

**FLOUTING AND VIOLATION OF GRICEAN MAXIMS TO CREATE HUMOR BY AN
INDONESIAN COMEDIAN “FAJAR SADBOY”****Adani Nur Sabrina**Faculty of Letters and Cultures, adaninursabrina@staff.gunadarma.ac.id, Gunadarma University**Article History**

Received : 10-10-2023

Revised : 20-10-2023

Accepted : 20-11-2023

Published : 26-11-2023

Corresponding author:adaninursabrina@staff.gunadarma.ac.id**No. Contact:****Cite This Article:****DOI:**<https://doi.org/10.56127/jushpen.v2i3.1107>

Abstract: *This research discusses how flouting and violating the Gricean maxims of conversation can create humor, especially the ones that are done by an Indonesian comedian named Fajar Sadboy. The data are taken from a video on Raditya Dika's YouTube channel with the title Bisakah Fajar Sadboy jadi Happyboy? By conducting this study, the researcher aims to find the maxims of conversation flouted and violated by Fajar Sadboy to create humor, as well as to analyze those floutings and violations. This is descriptive qualitative research with purposive sampling as the technique for gathering the data. The results show there are 15 data found which consist of 7 data of flouting and 8 data of violation; 6 data of maxim of quantity, 1 data of maxim of quality, 3 data of maxim of relation, 4 data of maxim of manner, and 1 data of the combination of maxims of manner and relation.*

Keywords: *Gricean Maxims, Pragmatic Infringements, Flouting and Violation, Cooperative Principle, Humor.*

INTRODUCTION

Communication is fundamental to human interaction as social creatures. By communicating, people will be able to convey information, express ideas and emotions, or simply establish relationships with each other. However, in order to achieve effective communication, people must understand what the other person is saying. There are times when someone does not convey literally what he or she wants to say. This is called *implicature*. Horn and Ward [1] suggested that implicature means an element of the speaker's meaning that, although not directly stated in the speech, represents a part of the speaker's meaning. Typically, the speaker's intentions extend beyond his or her words.

With regard to making communication run effectively and successfully, the philosopher Paul Grice initiated what he called the Cooperative Principle, which is a set of general rules that contributors are expected to apply in ordinary conversations [2]. In his Cooperative Principle, Grice stated “*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* [3].” He then categorized the Cooperative Principle into four categories, namely quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

Huang [4] cited Grice that a speaker can do several things to the maxim. First, he or she can observe the maxims. Second, he or she can violate a maxim. For instance, the speaker can breach the maxim of quality by deliberately telling a lie to his or her interlocutor. Third, he or she can opt out of a maxim. By opting out, one might clearly show that he or she refuses to cooperate in a conversation for some reason [2]. For example, he or she might break the maxim of quality by saying “*I may be wrong, but ...*” or “*I'm not sure if this is relevant, but ...*” when he or she wants to opt out of the maxim of relation. Fourth, a speaker may blatantly flout or disobey a maxim. Some speakers flout and violate maxims on purpose to create humor. As mentioned by Grice cited by Amianna [5], jokes are non-cooperative. Hoicka [6] added that jokes or humor involve

ambiguous literal meanings which are then considered entertaining for the listener. This ambiguity intersects with the maxim of manner proposed by Grice.

In this study, the researcher aims to analyze the flouting and violation of conversational maxims made by an Indonesian comedian named Fajar Sadboy [sic]. His real name is Fajar Labatjo, but he is better known as Fajar Sadboy since a video of him crying sadly because he was hurt by his ex-girlfriend went viral on social media. Then, comedian and presenter Denny Cagur invited him to the podcast to be interviewed. Fajar's character, who is innocent and often answers questions irrelevantly in the video podcast, makes the audience excited and laugh [7]. Therefore, this research also aims to identify which types of maxims of conversation are violated by Fajar Sadboy. The object of this research is Fajar Sadboy's video interview with Raditya Dika on his YouTube channel with the title *Bisakah Fajar Sadboy jadi Happyboy? or Can Fajar Sadboy be a Happyboy?* [8]

Several researchers have conducted similar studies, such as Sari et al. [9] who also analyzed maxim violations. The difference with the current research is that the previous research analyzed a movie to find the impacts of the violations on the effective communication in the movie, while the current research analyzes how the flouting and violation of conversational maxims can create humor. Widious et al. [10] also conducted similar research with the title *The Types of Maxim Violation Found in Luca Movie*. The research also used a movie as its source of data, while the current research used an interview video of an Indonesian comedian. Next, there is Syahputri et. al. [11] who also analyzed Fajar Sadboy. However, Syahputri discussed the language errors made by Fajar Sadboy, while the current research analyzed the flouting and violation of Gricean maxims.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As mentioned in the previous section, this research used the theory of conversational maxims proposed by Grice [3]. Echoing Immanuel Kant, Grice named the categories of his Cooperative Principle into *Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner*.

Quantity

This category deals with the amount of information a speaker should provide in a conversation. Huang [4] simplified this into

- (i) Do not give less information than is required.
- (ii) Do not give more information than is required.

Grice gave an analogy to this maxim, i.e., when you are assisting him to mend a car, he would expect you to contribute neither more nor less than required. For instance, when he needs you to hand him four screws, he expects you to hand him exactly four screws, rather than two or six.

Quality

This category is about truthfulness. There is a supermaxim for this category, i.e., "Try to make your contribution one that is true". Huang [4] simplified this category into

- (i) Belief—Do not say what you believe to be false.
- (ii) Evidence—Do not say what you lack evidence for.

An analogy given by Grice for this category is when he is making a cake and he needs you to hand him sugar, he does not expect you to hand him salt; and, if he needs a spoon, he does not expect to be tricked by being given a rubber spoon.

Relation

Under this category, there is a single maxim, namely, "Be relevant". Therefore, a speaker should make sure that the information he or she provides is relevant to the topic they are discussing at that moment and omit any irrelevant information.

Grice provided an analogy for this maxim: He expects his partner's contribution to be proper at every stage of the exchange. For instance, if he is mixing ingredients for a cake, he does not expect to be handed a good book or an oven cloth, even though he might need that at a later stage.

Manner

This category shows clarity. The supermaxim for this category is "Be perspicuous". The maxims that follow this category include:

- (i) Avoid obscurity.
- (ii) Avoid ambiguity.
- (iii) Be brief.
- (iv) Be orderly.

The analogy provided by Grice for this category is he expects his partner to make it clear what contribution he or she is making, and to execute his or her performance with plausible dispatch.

Flouting and Violating Maxims of Conversation

Grice described there are four ways in which people may fail to fulfil the maxims in ordinary conversation. The two of them are *violating* and *flouting*. One may violate a maxim when he or she is deliberately being uncooperative. This breach is frequently committed with the goal of deceiving. For example, one might say, “Patricia was with a man last night,” as a way of making Patricia’s routine dinner out with her husband seem like an affair with a different man [2].

Flouting, on the other hand, appears uncooperative while the actual purpose is actually to create an implicature. See an example below:

A: I am out of petrol.

B: There is a garage around the corner.

At first, it appears B has broken the maxim of relation by replying to A’s statement with irrelevant information. What would a garage do with A running out of petrol? It is not long before A finally realizes that what B means is that garages commonly sell petrol, so A can go there to get the fuel. Therefore, B’s point is directly relevant [2].

Ene [12] stated in her book that language plays an important role in creating comic quality. Language can be used in such a way as to show wit or humor. In addition, it can also be used in a way that is apparently incongruous. This is in line with what Cummings [13] mentioned in the encyclopedia he edited that humorous writings infringe the cooperative principle, such as retaining relevant information to create a surprising punch line. Not only texts but such humor can also be found verbally by comedians.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is descriptive because it includes fact-finding enquiries [14]. Kothari stated that the main characteristic of this method is the researcher does not have any control over the variables; he or she is only able to report what has happened or what is happening [14]. In line with Kothari’s notion, the current research analyzed what happened in the video of Fajar Sadboy on Raditya Dika’s YouTube channel.

The approach used in this research is qualitative because it is concerned with qualitative phenomena, e.g. investigating the reasons for human behavior—in this case, is how Fajar Sadboy flouted and violated the maxims of conversation. This is also library research because it analyzed a record [14], i.e., the podcast video of Fajar Sadboy with Raditya Dika.

Kothari [14] mentioned several methods of collecting primary data, one of them is content analysis. Content analysis is analyzing the contents of documentary materials, such as written documents (books, magazines, newspapers, etc.) or other verbal materials that can be spoken or printed. The primary data of this research is the video of Fajar Sadboy on Raditya Dika’s YouTube channel with the title *Bisakah Fajar Sadboy jadi Happyboy?* which was uploaded on January 21, 2023 [8]. In that video, there are Raditya Dika (later in the data will be stated as RD) as the host, Rais Marasabessy (RM) as the co-host, and Fajar Sadboy (FS) as the guest.

The data were collected by using purposive sampling which means the researcher purposefully chose the data that fit the aims of the research [15]. Below is the collection of the data gathered from the podcast video.

Table 1. Collection of the Data

No.	Timestamp	Conversation	Flouting or Violation	Type of Maxim
1.	00:10-00:14	RD: <i>Jar, lu, tuh, umur berapa, sih, Jar?</i> FS: Satu lima.	Flouting	Manner
2.	00:27-00:30	RD: <i>Berarti Fajar sekarang tinggal di mana?</i> FS: Di rumah.	Violation	Quantity
3.	01:15-01:23	FS: <i>Kenapa cicak diam-diam di dinding?</i> RD: <i>Karena dia happy.</i> FS: <i>Salah.</i> RD: <i>Kenapa?</i> FS: Karena kalau diam-diam selingkuh itu kamu.	Flouting	Relation
	01:33	RD: <i>Happy-nya di mana?</i>		

4.	02:12-02:16	FS: Happy <i>apa yang di ujung kata happy itu nama hewan?</i>	Flouting	Manner	
	02:26	FS: Happyboy.			
5.	04:12-04:15	RD: <i>Gimana, Jar, rasanya?</i> FS: Happy meal.	Flouting	Manner	
6.	06:27-06:32	RD: <i>Fajar, kamu di Jakarta tinggal di daerah mana?</i> FS: Di bagian sana.	Violation	Quantity	
7.	06:33-06:40	RM: <i>Mana? Selatan? Barat? Utara? Timur?</i> FS: Sekitaran Jakarta sini.	Violation	Quantity	
8.	06:43-06:52	RD: <i>Ada yang diingat enggak? Di kost-an atau rumah?</i> FS: Di rumah. Rumahnya di samping rumah orang.	Violation	Quantity	
9.	09:08-09:14	RD: <i>Di Jakarta apa yang paling seram yang Fajar lihat?</i> FS: Ini (demonstrating money symbol with his hand).	Flouting	Manner and Relation	and
10.	10:47-10:52	(Drank soda gembira beverage) FS: (casts a spell).	Violation	Relation	
11.	13:05-13:14	RD: <i>Kalau di Jakarta, selama ini Fajar paling suka makan apa? Ada enggak yang Fajar suka? Fajar paling suka makan apa di Jakarta?</i> FS: Nasi.	Violation	Quantity	
12.	13:17-13:25	FS: <i>Jangan pernah melupakan nasi.</i> RD: <i>Iya, iya.</i> FS: Dialah bukan hewan.	Flouting	Relation	
13.	15:16-15:22	RD: <i>Siapa yang ulang tahun?</i> FS: Oh, iya, saya! RD: <i>Eh, lu ulang tahun?</i> FS: <i>Tapi nanti tanggal 31 Mei.</i> RD: <i>Ya, berarti belum.</i>	Violation	Quality	
14.	17:28-17:47	RD: <i>Apa trauma yang elo paling rasain karena Perempuan, tuh, apa, sih?</i> FS: Trauma yang saya rasakan dia memberi HP kepada saya. RD: <i>Dia ngasih HP?</i> FS: <i>Setelah itu pergi.</i> RM: <i>Ngasih HP setelah itu pergi terus Fajar digebukin (karena) itu HP (hasil) jambret?</i> FS: HP—Harapan Palsu.	Flouting	Manner	
15.	17:55-18:05	RD: <i>Kalau ada yang mau collab sama Fajar, IG-nya di mana? Misalnya ada yang mau ngikutin Fajar.</i> FS: IG saya di Instagram, di akun saya.	Violation	Quantity	

Source: *Primary Data*

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the collection of the data, it can be seen that the researcher found 15 data, which fall into 7 data of flouting and 8 data of violation. The numbers of data of maxims that are flouted and violated are 6 data of quantity, 1 data of quality, 3 data of relation, 4 data of manner, and 1 data of the combination of manner and relation. Below is the analysis and discussion of the data. All of the analyses used the theory of Maxims of Conversation proposed by Grice [3] along with their flouting and violation theories.

Data 1

00:10-00:14

RD: *Jar, lu, tuh, umur berapa, sih, Jar?*

FS: **Satu lima.**

In the conversation, Raditya Dika asked Fajar how old he was. Instead of answering with the common number *fifteen*, Fajar chose to reply with *satu lima* which translates into *one five* in English. Saying *one five* as *fifteen* is not common in Indonesia. Therefore, in this case, Fajar has flouted the maxim of manner, because he was not perspicuous and did not state the answer clearly, even though it could still be understood. His incongruity managed to make both the host and co-host laugh. Thus, the breaking of this maxim can be considered humor.

Data 2

00:27-00:30

RD: *Berarti Fajar sekarang tinggal di mana?*

FS: ***Di rumah.***

In this data, Raditya Dika asked Fajar where he lived at that moment. However, Fajar replied with a vague answer. He did not mention any region to let his interlocutor know, but he only said that he lived in a house (*Di rumah*). He thus has blatantly violated the maxim of quantity because he deliberately gave less information than required. Nevertheless, Raditya Dika and Rais Marasabessy laughed at this improper answer.

Data 3

01:15-01:23

FS: *Kenapa cicak diam-diam di dinding?*

RD: *Karena dia happy.*

FS: *Salah.*

RD: *Kenapa?*

FS: ***Karena kalau diam-diam selingkuh itu kamu.***

01:23

RD: *Happy-nya di mana?*

In one moment of the interview, the three were throwing riddles related to ‘being happy’ for others to answer. Fajar came up with his own by asking “Why do the lizards stay quietly still on the wall?” which was inspired by an Indonesian children's song lyric. The other two gave up and Fajar revealed the answer: *Because the one who is quietly (secretly) cheating is you.* The other two understood that Fajar was being cheated on once by his ex-girlfriend, hence the name is Fajar ‘Sadboy’. However, his riddle did not relate to the topic discussed. This is emphasized by Raditya Dika asking for clarification in minute 01:23, “*Where is the happy part?*” because there is nothing to be happy about when you are cheated on. Therefore, Fajar has flouted the maxim of relation since he shared an irrelevant riddle.

As Ene [12] stated incongruity can also be used as humor, Fajar’s incongruity also managed to make Raditya Dika and Rais Marasabessy laugh.

Data 9

09:08-09:14

RD: *Di Jakarta apa yang paling seram yang Fajar lihat?*

FS: ***Ini (demonstrating money symbol with his hand).***

At another stage of their conversation, the three were discussing whether Fajar had seen a ghost. Raditya Dika asked Fajar about what was the scariest thing that he had ever seen. Instead of mentioning any name of a ghost, Fajar only gave a demonstration with his fingers by making a sort of symbol. This hand movement confused Raditya Dika and Rais Marasabessy because his answer was not related to the topic. Thus, Fajar flouted the maxim of relation. In addition to that, Fajar was actually giving an implication that the scariest thing for him was money (the symbol he was making was the symbol of money). However, since his way of delivery was not clear, he at the same time flouted the maxim of manner.

Data 13

15:16-15:22

RD: *Siapa yang ulang tahun?*

FS: ***Oh, iya, saya!***

RD: *Eh, lu ulang tahun?*

FS: *Tapi nanti tanggal 31 Mei.*

RD: *Ya, berarti belum.*

The main purpose of the video was to try meals that would make the eater happy, especially the guest, Fajar Sadboy. At a later moment in the video, the three were given a birthday cake. Raditya Dika instantly asked, "Who is having a birthday?". Fajar replied, "It's me!" However, it turned out that his actual birthday was on May 31, meanwhile the video was uploaded in January, so it definitely was not his birthday yet. Fajar has deliberately violated the maxim of quality because he was not telling the truth in his first response, even though later he mentioned that his birthday is on May 31. This deceiving answer succeeded in making the others laugh.

CONCLUSION

Gricean maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner are indubitably useful for a person to contribute to effective communication. People can use them as a guide to be a cooperative partner in exchanging ideas and expressions, or simply to socialize with others. Grice [3] also shared that there are infringements to his maxims whether one deliberately violates them to deceive his or her partner, or intentionally flouts the maxims while expecting his or her interlocutor to understand the implicature.

Some people purposefully break the Cooperative Principle for more interesting reasons, such as to create humor. This is often done by comedians as they retain the truth while violating the maxim of manner to finally reveal it in the punchline or exaggerating statements while flouting the maxim of quantity to make the audience laugh. The same thing has been implemented by an Indonesian comedian Fajar Labatjo as he plays his character 'Fajar Sadboy' who is known for his sadness due to being hurt by his ex-girlfriend and his incongruity while conversing with other people. Fajar managed to entertain his audience and brought laughter to the listeners.

This shows that the intentional manipulation of Gricean maxims in communication plays a captivating role in shaping the dynamics of human interaction. From the video taken from Raditya Dika's YouTube channel whose title is *Bisakah Fajar Sadboy jadi Happyboy?*, we can see how Fajar showcased his pragmatic infringements as deliberate strategies for creating humor. Out of the 15 data, we also found that one can break more than one maxim at a time, as shown in Data 9.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. R. Horn and G. Ward, "The Handbook of Pragmatics (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics)."
- [2] K. Lindblom, "Cooperative Principle," *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Elsevier, Denmark, 2009.
- [3] H. P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- [4] Y. Huang, *Pragmatics*, Second. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- [5] J. N. R. P. Amianna and A. Putranti, "Humorous Situations Created by Violations and Floutings of Conversational Maxims in a Situation Comedy Entitled How I Met Your Mother," *Journal of Language and Literature*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 97–107, Apr. 2017.
- [6] E. Hoicka, "The pragmatic development of humor," in *Pragmatic Development in First Language Acquisition*, D. Matthews, Ed., John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2014.
- [7] D. Nita, "Siapa Fajar Sad Boy yang Viral? Ini Awal Mula Terkenal hingga Diundang di Televisi," KOMPAS.TV. Accessed: Nov. 25, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kompas.tv/entertainment/362246/siapa-fajar-sad-boy-yang-viral-ini-awal-mula-terkenal-hingga-diundang-di-televisi>
- [8] R. Dika, "Bisakah Fajar Sadboy jadi Happyboy?," *Raditya Dika*. Jan. 21, 2023. Accessed: Nov. 14, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://youtu.be/XAcN_QyQ8wI?si=IoqAgIJwiORgWyeA
- [9] D. F. Sari, L. Nuraini, and K. A. Muthalib, "AN ANALYSIS OF MAXIM VIOLATIONS IN A MOVIE AND THEIR IMPACTS ON EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION," in *Literature as a Source of Wisdom*, Banda Aceh: Universitas Syiah Kuala, Jul. 2019, pp. 711–720.
- [10] N. W. B. A. Widiasih, P. N. Ayomi, and I. B. G. N. Winarta, "THE TYPES OF MAXIM VIOLATION FOUND IN LUCA MOVIE," *ELLITE: Journal of Education, Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 10–16, Apr. 2022.
- [11] D. Syahputri and L. S. D. br.Ginting, "Kesalahan berbahasa pada tayangan Fajar Sadboy: percuma cantik kalau bibir SCTV satu untuk semua," *Jurnal Komunitas Bahasa*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 123–131, 2023.
- [12] F. Ene, *A Guide to the Study of Comedy*. Edinburgh: Fellyway Books, 2013.
- [13] L. Cummings, Ed., "Humor," *The Pragmatics Encyclopedia*. Routledge, London and New York, 2010.

- [14] C. R. Kothari, *Research Methodology: Methods & Techniques*, Second Revised. New Delhi: New Age International Publisher, 2004.
- [15] S. J. Tracy, *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact*. West Sussex: Blackwell, 2013.