drama comedy Bajaj Bajuri Spesial Lebaran edition, which was broadcasted in Trans TV. In addition, the data was obtained from YouTube which was uploaded by MR WISE on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 with the title "Bajaj Bajuri (Spesial Lebaran, Lebaran Maafkan).

## **2. Methodology**

In this research, the researcher conducted the observation by using a descriptive qualitative approach. As Creswell (2009, p. 4) stated that qualitative research is a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups describe to a social or human problem. Due to the fact that in this research, the researcher observed and analysed the relationship between the humorous effects and cooperative principles. Furthermore, the theory used is based on the theory of Cooperative Principle, proposed by Paul Grice (1975), which established four maxims, those are Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Relation/Relevance, and Maxim of Manner. In addition, this research observed and analysed the humorous effects which was found during the conversation when people flout the maxims, whether it caused humorous effects or not. Therefore, the aims of this research was to observe and investigate the relation of humorous effects on Grice's conversational maxims which were found in Indonesia drama comedy Bajaj Bajuri Spesial Lebaran edition, which was broadcasted in Trans TV. In addition, the data was obtained from YouTube which was uploaded by MR WISE on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 with the title "Bajaj Bajuri (Spesial Lebaran, Lebaran Maafkan). In identifying and analyzing the data, the researcher took the following procedures, those were: firstly, collecting the data by downloading the video from YouTube which was uploaded by MR WISE on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 with the title "Bajaj Bajuri (Spesial Lebaran, Lebaran Maafkan), Secondly, transcribing the data which have

humor or funny context, Thirdly, identifying the characters' utterances which flout the maxims and have humorous effects. The last is applying the theory proposed by Paul Grice (1975) in order to identify and analyze the data. Further, the researcher did an analysis based on the theory which was proposed by Grice (1975), and then the researcher also did the analysis on the relationship between the humorous effects in this drama comedy and the flouting of conversational maxims.

### **3. Findings and Discussion**

In this section, the researcher provided the data which was found in the conversation between the characters in drama comedy Bajaj Bajuri Spesial Lebaran edition, which was broadcasted in Trans TV. In addition, the length of video is 37 minutes 31 seconds. The data shown below are the data which only indicated flouting the Grice's conversational maxims that provoke humorous effects on it. Thus, here are the data.

#### **Datum 1**

In this scene, there is a conversation between Oneng (the wife of Bajuri) and Emak (the parent-in-law of Bajuri) in the living room. In this case, Oneng asks about how many clothes that Emak has in Lebaran. This conversation occurred in 38 seconds up to minute 1 and 10 seconds.

.....

Oneng : Emangnye / baju lebaran Emak ada berape sih? / Kok jajalnya ampek ketiduran / perasaan oneng bajunya cuman satu //

*Oneng : Actually / How many lebaran clothes does Emak have? / How could you try to wear it until falling a sleep / I think the clothe is only one //*

Emak : Biar baju gue cuma atu / tapi kan kerudungan gue banyak // Jadi gue bisa variasiin tuh / ama yang ijo / ama yang item / ama yang kuning / kan jadi bisa keliatan banyak // (back sound orang tertawa)

*Emak : Even though, my cloth is only one / but I have many veils // So, I can make a variation, with the green one / black one / yellow one / Thus, it seems so many //*  
*(laughing back sound)*

Oneng : Yang keliatan banyak / baju ape kerudungnye? // (back sound orang tertawa)

*Oneng : Which seems more / the cloth or the veil? // (laughing back sound)*

Emak : Lu juga belum mandi tuh? //

*Emak : Haven't you taken a bath? //*

Oneng : Ih Oneng ude mandi //

*Oneng : Hm I have taken a bath //*

.....

In this scene, there are two flouting of conversation maxims which was flouted by Emak. One of them provokes a humorous effect. The flouted maxim which provoked humor can be seen in the part when Oneng asked to Emak about her veil as transcribed above, “*Actually / How many lebaran clothes does Emak have? / How could you try to wear it until falling a sleep / I think the clothe is only one //*”. Thus, in this case Emak flouted the maxim of quantity by answering Oneng’s question to much, she said that “*Even though, my cloth is only one / but I have many veils // So, I can make a variation, with the green one / black one / yellow one / Thus, it seems so many // (laughing back sound)*”. Therefore, when Emak flouted the maxim of quantity by giving too many answers, it provoked the humorous effect. It also can be indicated that there was a laughing back sound which means indicating something funny. Even though, there was another flouted maxim which was flouting maxim of manner when Emak tried to change the topic, but it did not provoke the humorous effect even if the conversation was still related with the previous one. In addition, this scene showed that people can use humor in the interaction to reduce the tension. Therefore, having some humors while doing the conversation or interaction is very necessary.

## **Datum 2**

In this scene, there is a conversation between Oneng (the wife of Bajuri) and Emak (the parent-in-law of Bajuri) in the living room. In this case, Emak asks about the condition of the stove. This conversation occurred in minute 1 and 18 seconds up to minute 1 and 38 seconds.

.....

Emak : Emang kenapa kompornye / rusak? //

*Emak : Why is the stove / is it broken?//*

Oneng : Gatau tuh / kayaknya semalam ada orang yang masak air / ditinggalin terus lupa matiin // (back sound orang tertawa)

*Oneng : I don't know / it seems there was someone boiled the water / but forget to turn it off last night // (laughing back sound)*

Emak : Itu kerjanya si Juri (panggilan Bajuri) tuh // (back sound orang tertawa)

*Emak : It must be juri' work (short-called of Bajuri) // (laughing back sound)*

Oneng : Tapi perasaan Oneng / bang Juri kaga ngejajalin baju ampe pagi // (back sound orang tertawa)

*Oneng : But I think / Mr. Juri didn't try to wear his cloths until morning // (laughing back sound)*

.....

In this scene, there was one flouted maxim which was done by Oneng that also provoked a humorous effect. Thus, it was maxim of quantity. Due to the fact that Oneng answered Emak's question with too much information, somehow Emak's question is actually the type of yes / no question. It was started when Emak asked about the stove to Oneng as transcribed in the conversation above, "*Why is the stove, is it broken?*". In this following utterance, One flouts the maxim of quantity by answering Emak's question with too much information, she said that "*I don't know / it seems there was someone boiled the water / but forget to turn it off last night //*". In this case, it was also indicated by the back sound of laughing people in this particular scene. In addition, Emak was actually doing a violating maxim at the same time by trying to tell something which is untrue. She accused Bajuri did the mistake. In this scene, the presence of humor is useful to avoid the fight or *face threatening act*. Besides saying that one lies, it is better to have humor in order to remain them. Thus, the interaction still goes smoothly and having no problems.

### **Datum 3**

In this scene, there is a conversation between Said and Ucup in front of Said house (both of them are the neighbor of Bajuri's family). In this conversation, Said asks about his appearance that wears new cloths to Ucup. This conversation occurred in minute 3 and 44 seconds up to minute 4 and 15 seconds.

.....

Said : Gimane cup / baju / peci / ama sejadah ane // serasi kan? (back sound orang tertawa)

*Said : How cup? / cloth? / cap? / and my prayer rug? // It is suitable, isn't it? // (laughing back sound)*

Ucup : Id / kite tuh ga boleh nyombong-nyombongin pakaian / yang penting ati kite bersih //

*Ucup : Id / we may not be an arrogant for what we wear / the important thing is the purity of our heart //*

Said : Iye iye ane salah // cup / tuh merk ente tuh masih nempel disarung // (back sound orang tertawa)

Said : *Yeah I know I am wrong // Cup / yourbrand of sarong still adhere // (laughing back sound)*

Ucup : Kalau gue copot / ga ketahuan barunye / oke? // (back sound orang tertawa)

Ucup : *If I put it off / no one knows that it is new / okay? // (laughing back sound)*

.....

In this scene, Ucup tried to be a good person that remained Said not to be arrogant if he wore a new cloth. However, Ucup was being arrogant after remaining Said in the end of the conversation. Thus, it provoked a humorous effects of the readers. In addition, there was also a maxim flouted by Ucup when Said asked about his appearance as transcribed in the conversation above, “*How cup? / cloth? / cap? / and my prayer rug? // It is suitable, isn’t it? // (laughing back sound)*”. In this case, Said asked for opinion related to his appearance to Ucup. Somehow, Ucup did not give his opinion but he gave an advice to Said. Therefore, this situation provokes humorous effects to the readers due to irrelevant information from Ucup’s utterances. Thus, at the same time, Ucup flouted the maxim of relation by being irrelevant during the conversation. In this scene, the presence of humor can also be used as the medium to give an advice to someone. Therefore, the situation when the conversation take place will be more friendly.

#### **Datum 4**

In this scene, there is a conversation between Hindun and Pak RT in front of Hindun house (both of them are the neighbor of Bajuri’s family). In this conversation, Hindun asks to pak RT whether he knows where her husband is going. This conversation occurred in minute 5 and 16 seconds up to minute 5 and 23 seconds.

.....

Hindun : Pak RT / liat mas Yanto (her husband) ngga? //

*HIndun : Pak RT / do you see where my husband is going to? //*

Pak RT : Engga tuh Ndun //

*Pak RT : I don’t know Ndun //*

Hindun : Tapi kalau kalung baruku liat kan? // (back sound orang tertawa)

*HIndun : But you can see my necklace, right? // (laughing back sound)*

.....



In this scene, there was one flouted maxim which was done by Hindun that provoked a humorous effect. In this case, Hindun flouted the maxim of relation by being irrelevant when she had a conversation with Pak RT. At the first time, she asked about her husband to Pak RT by saying, “*Pak RT / do you see where my husband is going to? //*”. After that Pak RT answered it in a correct way, by saying “*I don’t know Ndun //*”. Thus in this case, Pak RT did not flout the maxim. However, the following Hindun’s utterance was flouting the maxim of relation. Due to the fact that she was being irrelevant by changing the topic which was not relevant at all from the topic being asked at the first time. She said that, “*But you can see my necklace, right? // (laughing back sound)*”. Therefore, this situation provoked the humorous effects to the readers due to the irrelevant conversation by the characters. It is also indicated by the back sound of the laughing people in this drama comedy. In this scene, the presence of humor can be a medium to make the conversation more relax by having some jokes. Thus, it will also reduce the tension. Therefore, humor is necessary in daily interaction.

#### **Datum 5**

In this scene, there is a conversation between Bajuri and his wife, Oneng. The setting of place in this conversation is in the kitchen. They want to go to the Mosque to do Ied prayer, but Oneng is still in the kitchen preparing the broken stove. This conversation occurred in minute 6 and 25 seconds up to minute 6 and 47 seconds.

.....

Bajuri : *Astagfirullahaladzim / kompor aje diurusin // (back sound orang tertawa)*

*Bajuri : Astagfirullahaladzim / still take care of the stove // (laughing back sound)*

Oneng : *Ngeri ngeri bang / kalau kite tinggalin / terus mbleduk kebakarean / gimane? // (back sound orang tertawa)*

*Oneng : It is dangerous / if we leave / then the stove explode / how then? // (laughing back sound)*

Bajuri : *Eh / giliran sholat / ya sholat // Giliran kompor ya kompor (sambil makan pisang) //*

*Bajuri : If you want to pray / pray first // If you want to take care of the stove / do it first (while eating a banana) //*

Oneng : *Nah abang / abang mau sholat ape mau makan pisang dulu? // (back sound orang tertawa)*

*Oneng : You, do you want to pray or eat banana first? // (laughing back sound)*

Bajuri : Habis mau makan Opor belum mateng //

*Bajuri : It is because the Opor is not ready yet //*

.....

In this scene, there were two flouted maxims which was done by Bajuri that provoked humorous effects. The first part is when Oneng asked about the impact if the stove would be exploded. However, Bajuri did not answer the question in a relevant way. Thus, his answer is not what Oneng expected. In this case, Oneng asked, “*It is dangerous / if we leave / then the stove explode / how then? // (laughing back sound)*”. Then, Bajuri’s answer was not relevant by saying “*If you want to pray / pray first // If you want to take care of the stove / do it first (while eating a banana) //*”. This kind of situation will be possible to provoke the humorous effect of the reader, moreover when Oneng continue the conversation by asking Bajuri back. She asked, “*You, do you want to pray or eat banana first? // (laughing back sound)*”. It is the result that showed the humorous effects, after the flouted maxim of relation by Bajuri. Not only that, Bajuri also flouted the maxim of relation by being irrelevant due to the topic of the conversation. At the end of the conversation, he answered Oneng’s question by saying, “*It is because the Opor is not ready yet //*”. Actually, he should answer whether he wanted to pray or eat first, but in fact his answer was not relevant. Therefore, in this case he flouted the maxim of relation which also provoked the humorous effect during the conversation. In this scene, in order to avoid the fight, the presence of humor is needed. Somehow, people will be more enjoy if there is no tension when having the interaction though the conversation.

## **Datum 6**

In this scene, there was a conversation between Bajuri, Oneng, Nur, Mila, and Ucup. Thus, Nur, Mila, and Ucup are Bajuri’s neighbors. Whereas, the setting of place in this conversation is in front of Bajuri house. All the participants of the conversation do apologize one another, after that Nur asks about where is Emak (the parent-in-law of Bajuri). However, the taken list of the conversations below makes Mila and Ucup are only the passive participants without saying anything. This conversation occurred in minute 16 and 35 seconds up to minute 17 and 5 seconds.

.....

Nur : Mpok / Mak udah pulang belum? //

*Nur : Mpok / Does Mak come home? //*

Bajuri : Belon kali / ngga tau ngelayap kemana tu nenek-nenek // (back sound orang tertawa)

*Bajuri : Maybe not yet / I don't know where she has been going // (laughing back sound)*

Oneng : Abang / gue juga kaga ngelihat Nur / dari sholat Ied sampe pulangnye kaga ketemu-ketemu / Jangan-jangan die ke rumah Mpok Salma dulu ye Bang? //

*Oneng : Abang / I don't see her, Nur / since Ied pray until now I haven't met her / or maybe does she go to Salma house Bang? //*

Bajuri : Iye kali //

*Bajuri : Maybe yes //*

.....

In this scene, there was one flouted maxim which was done by Bajuri that provoked humorous effects. It was when Nur asked about Emak by saying. "*Mpok / Does Mak come home? //*". Then, Bajuri suddenly answered Nur's question with too much information. Due to the fact that Nur's question is actually categorized as yes / no question, but Bajuri answered that question with some additional information. He answered, "*Maybe not yet / I don't know where she has been going // (laughing back sound)*" In this case, Bajuri flouted both maxims of quantity and manner. It was because he answered the question with too much information and in an ambiguous way. Therefore, in this part provoked the readers to laugh which meant the flouted maxims provoked the humorous effects of the reader. In this scene, the presence of humor can make the situation friendly and relax by having some jokes. Thus, humor is indeed necessary for human life.

#### **Datum 7**

In this scene, there was a conversation between Bajuri, Ucup, and midwife. Whereas, the setting of place in this conversation is in the hospital. In this case, Bajuri, Oneng, and Ucup were in the hospital waiting for Emak that had been giving the treatment by the doctor because of an accident. This conversation occurred in minute 26 and 17 seconds up to minute 26 and 40 seconds.

.....

Midwife : Maaf pasien memerlukan banyak darah / kebetulan dirumah sakit sudah tidak ada stok lagi / apakah ada kira-kira sanak family atau keluarga yang golongan darahnya O sama dengan si pasien? //

Midwife : *Sorry the patient needs more blood / there is no more stock of blood in this hospital incidentally / Is there any relatives or family that has the same O blood as the patient? //*

Ucup : Bang / Abang aja bang sumbangin darahnya bang //

Ucup : *Sir, you can donate your blood //*

Bajuri : Kok musti saya sih? //

Bajuri : *Why should be me? //*

Ucup : Abang kan mantunye / badan abang yang paling gede / udeh // (back sound orang tertawa)

Ucup : *Because you are the son-in-law of her / your body is also fat / go on then // (laughing back sound)*

Bajuri : Golongan darah saya bukan O / lu aje Cup //

Bajuri : *My type of blood is not O // you go on Cup //*

In this scene, there was one flouted maxim which was done by Ucup. This flouted maxim caused humorous effect of the readers. In this case, Ucup flouted the maxims of relation since Ucup's answer was not relevant to the topic. It was started when the Midwife asked, "*Sorry the patient needs more blood / there is no more stock of blood in this hospital incidentally / Is there any relatives or family that has the same O blood as the patient? //*". However, Ucup did not answer the midwife's question, but directly asked Bajuri to donate his blood by saying, "*Sir, you can donate your blood //*". Thus, in this part, Ucup flouted the maxim of relation since he was being irrelevant. The situation was supported to provoke the humorous effect when Ucup forced Bajuri to donate his blood since he was the fattest one, he said that "*Because you are the son-in-law of her / your body is also fat / go on then // (laughing back sound)*". Not only that, it was also indicated when there was a laughing back sound that meant the situation was funny at the time. In this scene, the situation was unfriendly because everyone is panic. However, the presence of humor can reduce the stress and make the interaction more relax.

### **Datum 8**

In this scene, there was a conversation between Oneng and midwife. Whereas, the setting of place in this conversation is in the hospital. In this case, Bajuri, Oneng, and Ucup were in the hospital waiting for Emak that had been giving the treatment by the doctor because of an accident and Emak needs a blood donation. This conversation occurred in minute 26 and 46 seconds up to minute 26 and 40 seconds.

.....

Midwife : Ibu golongan darahnya O? //

Midwife : *Is your blood type is O, Ma'am? //*

Oneng : Suster kalau orang yang namanya mulai dari huruf O / biasanya golongan darahnya O juga kan? // (back sound orang tertawa)

Oneng : *Miss, if somebody's name is started by the word O / her blood type is just the same, isn't it? // (laughing back sound)*

Midwife : Ga ada hubungannya buk //

Midwife : *There is no any relations Ma'am //*

.....

In this scene, there was one flouted maxim which was done by Oneng. The maxim that was flouted by her was flouting maxim of relation, since she was being irrelevant at that moment. In addition, it also provoked the humorous effect when Oneng was being irrelevant. Thus, it was started when the Midwife asked, "*Is your blood type is O, Ma'am? //*". IN this case, the type of the question ws yes / no question, thus Oneng should answer by yes or no answers. In fact, Oneng gave sime statements which were not relevant. She said that "*Miss, if somebody's name is started by the word O / her blood type is just the same, isn't it? // (laughing back sound)*". In this case, Oneng flouted the maxim of relation that also provoked the humorous effect from the readers. Somehow, it was also indicated by the laughing back sound which meant there was something funny happened at the time. In this scene, when everyone seems to be panic, but once tries to make a joke. Thus, the situation is more relax. Therefore, the presence of humor can be used to reduce stress and panic in daily life.

Further, the findings and discussion in this research showed that the presence of humor in daily interaction is essential. It can be used to reduce the stress, tension, and make the interaction more relax and friendly. Therefore, humor is needed for the interaction in daily life. Somehow, this research only covers on how humor in language can be useful for human life in daily life. Therefore, other researchers may have similar research in order to fill in the gaps. For instance, how humor can be useful from different aspects of life, and etc.

#### 4. Conclusion

In this research, the researcher analyzed on how the conversation occurs between the characters in drama comedy Bajaj Bajuri Spesial Lebaran edition, which was broadcasted in

Trans TV. In addition, the data was obtained from YouTube which was uploaded by MR WISE on April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 with the title “Bajaj Bajuri (Spesial Lebaran, Lebaran Maafkan). There were many scenes which provoked humorous effects from the viewers or readers. Based on the findings and discussions, the researcher concluded that there were 8 data which had the relations between the Grice’s flouting of conversational maxims with the humorous effects. The most flouted maxim was flouting maxim of relation, which meant some of the character in drama comedy Bajaj Bajuri Spesial Lebaran were being irrelevant during the conversations. In addition, all those data also provoked the humorous effects on it, since the characters were not relevant towards the spoken topics. The back sound in this drama comedy supported the evidence that the situations when one of the characters flouted the maxims was in funny situation. Therefore, it caused the humorous effects. Somehow, even if there were some flouted maxims, but it did not lead the conversations into the end. In fact, it might make the conversation lively and friendly, sometimes the flouted maxims also caused the humorous effects.

## References

- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed). United States of America: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse*. London: Longman.
- Fraley, B., & Aron, A. (2004). The effect of a shared humorous experience on closeness in initial encounters. *Personal Relationships*, 11(1), 61-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00071>
- Holmes, J., Marra, M. (2002). Over the Edge? Subversive Humor between Colleagues and friends. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(1), 65-87. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/humr.2002.006>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, R. A. (2004). Sense of Humor and Physical Health: Theoretical Issues, Recent Findings, and Future Directions. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 17(1-2), 1-9. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/humr.2004.005>
- O’Grady, W. (1993). *Semantic: The study of meaning*. In Catherine pusateri (ed.), *Contemporary linguistics: An introduction*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.

- Priest, R. F., & Thein, M. T. (2003). Humor appreciation in marriage: spousal similarity, assortative mating, and disaffection. *Humor – International Journal of Humor Research*, 16, 63-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/humr.2003.005>
- Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantics Mechanism of Humor*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3_3) [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3_7) [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3_1) [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3_6) [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3_2) [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3_4) [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-6472-3_5)
- Schmitz, J. R. (2002). Humor as a Pedagogical Tool in foreign Language and Translation Courses. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(1), 89-113. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2002.007>
- Wijayana, I. D. P. (1996). *Prinsip Kerjasama. Dasar-dasar pragmatic*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Zhang, G. (2004). Grice's Maxims and the Principle of Selectiveness: An Advertasing Language Perspective. *Foreign Language and Literature Studies*. 38: 127-144.