

**HUMOR IN *JALAN PINGGIR* CRITICISM COLUMN
IN *SILATURAHIM* RUBRIC
SUARA MUHAMMADIYAH MAGAZINE
(A PRAGMATIC STUDY)**

A THESIS

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Completion of the Undergraduate Program in Linguistics at the English Department

Submitted by:

**NITA DIAN HANDAYANI
A2B 007 083**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG**

**2011
PRONOUNCEMENT**

The writer honestly declares that she compiles this thesis by herself and without taking any result from other researchers in S-1, S-2, S-3 or diplomas degree of any university. The writer also ascertains that she does not quote any material from other publications or other writing, except those that have been mentioned as the references.

Semarang, September 2011

Nita Dian Handayani

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

“Sesungguhnya tidak seorangpun yang dilahirkan berilmu, karena ilmu itu dimiliki dengan jalan dipelajari” (Ibnu Mas’ud R.a).

This thesis is dedicated to

My beloved Dad, Mom, and sister for the love, support and
pray for my happiness.

APPROVAL

Thesis Advisor,

Drs. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum.

NIP 19671004 199303 1 003

VALIDATION

Approved by

Strata 1 Thesis Examination Committee

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University

on 25 October 2011

Chair Person

Dr. J. Herudjati P, M.Sc., Ph.D.

NIP 19530327 198103 1 006

First Member

Second Member

Drs. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum.

NIP 19671004 199303 1 003

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

NIP 19790822 200801 2 013

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Praise is for Allah SWT who has given strength and true spirit so that this thesis entitled, “*Humor in Jalan Pinggir Criticism Column, in Silaturahmi Rubric Suara Muhammadiyah Magazine (A Pragmatic Study)*” finally accomplished, *Alhamdulillah*. On this occasion, the writer would like to thank to everybody who have contributed to the completion of this research report.

The great thanks and appreciation are extended to the following persons:

1. Dr. Agus Maladi Irianto, M.A., as the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
2. Mr. and Mrs. Sudartono, the writer’s parents for all the support and prayer.
3. Dr. Ratna Asmarani, M.Ed., M.Hum., as the Head of English Department.
4. Dra. Deli Nirmala, M.Hum., as the ex-chairman of the Linguistics section.
5. Drs. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M. Hum., as the writer’s advisor who has always given his continuous guidance, helpful correction, moral support, advices, and suggestions.
6. Dra. C.A. Puan Ellisafny, M.Ed, as the writer’s Academic Supervisor.
7. Dr. J. Herudjati. P., M.Sc., Ph. D and Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum who taught her to propose the best thesis.
8. All lectures in the English Department of the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University for the invaluable knowledge which is useful to improve not only the self-quality, but also the social one.
9. The beloved sister, Cendikia Artha Putri, for the smile everytime the writer comes home.
10. The cool and honest Nucki Widhasmoko for all great time we spent together in recent days.
11. The sweet Nevi Candra Erliza, Nurul Adhalina, and Sofiana Rosyida for the moments we shared in consulting paper to the advisor.

The writer realizes that this thesis is still far from perfect. She, therefore, will be glad to receive any constructive criticism and recommendation to make this thesis better.

Finally, the writer expects that this thesis will be useful to the reader who wishes to learn something about humor discourse especially the application of it.

Semarang, September 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE OF TITLE	i
PRONOUNCEMENT	ii
MOTTO AND DEDICATION	iii
APPROVAL	iv
VALIDATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENT	viii
APPENDICES LIST	x
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Scope of the Study	3
Purposes of the Study	4
Underlying Theories	4
Research Methodology	9
Writing Organization	10
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
Speech Act	12
Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary	14
Direct and Indirect Speech Act	17
The Cooperative Principles	18
Implicature	21
The Term of Humor	24
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODS	29
Type of the Research	29
Data Source	30
Population and Sample	30
Method of Collecting Data	31

Method of Analyzing Data	32
CHAPTER 4. DISCUSSION	34
Speech Act	34
The Humor Analysis	41
The Cooperative Principles	59
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS	62
REFERENCES	63

APPENDICES LIST

1. Table of the Speech Act (SA) and the Cooperative Principles (M) Data List
2. Table of the Respondents Checked List
3. The Background of Respondents

ABSTRAK

Dalam skripsi ini, di jelaskan tentang pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama dalam wacana humor, terutama dalam kolom kritik majalah Suara Muhammadiyah. Pada dasarnya, kritik disampaikan sebagai ungkapan ketidakpuasan atas keadaan sekitar, terutama berkenaan dengan masalah sosial, politik, lingkungan, bahkan agama. Tidak jarang kritik disampaikan dengan bahasa yang serius, tetapi tidak sedikit pula yang menggunakan bahasa ringan dan dibumbui dengan sedikit lelucon. Tujuannya adalah agar lebih mengenai sasaran tanpa harus menyakiti objek kritikan. Dalam hal ini, sebagian besar kritik ditujukan kepada pemerintah Indonesia. Kritik disampaikan dalam bentuk pernyataan kemudian ditanggapi dengan bahasa yang kadang mengundang tawa pembaca. Bagaimanapun, humor tidak jarang dicapai sebagai akibat dari pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama dalam percakapan, begitu juga dengan wacana humor dalam kolom kritik majalah Suara Muhammadiyah. Berdasarkan fenomena tersebut, penulis menganalisis bentuk pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama dalam wacana humor kolom kritik majalah tersebut. Penekanannya ditujukan pada bentuk linguistik pemicu humor yang terdapat dalam tanggapan kritikan. Dalam hal ini, ilmu pragmatik dan konteks humor dirasa tepat untuk menganalisa data yang didapat. Sebagaimana yang tertera di atas, objek atau sumber data dari penelitian ini adalah kolom kritik pada rubric *Silaturahmi* majalah *Suara Muhammadiyah* edisi bulan Januari hingga Agustus 2011. Data diperoleh dengan menggunakan metode dokumentasi dan teknik catat, serta dianalisa dengan metode padan referensial dan agih. Adapun teori-teori yang digunakan meliputi teori tindak tutur dari Searle (speech act), prinsip kerjasama dalam percakapan dari Grice (the cooperative principles), dan teori humor. Dari 88 ujaran yang didapat, penulis mendapati 34 humor yang termasuk dalam tindak tutur, dengan klasifikasi ujaran representatives sebanyak 33 ujaran dan 1 ujaran direktif. Adapun analisis pemicu humor dilakukan dengan membagi ujaran ke dalam 4 topik pembahasan, yakni bidang kriminal/hukum, bidang pendidikan, bidang sosial/agama, dan bidang politik. Hasilnya, pemicu humor dapat berupa pertanyaan retorik (untuk menyindir, bukan bertanya), persamaan bunyi kata, perulangan kata dalam kritik dan respon, dan makna-makna konotasi. Selanjutnya, dari analisis pelanggaran prinsip kerjasama ditemukan sebanyak 14 ujaran dimana seluruhnya melanggar maksim cara. Hal ini karena humor sering disajikan dalam bentuk tidak langsung untuk menghindari kemarahan objek sindiran atau kritikan.

Kata kunci: *kritik, humor, tindak tutur, prinsip kerjasama, kalimat retorik*

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. Background of the Study

In daily life, most of people are familiar with the word 'criticism'. Criticism can be found everywhere; in daily conversation, in talk show conversation, in daily news, etc. Criticism becomes a part of discourse because it uses language as the media. It is delivered by someone or some people to give comments or appraisals about something. As Hornby (1974: 204) said that criticism is the art of making judgements (concerning art, literature, etc). The word 'judgements'

is absolutely in incisive meaning.

Criticism in mass media is very often to be found. Usually, it is used to give comments about social, political, and environmental problems. As one of the functions of mass media is to provide information for readers, criticism also provides actual information because usually it talks about the latest information. Mostly, criticism comes from public society that reveals their dissatisfactions about their surroundings and government. The example of mass media criticism can be found in *Suara Muhammadiyah* magazine. It is a kind of religious magazine which provides social, political, theological, and environmental problem-solving from the competent figures. In the magazine, the criticisms can be found in *Jalan Pinggir* column, in *Silaturrehman* rubric. The magazine which is published twice a month presents social, political, theological, and environmental problems criticisms that are specially addressed to government. Each criticism consists of statement (problem) and comment or response. Here, the comments or responses are mostly in form of humor because the using of word choices triggers to laugh. Hornby (1974: 416) said that humor is the quality or content of something such as story, joke or performance that triggers amusement and laughter.

Recently, criticisms or protests are mostly delivered by using humor as the media. It is in favor with the traditional national identity that commonly does not desire to be criticized in direct ways. By the attitude of this country, the indirect criticisms are more influential than the direct ones. Moreover, humor criticism is in collective responsibility since it usually uses common humor as the way local custom.

The humor activity in the criticism discourse belongs to speech act. There is speech act which belongs to humor discourse and is delivered clearly and directly, but there is also a kind of speech act that is delivered indirectly. The indirect delivery of humor speech can cause some jokes for them who can catch the meaning inside utterances. On the contrary, someone who can not catch the intention of the indirect speech can be mad in responding the humor utterances because of some misunderstandings in humor interactions.

Based on the above explanation, the interesting part of this research would be the lingual forms of the trigger of the humor sections in the criticism discourse in the magazine. This is the reason that triggers the writer to write a thesis entitled "*Humor in Jalan Pinggir Criticism Column, in Silaturrehman Rubric, Suara Muhammadiyah Magazine (A Pragmatic Study)*".

2. Scopes of the Study

In Pragmatics, there is a study of the cooperative principles which is commonly related to implicatures. Implicature is resulted by the violation of the principles of the cooperative principles, or maxims. In this thesis, the trigger of the maxims violations comes from the humor part of the criticisms. The humor section also belongs to the kinds of speech act as how the humor comes up in criticisms, or it can be said that pragmatics is a study of utterances that closely related to speech act.

The thesis focuses on what kinds of speech acts inside the criticisms are. Then, related to the background of study, the writer wants to know about what the lingual forms of the trigger of the humor inside the criticisms are. Finally, the interesting question would be how the lingual forms of the cooperative principles violations are, especially related to the humor utterances of the criticisms in the *Suara Muhammadiyah* magazine.

3. Purposes of the Study

In accordance with the scope of the study, this research aims to:

1. Describe the kinds of speech act of the criticism discourse in the *Suara Muhammadiyah* magazine, especially for the humor parts.
2. Identify the linguistic forms function as the trigger of humor inside the criticism discourse of the *Suara Muhammadiyah* magazine.
3. Identify the cooperative principles violations in the humor parts on the criticism discourse in the *Suara Muhammadiyah* magazine.

4. Underlying Theories

To obtain the purposes of this research, the writer uses some theories about speech act, Gricean's maxims, and humor term.

1. Speech Act

One of the most important things in communications is speech act. Speech act is always related to action which is conveyed by utterances. It is a kind of action taken by someone in a figure of speech. Because when people produce utterances, they do not only produce utterances grammatically but also perform actions via their utterances.

There are two kinds of speech acts; namely Constative and Performative. Constative speech act reports an utterance in 'true or false' level only. It describes a situation or reports some state of affair. So, when a speaker says something, it could be just to inform whether it is true or not. Performative speech act, on the other hand, does not describe or report anything at all as true or false. In performative, a speaker makes utterances and also does something in act or allows someone to an act.

Performative speech act is divided into explicit and implicit. Explicit performative shows that an utterance performs an action directly. Explicit is the real meaning when the utterance is produced by a speaker. It is indicated by performative verbs. On the other hand, implicit has utterances in which the performative action is stated implicitly. There are no performative verbs in the utterances.

2. Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary

On any occasion, the action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related acts (Yule, 1996: 48), namely locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts.

Locutionary act is an activity to produce utterances which have meanings semantically (Gunarwan, 2007: 7). So, in locutionary people are 'saying something'.

Illocutionary act is an activity to produce utterances which have meaning and speech force (for what purpose an utterance is uttered) (Gunarwan, 2007: 7). It might say that in uttering utterances, people want to describe and doing something by the utterances. Illocutionary act is divided into five acts; they are declarations, representatives, expressive, directives, and

commissives.

Perlocutionary act is an activity to produce utterances which have meaning semantically, speech force, and effects for the listener. So, when a speaker is saying something semantically, s/he wants listener to do what the speaker said.

3. Direct and Indirect Speech Act

Direct speech act is an act in which there is a relationship between structural forms (declarative, interrogative, and imperative) and communicative functions (statement, question, and command/request). On the other side, indirect speech act is an act in which there is no direct relationship between structures (declarative, interrogative, and imperative) and functions (statement, question, and command/request).

4. The Cooperative Principles

Grice in Yule (1996: 37) has assumed that speakers and listeners in conversations are generally cooperating with each other. The cooperative principles are divided into four sub-principles, they are:

a. Maxim of Quantity

- 1) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
- 2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

b. Maxim of Quality

- 1) Do not say what you believe to be false.
- 2) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

c. Maxim of Relation: Be relevant.

d. Maxim of Manner

- 1) Avoid obscurity of expression.
- 2) Avoid ambiguity.
- 3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
- 4) Be orderly.

5. Implicatures

However, there are many possibilities that speakers can violate the maxims. Moreover, humour condition and cooperative principles violations are very familiar each other. This condition will bring into the kinds of implicature (additional meaning behind utterances). Grice (Yule, 1996: 40) divided the term of implicature into:

a. Conventional Implicature

This is a kind of implicature that is not occur in conversation and does not depend on social context for the interpretation. Conventional implicature is associated with specific words and results in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used (Yule, 1996: 45).

b. Conversational Implicature

In contrast with the conventional implicature, this kind of implicature occurs in conversations. It might say that one may uses this implicature to convey more than s/he said in conversations. This kind of implicature is divided into generalized and particular conversational implicature.

Generalized conversational implicature does not need special knowledge to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. Differing from generalized, particularized conversational implicature needs special knowledge of any particular context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning.

6. The Term of Humor

In the old use, the word humor or humour (British) means four liquids (blood, phlegm, choler, melancholy) in the body which is said to determine a person's mental and physical qualities (Hornby, 1974: 416). But, recently humor is related to the capacity to cause or feel amusement, or it can be said that humor aims to create a situation which trigger people to laugh.

Usually, there are humor language principles isolations to create word forms which trigger amusement. Humor is used in the meaning of something which triggers people or listener to laugh. It is because something that is tickling the feelings, something that is astonishing, something that is strange, illogical, fool, clumsy, contradictory, and naughty.

Theoretically, humor is a media and a method to feature a certain morality in belles-lettres. The way is by distorting the universal moral code with the opposition in form of epigrammatic and funny language use (William in Akhmadi, 1987). There are three fortifications of the most used theory; they are *released theory*, *conflict theory*, and *inharmonic theory* (Wilson in Soedjatmiko, 1992: 70). Basically, humor can be reached when disequilibrium changes into equilibrium as soon as possible. It is called as economic criteria then.

5. Research Method

In this research, the writer uses descriptive method since it is used to describe, to write, to analyze, and to interpret certain conditions in accordance with variables on the actual facts (Mardalis, 2003: 26). The writer also uses a qualitative approach to facilitate in giving clear descriptions about the data that are collected in words, phrases, and sentences.

The writer uses primary data since the data are collected from the first source, that are the data taken from the *Suara Muhammadiyah* magazine by analyzing the humour utterances in the

criticism column that violate the cooperative principles. The writer uses documentation method and *catat* (Eng: written) technique to collect the data. Also, the writer uses *Simak Bebas Libat Cakap* method since the writer only takes the data without taking part. The other important thing is that the writer is assisted by five people in which then they are called as respondents to determine the humor utterances in criticisms. In this case, they have to give a check in the criticism which is funny according to them.

In this study, the objects are human utterances (Sudaryanto, 1993: 28). *Padan* referensial method is used to analyze the data by determining element that is language reference.

6. Writing Organization

To make it easier, the writer organizes this thesis into five chapters. Each chapter is divided, but actually they are related and completed each other.

a. Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter helps the reader to understand the summary of the whole thesis contents. It consists of the background of study, scope of study, purposes of study, underlying theory, research method, and writing organization.

b. Chapter 2: Literary Review

This chapter consists of the description of the theory used by the writer to analyze the data of the research.

c. Chapter 3: Research Method

In this chapter, the writer describes the type of research, data source, population and sample, technique of collecting and analyzing the data.

d. Chapter 4: Data Analysis

In this chapter, the writer describes the analysis of the utterances which are related to the topic of this research.

e. Chapter 5: Conclusion

This chapter describes the conclusion of this research based on the analysis.

CHAPTER 2

LITERARY REVIEW

In this world, where most people are eager to learn many new things in order to help their ways to success, conversation becomes extremely important. Communication is needed as a bridge that relates two different ideas or even beliefs. Without a good communication, people will find that it is very difficult to understand what others want, also to explain the ideas they have in mind. Therefore, being communicative can help them to avoid unnecessary misunderstanding.

This chapter will review some related theories about speech act, the cooperative principles, and humor term.

2.1. Speech Act

One of the most important activities in a communication is speech act. Speech act is always related to action which is conveyed by utterances. It is a kind of action taken by someone in a figure of speech. Because when people produce utterances, they do not only produce utterances grammatically but also perform actions via the utterances. As Austin said, see Gunarwan (2007: 7), while uttering utterances, people also do actions. Consider this example:

1) You're fired! (Yule, 1996: 7)

Sentence (1) can be used to perform an act of ending an employment if it is uttered by a boss that has a great deal power. It can be said, besides saying something, there is an act that follows the utterance. There are some more specific labels about speech act, such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, or request.

According to Austin, there are two kinds of speech acts; namely Constative and Performative. Constative speech act reports an utterance in 'true or false' level only. Constative speech act describes a situation or reports some state of affair. For describing something, Austin used constative speech act (Gunarwan, 2007: 6). In other words, when a speaker says something, it could be just to inform whether it is true or not. For example: 'I have a good job'. The utterance is used to inform a kind of situation about the speaker to listener.

Performative speech act, on the other hand, does not describe or report anything at all as true or false. In performative, a speaker makes utterances and also does something in act or allows someone to an act. Austin in Palmer (1981) said that performative sentence (or simply performative) consists of performative verbs, such as *promise, apologize, thank, censure, approve, and congratulate*.

Performative speech act is divided into two, they are explicit and implicit. Explicit performative shows that an utterance performs an action directly. Explicit is the real meaning when the utterance is produced by a speaker. It is indicated by performative verbs. For example, when a speaker wants to give a promise, s/he would use the word 'I promise'.

2) I promise that I will come tomorrow.

In sentence above, listener does not need to have a special knowledge to understand the utterance since it has already revealed the act which is indicated by the use of performative verb.

On the other hand, implicit has utterances in which the performative action is stated implicitly. There are no performative verbs in the utterances. Now, take a look at this example:

3) It's so hot right here!

The speaker might have other intentions by saying the utterance, beside just wants to say that the weather is really hot. Listener should have a special knowledge to understand what speaker wants. In this case, the speaker might want to have some fresh water or turn on fan.

2.2. Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary

On any occasion, the action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related acts, namely locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts (Yule, 1996: 48).

Locutionary act is an activity to produce utterances which have meanings semantically (Gunarwan, 2007: 7). So, in locutionary people are 'saying something' that has meaning. For example when someone says 'the weather is hot', it means that s/he does not feel comfort with the weather. There are some particular purposes of locution – to answer a question, to announce a verdict, to give a warning, etc (Palmer, 1981: 162).

Illocutionary act is an activity to produce utterances which have meaning and speech force (for what purpose an utterance is uttered) (Gunarwan, 2007: 7). It might say that in uttering utterances, people want to describe and doing something by the utterances. Illocutionary act is divided into five acts (Yule, 1996: 53), they are:

a. Declarations are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterances. In this case, people change or result new status of something by their utterances. Consider this example:

4) Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife.

An illustration of sentence (4) shows that speaker (the priest) change the world (a couple status of marriage) by his utterance in (4). The speeches that belong to this speech act are *baptizing, naming, exiling, retiring, judging, punishing, excommunicating, etc.*

b. Representatives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Consider this example:

5) It is a warm sunny day.

An utterance in (5) represents some kind of situation that speaker believes to be in the case. The speeches that belong to this kind of speech act are *declaring, arguing, boasting, complaining, proposing, reporting, notifying, informing, etc.*

c. Expressives are those kinds of speech acts that state what speaker feels. It belongs to *thanking, congratulating, forgiving, apologizing, fulminating, etc.* Consider this example:

6) Congratulations!

Sentence in (6) illustrates that the speaker shows what s/he feels at that time. S/he shows that s/he feels glad or a kind of happy of anyone's success.

d. Directives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something. It aims to make someone do something as speaker wants. The general functions of directive can be commands, orders, requests, or suggestions. Consider this example:

7) Gimme a cup of coffee. Make it black.

The sentence in (7) shows that speaker wants listener or someone else to give her/him a cup of black coffee. It is a kind of ordering something to someone. The speeches that belong to this kind of speech act are *ordering, reserving, begging, demanding, advising, etc.*

e. Commisives are those kinds of speech acts that speaker uses to commit themselves to some future action. It can be *promising, threatening, refusing, pledging, etc.* Consider this example:

8) I'll be back.

The sentence above shows that speaker tries to give a promise that s/he will be back later. It can be said that there is a commitment between speaker and listener about something.

Perlocutionary act is an activity to produce utterances which have meaning semantically, speech force, and effects for listener. When a speaker is saying something semantically, s/he wants listener to do what the speaker said. People do not, of course, simply create an utterance with a function without intending it to have an effect (Yule, 1996: 48). If there is a statement 'I've just made some coffee', the speaker will utter it on the assumption that listener will recognize the effect the speaker intended, for example to account for a wonderful smell, or to get listener to drink the coffee.

2.3. Direct and Indirect Speech Act

Direct speech act is an act in which there is a relationship between structural forms (declarative, interrogative, and imperative) and communicative functions (statement, question, and command/request). Consider this example:

9) It's cold outside. (Yule, 1996: 55)

The sentence (9) can be seen as a direct speech act since it is in a form of declarative and aims to make a statement. Here is a direct relationship between the structural form and the communicative function.

On the other side, indirect speech act is an act in which there is no direct relationship between structures (declarative, interrogative, and imperative) and functions (statement, question, and command/request). Consider this example:

10) Do you have to stand in front of the TV? (Yule, 1996: 55)

The sentence in (10) may in the form of interrogative, but actually it aims to give a command to the listener. Here, in the above case, the speaker does not need an answer, but an action from the listener.

2.4. The Cooperative Principles

Grice, see Yule (1996: 37), stated the cooperative principles that said: “make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or directions of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”. Grice (1975) proposed as a guideline these four basic maxims of conversation (general principles that help to create an efficient and cooperative use of language, which will result in a general cooperative principle). These principles are expressed as follow:

2.4.1. Maxim of Quality

According to the first rule, people are expressed to say what they know to be true. When talking with others, people expect them to tell the truth. If there is a question, “Have you seen my dog?” an honest answer is expected. The main principles of the maxim of quality (Levinson, 1983: 101) are:

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

2.4.2. Maxim of Quantity

According to this rule, when talking, people are expected to provide just enough information to get their point understood. Most people usually hope that others would tell them everything they need to know. However, people should not provide too much or too little information. As an example, when a husband gets home from an important meeting and his wife asked, “What happened today?” – He is expected to answer the question without providing too many details (“the meeting started three minutes late, I sat by the door, the first person to speak...”) or too little information (“not much”). The main principles of the maxim of quantity (Levinson, 1983: 101) are:

- a. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.
- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

2.4.3. Maxim of Relation

According to this rule, one is expected to stay on the topic. In other words, s/he has to make sure that what s/he said is relevant for what is talked about. If a woman asked, “Isn’t George the most attractive man you ever met?” she certainly will not be on topic if she answers “Uh, it is very nice for having a candle light dinner tonight, eh?” The main principle of the maxim of relation is: make your contributions relevant (Levinson, 1983: 102).

2.4.4. Maxim of Manner

The last rule stated that your comments should be direct, clear, and to the point. One should not use words he knows his listeners will not understand or says sentences which he knows have double meanings. A speaker should also not state something in a lengthy way if s/he could say it in a much simpler manner. As an example, instead of saying “I saw closely with my eyes a long-necked and brown-spotted animal at place where they keep animals in town”, one would effectively prefer to say “I observed a giraffe at town zoo.”

The main principles of the maxim of manner (Levinson, 1983: 102) are: Avoid obscurity, avoid ambiguity, be brief, and be orderly.

2.5. Implicature

The word 'implicature' means that an utterance actually provides an implicit meaning behind what is actually 'said' (that is to say, more than what is literally expressed in the utterances) (Levinson, 1983: 97). Consider this example:

11) A: Can you tell me the time?

B: Well, the milkman has come.

Sentence (11) above might imply (12):

12) A: Can you tell me the time? [Do you have the ability to tell me the time?]

B: Well [No, I do not know the exact time of this present moment], the milkman has come [...But I think I can provide you this information: the milkman always comes at this particular time. Now you can figure out by yourself what time it is].

In a conversation, a speaker conveys a message and meaning to a listener. But, a speaker often conveys something that has more meaning than what is actually said. Implicature is derived from (a) what is said, and (b) the assumption that at least the cooperative principle is being maintained (Levinson, 1983: 122). Grice (Yule, 1996: 40) divided the term of implicature into:

1. Conventional Implicature

This is a kind of implicature that does not occur in conversation and does not depend on social context for the interpretation. Conventional implicature is associated with specific words and results in additional conveyed meanings when those words are used (Yule, 1996: 45). Consider this example:

13) Yesterday, Marry was happy and ready to work.

14) She puts on her clothes and left the house. (Yule, 1996: 46)

The two sentences above have different meanings though they have the same 'and' words. However, the first 'and' as in (13) is functioned as a coordinate connector to combine to kinds of verbs, then the second 'and' as in (14) means then as an orderly activity.

2. Conversational Implicature

In contrast with the conventional implicature, this kind of implicature occurs in conversations. It might say that one may uses this implicature to convey more than s/he said in conversations. Consider this example:

15) Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.

Dexter: Ah, I brought the bread. (Yule, 1996: 40)

Here, Dexter's response in the above conversation seems flout the maxim of quantity,

though actually it is not his intention. He might intend that what is not mentioned was not brought. In this case, Dexter conveys his intention by more than what he said via a conversational implicature.

This kind of implicature is divided into generalized and particular conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicature does not need special knowledge to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. Consider this example:

16) I was sitting in a garden one day. A child looked over the fence.

The sentence above might imply that the child is outside of the garden. Also, it conveys a message that the garden and the child mentioned are not the speaker's. That is why the speaker does not say 'my garden' and 'my child'.

Differing from generalized, particularized conversational implicature needs special knowledge of any particular context to calculate the additional conveyed meaning. It is because, most of the time, conversations take place in very specific context in which locally recognized inferences is assumed. Consider this example:

17) Ann: Where are you going with the dog?

Sam: To the V-E-T. (Yule, 1996: 43)

Sam's respond is to fool his dog, because his dog recognizes about 'vet'. So, Sam produces a more spelled out utterance, implicating that he does not want the dog to know his answer to the question just asked. In this case, Ann has to have a special knowledge about the 'vet'.

5. The Term of Humor

In the old use, the word humor or humour (British) means four liquids (blood, phlegm, choler, melancholy) in the body which is said to determine a person's mental and physical qualities (Hornby, 1974: 416). But, recently humor is related to the capacity to cause or feel amusement. Or it can be said that humor aims to create a situation which trigger people to laugh.

Usually, there are humor language principles isolations to create word forms which trigger amusement. Humor is used in the meaning of something which triggers people or listener to laugh. It is because something that is tickling the feelings, something that is astonishing, something that is strange, illogical, fool, clumsy, contradictory, and naughty.

Humor is functioned as a solace in form of joke or social protest. It is because humor can funnel some strained minds and feelings. Humor becomes a media to convey complaints or criticisms in a refined manner without deranging the object. This function is related to satire humor which is identical with social or political criticisms humor.

Theoretically, humor is a media and a method to feature a certain morality in belles-lettres. The way is by distorting the universal moral code with the opposition in form of epigrammatic and funny language use (William in Akhmadi, 1987). There are three fortifications of the most used theory; they are *released theory*, *conflict theory*, and *disharmony theory* (Wilson in Soedjatmiko, 1992: 70).

Released theory deemed that joke is an emotional trickery. It seems like threatening, but the fact

does not (Soedjatmiko, 1992: 70). Consider this example:

18) (A boss was mad to his employee who often came late to the office)

“Kemarin ban mobilmu kempes. Kemarinnya lagi mobilmu mogok. Pagi ini jalanan macet. Besok kamu bilang mobilmu nabrak pohon.”

“Jangan begitu, Pak. Nanti perusahaan rugi....”

In the above conversation, the answer of the employee can be inferred into [1] financial lost (discipline, time) and [2] manpower lost (the dead of the employee) (Soedjatmiko, 1992: 71).

In the other hand, conflict theory offers a pressure to humor act implication. Greig (1923 in Soedjatmiko, 1992: 71) said that humor is the opposition of geniality and surliness. While Knox in Soedjatmiko (1992: 71) said that humor is the opposition of trifling and seriousness. The usual example is sad news which is accepted by enthusiasm. Let's take a look at this example:

19) “Ma’am, your husband has just been run over by a steamroller.”

“I’m in the bath up. Slip him under the door.” (Soedjatmiko, 1992: 71)

The above conversation reveals a kind of sad news, but the respond of the second speaker present a kind of enthusiasm.

The disharmony theory makes reference to cognitive explanation; that is two different interpretations which is combined into a complex combination meaning. Consider this example:

20) + “Mengapa Sani tidak suka pada neneknya?”

- “Mengapa?” (Neneknya cerewet?)

+ “Sani tidak punya nenek.” (Soedjatmiko, 1992: 71)

The above conversation can be identified using disharmonic theory. The question indicates that Sani’s grandmother exists, the fact is she does not.

Freud in Soedjatmiko (1992: 71) said that humor is (a) the divergence of natural mind, and (b) expressed economically into words and time. Meanwhile, Wilson in Soedjatmiko (1992: 72) symbolized humor as ‘X’ and the two different interpretations as ‘M₁’ and ‘M₂’. He considered that humor can emerge in these steps (Soedjatmiko, 1992: 72):

- a. $M_1=X=M_2$, and $M_1 \diamond M_2$ makes an unbalanced cognitive structure.
- b. The relation of $X=M_1$, is stronger than $X=M_2$, so that a harmony in a perception causes wonder.
- c. The unbalance condition is handed by these three alternatives:
 - $M_1=X$ $M_1 \diamond X$ (M_1 is wrong)
 - $M_2=X$ $M_2 \diamond X$ (M_2 is wrong)

- $M_1 \leftrightarrow M_2$ $M_1 = M_2$

d. When equilibrium is reached, there is no more continuance mind between speaker and listener, there is only laugh continuously.... (Wilson in Soedjatmiko, 1992: 72).

Basically, humor can be reached when disequilibrium changes into equilibrium as soon as possible. It is called as economic criteria then.

1. The Humor Linguistic Theory

The term of linguistic is related to the lingual forms as the trigger of the humor. Humor reaches its funniness by the disharmony, though not all disharmony causes funniness (Soedjatmiko, 1992: 72). The performance of the disharmony aims to give a surprise as a protest media.

2. The Humor Semantic Theory

By engaging semantic term, it can be inferred that humor is also in sentences level. Humor in a criticism engages sentence as the media. That is why humor cannot be apart from sentence. Humor semantic uses ambiguity as the trigger (Soedjatmiko, 1992: 73). The way is by opposing the first meaning M_1 and the second meaning M_2 . Listener or reader can enjoy the funniness when s/he takes either one of the meanings, then s/he laughs at her/his own wrong perception. Humor semantic also uses the ambiguity in lexical, sentence, and discourse levels.

3. The Humor Pragmatic Theory

In discourse level, there are communication rules as Grice stated in his '*cooperative principles*' (CP). The humor term can appear when there are violations of the cooperative principles. The violations trigger *irony principles* (IP) to turn up. IP enable a speaker to act politely though the fact is not (Soedjatmiko, 1992:77). IP reveals that humor comes as the violations of the cooperative principles.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses about the method of collecting and analyzing the data. It includes the description of the type of research, data source, population, samples of the data and the way to collect them. Then, it talks about how the data are analyzed.

1. Type of Research

This research belongs to descriptive research with qualitative approach. According to Mardalis, descriptive research aims to describe the factual issues (2003: 26). Besides, there are some efforts to describe, to write, to analyze, and to interpret certain conditions in accordance to variables on the factual facts. Descriptive method also emphasizes on the result of the research or the writer objection to the language application. In this case, the writer wants to describe the humor utterances in the criticisms.

The writer also uses qualitative approach since this research is intended to give description in the form of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences, not in numbers. Moreover, qualitative research method emphasizes on analysis with scientific approach.

2. Data Source

Data are needed as the object of this research. There are two kinds of data sources; they are primary and secondary data. Primary data is gained directly from the first source, while secondary data is gained from the second party (Suryabrata, 1997: 84).

In this research, the writer uses primary data since it is collected from the first source that is the data taken from criticism column in the *Suara Muhammadiyah* magazine. It is one of the rubrics in the magazine that contains some humor utterances in form of criticisms.

3. Population and Sample

Population is the whole number of analysis object which consists of the real, abstract, phenomenon, and indication things that become data sources and have certain and similar characteristics (Arikunto, 1982: 90). The population in this research is the whole utterances in criticism column in the magazine. The magazine is collected from January to August 2011 editions.

On the other hand, sample is a part of population which represents the characteristic of the population (Arikunto, 1982: 92). The samples of this research can be figure out from humor utterances that violate the cooperative principles. In determining the samples, the writer uses purposive sampling since the writer only takes the data which are fulfilling the humor criteria and can be analyzed.

4. Method of Collecting Data

The writer collects the data from a magazine entitled '*Suara Muhammadiyah*'. In this case, the writer uses documentation method. As Arikunto said that documentation method is a method of collecting data in form of notes, transcript, book, etc (1982: 132). This method is continued by

catat technique since the data is in the written form. Therefore, the procedure of collecting the data can be seen as follow:

- a. Reading the *Suara Muhammadiyah* magazine, especially the rubric of *Silaturahmi, Jalan Pinggir* column which contains criticisms.
- b. Taking the samples which are the humor utterances uses the purposive sampling assisted by five people, in which then they check the funny utterances in the criticisms according to what they feel. The five people, then, are called as the respondents.

Responden penelitian adalah seseorang (karena lazimnya berupa orang) yang diminta untuk memberikan respon (jawaban) terhadap pertanyaan-pertanyaan (langsung atau tidak langsung, lisan atau tertulis ataupun berupa perbuatan) yang diajukan oleh peneliti. Dalam hal penelitian dilakukan dengan menggunakan tes, maka “responden” penelitian ini menjadi “testee” (yang dites). Responden penelitian bisa subjek penelitian, bisa orang lain (Amirin, [tatangmanguny.wordpress.com.](http://tatangmanguny.wordpress.com), 2009)

However, there are only five respondents in this study and they have to check the list of the data which are funny according to them. In this case, the writer assumes that the funniest utterances are them which have at least three checks from the respondents.

- c. Grouping the samples to be the data in which then the analysis of kinds of speech act and maxim violations are separated.

5. Method of Analyzing Data

In this research, the writer uses *padan referensial* method. This method is used for showing the intentions of utterances that are produced by speaker. Sudaryanto (1993: 13) said that the method is used to interpret utterances as the reactions to speaker intentions. The writer also uses *agih* method since this is a method in which the determiner belongs to language itself.

There are two steps in analyzing the data; they are the procedure of analyzing the data and the presentation of data analysis:

1. Procedure of Analyzing the Data
 - a. Observing utterances which belong to the sample of this research in the criticisms.
 - b. Analyzing and describing the humor utterances which contain speech acts using Searle’s theory.
 - c. Analyzing and describing the linguistic form of the trigger of humor utterances.
 - d. Analyzing and describing the humor utterances which contain the cooperative principles violations using Gricean’s maxims.
2. Presentation of Data Analysis

In this research, the writer uses informal presentation method. This is a formulation of ordinary words, but using the technical terminology (Sudaryanto, 1993: 145).