

COOPERATION MAXIM ERROR PRINCIPLES AND IMPLICATIONS ON WARINTIL OFFICIAL SERIES “GA BOLEH SOUZON”

Yosi M. Passandaran*

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Jakarta
087773935696
yosi.m.passandaran@gmail.com

Yulia Sofiani Zaimar M.Hum

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Jakarta
082127082374
yuliazaimar@gmail.com

Leni Tiwiyanti

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Jakarta
085714142808
lenitiwiyanti@gmail.com

Received 2022-04-04; Revised 2022-0712; Accepted: 2022-11-03

ABSTRAK

This article describes the error of maxims and the meaning of implicatures in the sitcom of *Kontrakan Rempong* from Warintil Official on Youtube. There are five types of violations of the cooperative principle are caused by the speech participants. The research method uses descriptive qualitative. The data is taken from *Kontrakan Rempong*, titled “*Gak Usah Souzon*”. The collecting data uses the documentation method by listening and note-taking techniques from the *Kontrakan Rempong's* characters conversation. The object is the form and meaning of implicature in humour *Kontrakan Rempong*. The results indicate the form of conversational implicatures that function as a supporting of humour in the humorous discourse. The series of *Kontrakan Rempong* has a violation in the maxim of the cooperative principle. In the maxim of quality, there are two categories of violations; they are the words that are used solely to show the characters arrogance and to make the main character a fool. In other words, the error maxim seems to the trying to evade responsibility. The function of violation of the maximal principle of cooperation has been categorized based on existing data like wisdom maxim, acceptance maxim, humility maxim, quality maxim, approbation maxim and quantity maxim. The maxims error is the error of quantity maxim, quality maxim, wisdom maxim approbation and humility maxim. In addition to supporting humour, the error causes many implications related to human nature and real life.

Keywords: humour, error, maxim, implicature

ABSTRACT

Artikel ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan kesalahan maksim dan makna implikatur dalam situasi komedi “*Kontrakan Rempong*” dari Warintil Official di Youtube. Ada lima jenis pelanggaran prinsip kerja sama yang dilakukan oleh penutur. Data diambil dari video drama pendek komedi (sitcom) Youtube “*Kontrakan Rempong*” yang berjudul “*Gak Usah Souzon*”. Data dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan metode dokumentasi dan dengan teknik simak-catat dari percakapan para tokoh dalam drama “*Kontrakan Rempong*”. Obyeknya adalah bentuk dan makna implikatur yang terdapat dalam drama “*Kontrakan Rempong*”. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bentuk implikatur percakapan berfungsi sebagai pendukung humor

* Corresponding Author

dalam wacana humor. Drama Kontrakan Rempong melanggar maksim prinsip kerjasama. Dalam maksim kualitas, ada dua kategori pelanggaran, yaitu kata-kata yang digunakan, semata-mata untuk menunjukkan diri (sombong) dan untuk membodohi si tokoh utama. Dengan kata lain, maksim kesalahan tampak sebagai upaya untuk menghindari tanggung jawab. Fungsi pelanggaran prinsip maksimal kerjasama telah dikategorikan berdasarkan data, yaitu maksim kebijaksanaan, maksim penerimaan, maksim kerendahan hati, maksim kualitasm maksim persetujuan, dan maksim kuantitas. Kesalahan maksim terdapat pada maksim kuantitas, maksim kualitas, maksim kebijaksanaan, dan maksim kerendahan hati. Selain mendukung humor, kesalahan tersebut menimbulkan implikasi terkait dengan fitrah manusia dan kehidupan nyata.

Kata kunci: *humor, implikatur, kesalahan, maksim,*

INTRODUCTION

Background

Language as communication tool is very important for humans and even becomes part of human life, and belongs to the people who use it. According to Kridalaksana (2004, 17) language is a system of arbitrary sound symbols used by members of social groups to cooperate, communicate, and identify themselves. There is no society without language, and there is no language without society. Language is an important element in the development and delivery of science and culture. Language can also be a differentiator of a community group. This is in line with the opinion of Saussure (Syaf, 2017) who argues that language is one of the distinguishing characteristics; this is because by using language, every group in society can become a different unit from other groups.

In communication, sometimes humans do not convey their feelings or ideas directly, but through the hidden meaning behind their speech. To understand the hidden meaning behind the speech, one must understand the context of the speech. Context is an environmental situation in a broad sense that allows speech participants to interact, and makes their speech understood. The context can also be called a speech situation. The meaning is influenced by the existence of the speech situation is what the speaker wants to achieve. So, the speech partner understands the purpose of the conversation. However, it is necessary to have a good cooperative relationship between the speaker and the speech partner. The speaker's intentions and goals can be understood by the speech partner, it is necessary to have effective and efficient communication.

The humorous discourse contained in the sitcom film is an entertainment discourse that is related to pragmatics. In the humorous discourse, there are utterances contain

violations of the principle of cooperation in conversation and conversational implications. The phenomena that exist outside the language of structural linguistics do not able to explain it. That was the trigger for the birth of a new branch of linguistics called pragmatics in the early 1960s. Pragmatics itself contains things about the use of language that cannot be explained from the point of view of structural linguistics.

In delivering humour, words can be ironically managed to create laughter. According to Grice (1989), "Irony is a discrepancy between the literal meaning of the speaker's utterance and the tone, facial expression or body language that indicates another meaning of the utterance which sometimes contradicts what is conveyed". Verbal irony is done by saying an event that is contrary to its true meaning and the discrepancy between the atmosphere presented and the underlying reality. This is where the maxim often goes wrong.

Not all utterances have a meaning that is directly contained in the speaker's words in speaking. According to Keraf (2005), the irony is a discrepancy between the literal meaning of the speaker's utterance and the tone, facial expression or body language that indicates another meaning of the utterance which sometimes contradicts what is conveyed. In this case, it is pragmatics that can study. According to Wahyuningsih and Rafli (2017), pragmatics is a field of linguistics that examines reciprocal relationships. It means the reciprocal relationship is important between the speakers. There is meaning in the speakers' reactions.

This approach needs to investigate how listeners can conclude what is being said to the interpretation intended by the speaker. This type of study explores how much of what was not said turns out to be part of what was said. Fromkin (2000) argues pragmatics is the study of linguistic communication according to the principles of conversation. One of the principles of conversation is the principle of cooperation, was proposed by Grice. The relevance of linking pragmatic studies with the principle of conversation is the fact that the speaker's intention of expression can be controlled by this principle. Violation of the principle of conversation causes a discrepancy between what the speaker says and what is meant.

In an effective speech, the participants are required to comply with the cooperative principle, but the utterances contained in humorous discourses often violate the cooperative

principle. The violation aims to create humour so that the response of laughing or smiling is obtained from the audience of humour. To violating the cooperative principle, there is conversational implication in the humorous discourse,. The emergence of this implication is used by the creators of humour to create a funny effect. Through conversational implication, the discourse of political humour has succeeded in building humour that can provide a laugh or smile response for the audience. Violations of the principle of cooperation and conversational implication, which are contained in the humorous discourse, are the object of analysis in this research.

Problems Formulation

Based on the background, the following are the research problems:

1. What are the error maxims in the “*Ga Boleh Souzon*” from sitcom *the Kontrakan Rempong*?
2. How audiences can get the meaning of the implication words?

Research Aims

The followings are the objectives of the research.

1. To find the error maxims in the “*Ga Boleh Souzon*” from the sitcom *Kontrakan Rempong*
2. To get the meaning by the implication words

Theoretical Review

In linguistics, the language used by speakers generally does not pay attention to the appropriate linguistic rules. The language used usually comes out by itself without the speaker realizing it. The speaker only thinks about his communicative speech and can be understood by the speech partner. Badudu (Karisma, 2017:1) adds that language is also used to distinguish humans from other creatures because through language humans can express feelings, thoughts, and desires to others.

Purwo (Yanti, 2019:35) defines pragmatics as a study of the meaning of speech (utterance) using context-bound meanings. Meanwhile, treating language pragmatically is to treat language by considering its context, namely its use in communication events.

In a communication, we can assume that speaker articulates his utterance in the purpose of communication to the addressee. There is a goal to understand by the addressee about what the communication means. So, the speaker always tries to speak relevantly to the context, clear, and understandable easily.

In a conversation, there needs to be cooperation between speakers. There is a kind of principle of cooperation that speakers and speech opponents must do in order to the communication process to run smoothly. In this principle of cooperation there are five maxims, as follows:

a. Wisdom Maxim

According to Leech (Rahardi, 2005) the principle of politeness of speech participants should adhere to the principle of reducing profits for themselves and maximizing benefits for others in speaking activities. If we have maximized profits for others, it can be said that the speaker has been polite and wise. People who speak according to the maxim of wisdom will be said to be polite. The speech that adheres to the maxim of wisdom can avoid jealousy, envy, and other attitudes that are less polite to the interlocutor. Likewise, feelings of hurt resulting from the treatment of others can be minimized if this maxim of wisdom is firmly held and implemented in speaking or interacting activities. So, this maxim, politeness when speaking activities can be done if the maxim of wisdom is implemented properly.

b. Humanity Maxim

Wijana & Rohmadi (2011: 57) reveal that the maxim of humility is expressed in expressive and assertive sentences. If the maxim of generosity is centred on others, then the maxim of humility is self-centred. This maxim requires that the participants of the speech must maximize their disrespect for themselves and minimize their respect for themselves. The example:

A: "You're very smart."

B: "Oh no, it's just mediocre. It was just a coincidence."

The statement B above is an example of minimizing self-respect because it reduces self-praise and adds insult to him.

c. **Approbation Maxim**

Leech (Rahardi, 2005) says that the approbation maxim can be called the maxim of compatibility. This maxim, it emphasizes that the speaker and the speech partner can foster compatibility, agreement or agreement in speaking activities. Speakers and speech partners can be said to have a polite attitude if there is agreement or compatibility in speaking activities.

In Javanese society, people are not allowed to argue directly against what is said by others. The Javanese women are not allowed to oppose something that men said. If we look at people speaking today, the interlocutor often uses a nod of agreement, a thumb up, a face without wrinkles on the forehead, and so on. It is a kinetic paralinguistic property to express a certain meaning. The example:

A: "See you tomorrow"
B: "Ok."

d. **Quality Maxim**

In the maxim of quality, contributions of conversation participants should be based on adequate evidence. The evidence ensures the truth of the speech events that occur in a situation. Rahardi (2005: 55) suggests in the maxim of quality, a speech participant is expected to convey something real and according to the actual facts in speaking. Therefore, the maxim of quality requires speech participants not to say something that is not by the facts. The maxim of relevance requires that the speech participant is expected to be relevant to the information provided following the topic of the conversation. The maxim of means requires the participants to communicate to provide clear and unambiguous information.

Quality maxim makes it easier for the speech partner to know what the writer wants. It is a rule that governs a good and quality conversation according to the existing truth. Research on the principle of cooperation, especially maxims, is often carried out by other researchers. The example:

A : How many maxims of cooperation according to Grice?
B : According to the Grice book I read, there are four maxims in the principle of cooperation.

e. Quantity Maxim

Herawati (2013) states the maxim of quantity relates to the quantity of the contribution given by the speech participants. This maxim expects each participant to contribute according to the needs of the interlocutor. So, the contribution given is not less or more than what other speech participants need. The opinion about the maxim of quantity is meant that this maxim is a maxim that expects the speaker to provide sufficient information. The maxim of quantity requires adequate and not excessive information. The maxim expects the speaker to provide information that is neither less nor more. The following is an example of the maxim of quantity:

A: Who is in the class?

B: Mr Muntazir, a lecturer in Creative Writing, who is also the head of the Indonesian language department, enters the class.

METHOD

The approach used in this research is qualitative research with a descriptive type of research. In line with this expression, the main purpose of this descriptive research is to describe the characteristics of the subject or object of research in detail and systematically, facts, and accurately regarding the facts, characteristics and relationships between the phenomena being investigated. Implicature, which is used in this study, by using the theory of Grice in adopting cooperative principles. The object of research used is the maxims that violate the principle of cooperation and identify the type of speech act in each implication, in the sitcom foil on the YouTube channel, Warintil Official in *Kontrakan Rempong* series. The data is taken by one of the titles "*Ga Usah Souzon*".

The data was collected by the documentation method. The data is collected by downloading the sitcom from YouTube and recording the necessary conversations. So, the data collection methods and techniques used in this study are the listening method with the free-to-talk listening technique, the recording technique, and the note-taking technique. The analytical methods and techniques used in analyzing the data are using heuristic methods and equivalent methods with pragmatic and normative subtypes, with the basic technique using the determining element sorting technique with an advanced technique using comparisons and comparisons. The method of presenting the results of data analysis in this study is a formal and informal presentation.

RESULT and DISCUSSION

Result

The material for humour is usually taken from everyday life. To provoke humour, usually, the things that are discussed make awkward, redundant, and unthinkable by others. One of the branches of linguistics that discusses the structure of language and humans is pragmatics. The side of pragmatics is widely used to produce humour. In pragmatics, there are rules known as conversational maxims. By obeying the maxim of conversation, it is hoped that a conversation will take place effectively and efficiently. However, in humour, this conversational maxim is deliberately violated to create a humorous effect. Through humour, many of the speaker's sentences, tend to imply or suggest it, that is, the speaker often succeeds in conveying implications that do not express information explicitly but the listener can recognize by implication.

The *Kontrakan Rempong* series is made by six actors from Medan. It tells story about a rental house *Rempong* which has now reached more than 100 episodes. The stories are close to the daily lives of women, coupled with funny scenes that make their content always awaited. Who would have thought that all the feminine roles in Warintil were played by some men? Their appearance on YouTube and in everyday life is certainly very different. This is the original appearance of the players on Warintil's YouTube channel.

The beginning of the “*Kontrakan Rempong*” was formed, when initially the character Mumu (played by Putra Samuel) lived in the same village with the character Rita (played by Purwadi). In the real world, Purwadi and Putra are really good friends. Then they migrated to Medan. They met Sam (character Ishaya) and Irwansyah (character Castle). They played on a live streaming and met Bagus (character Nining). The name Warintil was formed on February 27 2017 (Nasition, 2020). On the live streaming, they collaborated and helped each other in various challenges. It was where they met Aris (character wak Bordir). They were inspired by the live streaming they played. They developed it. Next, their YouTube was monetized; they started thinking about making *Kontrakan Rempong*. Then, Irwansyah (character Castle) made each their character and they were played nicely by all of them. This is where the maxim often goes wrong.

In this research, the researcher found compliance with the error maxim principle and the use of implicatures from the theory presented by Grice. Grice in Kushartanti (2007:

106) revealed that in the cooperative principle, a speaker must obey the maxims found in all of the five maxims, as follows: wisdom maxim, acceptance maxim, humility maxim,, quality maxim, approbation maxim and quantity maxim. The researchers would like to start to analyze some conversations in this part.

Wisdom Maxim

The function of politeness always involves a conversation about maxims, where the maxim of wisdom is in the form of a request to advice offer, and promise something to others. It is a good thing in everyday life. Its application can be seen in the following analysis:

Eda Sondang: *Tak usah lah kita bicara angsuran orang itu tadi.. Sementara angsuranmu tak pernah kau bayar sama aku. Kek mana jadinya*
Kak Mumu : *Kek manalah ku buat. Uang ku pun dari sawah. Kehidupan hari-hari kami dari situ. Sekarang mamak ku pun lagi sakit, ngirimi uang pula aku ke sana, da... (eda).*

The sentence "no need" describes the fulfilment of this maxim. However, the sentence "While you never paid your instalments with me" can be considered a violation. This is because the statement is like Eda Sondang doesn't want to understand Mumu's situation, which experiencing financial difficulties.

Humility Maxim

In the function of politeness, there is an understanding of the maxim of humility, namely the maxim that reduces praise to others and increases praise for his or herself.

Case 1.

Mumu : *"Mana ada ini silver. Uiih antingmu nabanggakan, da. Berapa karat, daa?"*
Eda Sondang : *"aa ¼ (seperempat) aja."*
Mumu : *"¼ ya.. oooi ya mak jan..."*
Eda Sondang : *"Cincin mu bagus la ini berlian?"*
Mumu : *"Mana ada ini silver.. silver Jamaica"*
Eda Sondang : *"Kalo aku ga bisa lah pakai silver.. Bukannya aku sombong ya."*
Mumu : *"Emang ga cocok da.. eda pake yang palsu."*

In the dialogue above, eda Sondang violates humility because she boasts with her jewellery. In addition, eda Sondang said that it was not suitable for her to wear silver jewellery. The humility maxim error occurs because she exaggerates her existence, not only from his speech but also from his gestures. In the context of the jewellery above, eda

Sondang seems to be self-deprecating by saying that she cannot use silver or other than gold jewellery. Talking about implication, in the text above, literally seen directly, the speech spoken by Mumu is an expressive illocutionary speech act which intends to praise the addressee things that are advantageous with the advantages in the interlocutor conveyed through a compliment. Thus, the speech has another purpose, namely predicting a favourable situation for both the interlocutor and the speaker.

Case 2

Bordir : “Ngapain kau di sini.. ini wilayah ku.. Pulang sana!”

Eda Sondang: “Ya mo nagih utang lah aku sama dia!” (while pointing at Mumu)

Mumu : “Udahlah Border, gara-gara suara kau kuat suara jadi semua orang tau!”

Bordir : “Berapa rupanya utang si Mumu?”

Eda Sondang: “Empat ratus ribu lagi.. Kau mau bayarkan, iya?”

Bordir :”Cuma empat ratus rupanya. Heboh kali kau ni nya bayar utang si Mumu ni ya!”

Mumu : “Eh Serius la kau Bor.. Ee makasi ya deekk yaa”

Bordir : “Adek.... Kakak..”

Mumu : “Ooo iyaa.. makasih ya kaaak...”

In this case, wak Bordir sentences should categorize the sympathy maxim, because she is willing to help Mumu to pay off the debt. However, what Embroidery said is an error of the humility maxim, because she looks proud, and a little arrogant, both in front of eda Sondang and Mumu. In the conversation above, the violation of the maxim of humility is very clear, it can be seen when Mumu who is far above Bordir is willing to call Bordir's sister.

Besides the error maxim, in this conversation, there is an implication that shows arrogance. The first implication of arrogance, Bordir wants to help Mumu in pay off Mumu's debt. However, as the second implication, she doesn't mean to be completely willing to help. Bordir just want to show eda Sondang that she is better and richer than her. Bordir also has the intention that Mumu does not move from her house rental to eda Sondang's place. It is because Bordir already knows that eda Sondang's rental house is cheaper than hers. In this scene, we can analyze that humour is often used to wrap up social criticism when social criticism in the form of writing reaps many pros and cons. Social criticism is considered a means of communication, which functions as control throughout the social system in social life.

Approbation Maxim

This maxim requires speech participants to be polite by giving appreciation to the interlocutor so that none of the participant mocks, berates, or demeans other parties, like in conversation:

- Bordir* : “*Apa urusan mu sama dia.*”
Eda Sondang : “*Ya mau menagih utang!*”
Mumu : “*Udahlah Bordir, gara-gara suara kau kuat jadi semua orang tau, Bordir, berapa rupanya utang si Mumu?*”
Eda Sondang : “*Empat ratus ribu lagi.. Kau mau bayarkan, iya?*”
Bordir : “*Cuma empat ratus rupanya.. heboh kali kau ni nya bayar utang si Mumu ni, ya!*”

From the conversation above, the utterance, “*Udahlah Bordir, gara-gara suara kau kuat suara jadi semua orang tau*” is a kind error of the approbation maxim error This is because Mumu considers Bordir's words with her loudly voice an insult, which he fears will cause many people to know Mumu's debt to eda Sondang

The implicature in this conversation that someone sometimes does well is not because he is sincere. However, sometimes he does well to look better than his or her interlocutor. It is proved by the Levinson statement (Harared, 2017), the implicature theory gives an explicit explanation of the differences between what we are said by external meaning and what they mean to the utterance. We can see in “*berapa rupanya utang si Mumu?*” dan “*Cuma empat ratus rupanya.. heboh kali kau!*”

Quality Maxim

- Debra*: “*Eh mak e... kamu sakit ya... pucat lho...*”
Munu : “*Ih bodrexin kali.. bibirku ni .. bibirku ini lagi pecah-pecah.. Jadi kupakaikan salep telapak kaki itu.*”
Teman : “*Tapi bibir kak Nunu dua warna.*”
Mumu : “*Indang, kan. Cucok, kan warnanya.*”

In the conversation above, the maxim of quality is ignored, in order to create a funny impression as shown in the giving of wrong and illogical answers, which are contained in "two-coloured lips are beautiful". The sentence “two-coloured lips are beautiful” considered as something that it is not true. The conversation between Deborah, Nunu, and her friend gives wrong information because the utterance cannot give

satisfaction to Deborah and her friend. The thing that violates the maxims in the conversation above is the medicine for the soles of the feet is cracked lips.

Quantity Maxim

Nining : “Ngapain kau kemari?”

Bodir : “Kau ah lupa.. malas aku mau ngulang ngulang lagi.”

Nining : “Lupa apa lagi si wak, udah siap semua kerjaan aku.. makanya aku tidur tiduran. Sinilah! Kau golek-golek dulu. Jangan sampai mimisan kau. Kepanasan.”

Bodir : “Uang kontra’an mu mana

Nining : “Ha? Uang kontra’an? Kok dh cepet kali.. ni masih akhir bulan kok.”

Bodir : “Sekarang sudah tanggal 32.”

Nining : “Sekarang bulan agustus kan sampai tanggal 15.”

In this conversation, we can see the violation of the quantity maxim. This violation was most evident when Nining did not answer Embroidery's question about the rent. On the other hand, Embroidery also makes an error in the quantity maxim, because it said that it was “August 32”. The response deviation given by Nining indicated that the speaker violated the maxim of quantity because Nining was actually evading paying the rent. So, he obscured the topic of conversation. This causes the communication process to be not run effectively and efficiently. For this reason, this maxim relates to more or less information conveyed, in this case by wak Embroidery. As stated by Wijana (1996), “The maxim of quantity is related to the amount of information given by each speech participant”.

The implicature is someone is easily manipulated, if the person is too innocent, or easily influenced. These implicatures can be seen through the sentence, which came from Nining “*Ha? Uang kontra’an? Kok dah cepet kali.. ni masih akhir bulan, kok.*” It can be interpreted that Nining is trying to make the embroidery forget the due date of its rent payment. The underlined sentence is considered as funny speech because it is considered funny. However, it actually implies that Nining failed to lie to Embroidery. It could be depicted, that Nining is not who can a person, quickly to think

Discussion

From the results above, the language, which was originally used in communicating in wak Bordir's rented area, will have different forms of language politeness. If the residents of *Kontrakan Rempong* communicate with outsiders, the politeness of the different languages spoken is to maintain the values or rules of politeness in speech and

action. The politeness of language depends on who we are talking to, about what, under what circumstances, and in what situation the conversation takes place. Many people in the community often assume that people who live in rented houses in slum areas are a collection of people who lack ethics. The use of the maxim of cooperation and the maxim of politeness is not suitable as a benchmark in humour discourse. Violations in humorous discourse are usually deliberately made to make the atmosphere fluid and make the audiences laugh.

This humour is acceptable because most of the audiences who laugh have the same background of association, perception or understanding as Bodir or eda Sondang as the first speakers. The same understanding and association of references, communication in the form of humour can work well, because there has been an understanding of meaning between the speaker and the interlocutor, even though there are many error maxims. Every change usually always causes problems, both big and small problems. A social problem will occur when the reality faced is different from the expectations of society. In the proletarian class society, the violation of the maxim of humour is sometimes just a tool to make people laugh. However, in reality, a lot of humour depicts real life.

In delivering humour, many words can be ironically managed to create laughter in the sitcom *Kontrakan Rempong*. Verbal irony is done by saying an event that is contrary to its true meaning and the discrepancy between the atmosphere presented and the underlying reality. From the results of this study, it can be revealed that the implicature arises due to a violation of the maxim of the cooperative principle. The implicatures are conversational implicatures. Conversational implicatures in this study have categories, namely special, and general conversational implicatures produce six types of categories, namely, giving advice, complaining, giving information, criticizing, asking and praising.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results that have been described or explained previously, it can be concluded:

1. The Youtube sitcom, *Rempong Kontakan*, has a violation of the maxim of the cooperative principle. In the maxim of quality, there are two categories of violations, namely the words that are used solely to show her or himself (arrogance) or make the
-

character Bordir a fool. In other words, in character Nining case, the error maxim seems as the tray of evading responsibility. The principle of cooperation has been categorized based on the available data like wisdom maxim, acceptance maxim, humility maxim,, quality maxim, approbation maxim and quantity maxim. The maxims error is the error of quantity maxim, quality maxim, wisdom, maxim approbation, and humility maxim. In addition to supporting humour the error causes many implicatures related to human nature and real life.

2. The form of conversational implicatures serves as a support for humour in the discourse of the YouTube Sitcom, *Kontrakan Rempong*. The results can be revealed that implications arise due to violations of the maxim of the cooperative principle. In humorous discourse, the use of conversational implication will cause humour, amusement, or laughter for the interlocutor who can capture the meaning conveyed in the humour discourse. If the speech partner cannot catch the meaning of humorous discourse contains conversational implicatures, it is certain the person will not feel funny, amused, or laugh, even he get angry in response to the discourse. There are obstacles to convey the true meaning. Speaking partner's experience, whether in misunderstandings in interacting or even failure to communicate simply. It is because they do not master conversational implicatures.
-

REFERENCE

- Fromkin, V.A. (2000). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Linguistics Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell publisher Ltd
- Grice, H.P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Harared, N. (2017). Implikatur: Fungsi Tindak Tutur Dalam The Big Bang Theory. *Pujangga*, 3 (2), 60–68.
- Herawati, A. (2013). The Cooperative Principle: Is Grice's Theory Suitable To Indonesian Language Culture. *Lingua Cultura*, 7(1), 43-48.
- K., Karisma H. (2017). "Implikatur Lan Inferensi Sajrone Kolom Pethilan Ing Kalawarti Panjekar Semangat Taun 2013." *Jurnal Online Baradha*, vol. 2, no. 2
- Keraf, G. (2005). *Diksi dan Gaya Bahasa*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka. Utama.
- Kridalaksana, H. (2004). *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka
- Kushartanti, dkk. (2007). *Pesona Bahasa: Langkah Awal Memahami Linguistik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Nasition, I. (2020). Profil Terlengkap Para Pemain Kontrakan Rempong (Warintil Official): Nining, Bu Atik, Wak Bordir, Rita, Mumu, Hingga Ishaya!. Taken from <https://www.dontsad.com/2020/01/profil-terlengkap-para-pemain-kontrakan.html>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2005). *Pragmatik: kesantunan imperatif bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Syaf, E. J. (2017). Pertarungan Simbol Identitas Etnis Sebagai Komunikasi Politik Dalam Pilkada Kota Makassar. *KAREBA: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 215-224.
- Wahyuningsih, H., & Rafli, Z. (2017). Implikatur Percakapan dalam Stand Up Comedy 4. *Bahtera: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 16(2), 139-153.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (1996). *Dasar-dasar pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Wijaya, I. D. P., & Rohmadi, M. (2011). *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik Kajian Teori dan Analisis*. Surakarta: Yuma Pustaka.
- Yanti, B. (2019). A. Pengertian Pragmatik. *Studi Naskah Bahasa Arab*, 35.
-