Analysis of Humor on Cartoon Comics "Be Like Bro": Pragmatics Study

Anindita Dewangga Puri
Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada
aninditalucia@gmail.com

FX. Risang Baskara
Faculty of Business, Design, and Arts, Swinburne University of Technology
rbaskara@swinburne.edu.my

ABSTRACT

This article aims to identify the types of violation of conversational maxims created by cartoon comic entitled "Be Like Bro" in the English version and also to describe how the humorous situation can be created from those violations. There are two findings in this research. First, those six data show that there is a violation of conversational maxims, which are the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. Those six data also show that the humorous situation is creating by incongruent meaning in the conversation and releasing the feeling.

Keywords: humor, cooperative principles, context, pragmatics

INTRODUCTION

One of the linguistic phenomena that have developed in society today is humor. Humor is a short story that tells a funny situation that can make the reader laughs because of its entertainment. According to Wijana on his book *Kartun: Studi tentang Permainan Bahasa,* humor is a form of the game which is used wordplay that can stimulate human to smile and laugh for those who see it (2003).

Nowadays, the use of humor is increasing. Many types of humor appear in the society such as comic strips, memes, humor in the movies, stand-up comedy, and another humor that can be found around us. As something that can make people laugh, humor also has a function to build a good relationship in society. There is a unique thing that can trigger the appearance of humor in a conversation that is by violating the rules of language use.

In this research, the researchers try to analyze a topic related to humor in one of the comic cartoons, *Be Like Bro* because of the development of the use and the uniqueness possessed by humor itself. The comic cartoon entitled *Be Like Bro* is already familiar, and it can be found on social media such as Facebook.

According to the background of the research, there are two problem formulations in this research. The first research question is: What are the types of violation in cooperative principle that appear in comic cartoon *Be Like Bro?* Moreover, the second is: How can the violation in cooperative principle make a humor situation in comic cartoon *Be Like Bro?* From the questions we can have two research objectives to be achieved in this research; to find out the types of violation in cooperative principle that appear in comic cartoon *Be Like Bro* and to explain how the violation in cooperative principle can make a humor situation in comic cartoon *Be Like Bro.*

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Several studies have been conducted regarding the object of humor-based research. The first was carried out by Suwanto (2012) in his thesis entitled *Verbal Humor Analysis of English Language (A Case Study in the How I Met Your Mother Comedy Series).* This thesis discusses the humor situation that occurs in that comedy series and the researcher found that there are linguistic aspects that are used to invite humor situation in this comedy. The result of this study proved that linguistic aspects such as orthographical, phonological, morphological, hyponym, antonym, euphemism, hyperbole, deixis, the connection of intra-sentential elements, the connection of intra-centric elements, and the connection between propositions are the trigger of humor situation. Also, there are several violations from the principle of cooperation, the principle of politeness, the principle of irony, and the presupposition that causes a humorous situation.

The second study was conducted by Triandana (2014) entitled *Discourse of Humor in Kill the Messenger Movie (A Case Study of Stand-Up Comedy by Christ Rock).* This thesis aims to determine the structure of the humor in stand-up comedy, to find out the aspect of pragmatics that creates humor, to find out language aspects and the function of the humor in stand-up comedy. As a result, there are various structures, and patterns such as one-liners, questions and answers, simple structures, and complex structures are used in this movie. There are also some linguistic aspects such as morphology, syntax, semantics, deixis, and language style that can be factors to create humor situation in the film. In the end, the researcher also finds that solidarity, power, and psychology are the functions that can be found in humor in that movie.

According to the explanation from the researches above, this research has a different research object compared with both of the researches. The object of the research taken by Suwanto (2012) is comic strips, and Triandana (2014) took the film as his research object while this research uses the comic cartoon as the object. Furthermore, this research also develops the problem formulations related to the violation of cooperative principle and how those violations.

PRAGMATIC THEORY

Pragmatic is a branch of linguistics that focuses on the meaning of the speech. Levinson (1983:21) defined pragmatics as the study of the relationship between language and its context as a basis to understand the speech which is delivered. Another definition of pragmatics is also stated by Yule (1996:3-4) which states that pragmatics examines the relation between linguistic forms and the user of the linguistic forms.

According to Yule (1996), there are for areas in the pragmatic study. First, pragmatics is the study of the meaning behind the speaker's words. It means that pragmatics try to analyze what is meant by the speaker behind the words expressed. Second, pragmatics is the study of meaning in a context. It proves that pragmatics can examine how speakers organize their words according to the context and the situation when they speak. Third, pragmatics examines that sometimes speech is not directly expressed by the speaker. The last, pragmatics explains how things can be expressed based on the closeness between the speaker and the listener.

In conclusion from the explanation above, it can be said that pragmatics is the study of the meaning of a speech. By using pragmatic approach, people can learn about the meaning of speech, the assumption that arises from the speech, and the action shown by them when there is a conversation between the speaker and the listener.

Context

Context is an essential element in the pragmatic study. A researcher must pay attention to the context in a conversation in doing practical research. According to Cutting (2002), there are three types of contexts in the pragmatic study: (1) Situational Context, this context is related to the time and place where the conversation is taking place, (2) Background Knowledge Context, this context is related to the existing cultural background and also related to individual relations in a conversation, (3) Co-textual Context, related to the content contained in a text.

Conversational Implicature

Conversational Implicature mainly refers to the collaboration carried out by the speaker and the listener in conducting a conversation. According to Yule (1996: 35), it means that in a conventional implicature, sometimes specific intentions are not discussed but are in a conversation. An example of a conventional impression can be seen through the following example:

Mars: Did you do the homework?
Venus: I was sick last night.

Based on the brief example above, Mars hopes that Venus answers the question related to the questions he asked. However, the question is not answered with yes, I did the homework or no, I did not do the homework, but the answers *I was sick last night*. The sentence *I was sick last night* shows that Venus is not doing her homework because he was sick. Therefore, in a conversation, it is expected that the listener can understand the meaning implied in a conversation.

The Cooperative Principle

According to Grice (in Wijana, 2003), four maxims must be obeyed by the participant in the speech act in a conversation. The maxim consists of the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner.

Maxim of Quantity

Based on the maxim of quantity, each conversation should contribute as much as possible or as much as the other person needs. Examples of maxim quantity are as follows:

Anthony: George, did you buy the apple juice?
George: Yes, I bought the apple juice.

According to the conversation above, George is very cooperative in responding to the questions from Anthony. What became George adequately answered a question from Anthony.

Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality requires the participants to tell the truth. According to Yule (1996), this type demands not to say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Teacher: Why did you finish your homework last night?
Frans: I needed to take a rest because I was sick last night.

Based on the conversation, the teacher hopes to find out the reason why Frans did not finish his homework last night. During the conversation, Frans answered honestly that he had not finished his homework because he was sick. If Frans answered the question from the teacher honestly, it means he is not lying and does not violate the maxim of quality.

Maxim of Relevance

Maxim of relevance requires each participant to make a contribution that is relevant to the issue of the conversation (Wijana, 2003: 58).

Mother: Ani, there is a telephone.
Ani: I am in the restroom, ma'am.

If it is observed, the conversation implies that at that time Ani could not answer the telephone directly. Indirectly Ani asked for help so that his mother received the call. According to this example, it can be seen that the maxim of relevance does not only arise from its spoken meaning but also can arise by the implications of the speech.

Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner requires that each participant in the conversation should speak directly, not blurred, not excessive, and expected to be coherent (Wijana, 2003).

Alex: John, I like your jacket. Where did you buy it?
John: Thank you. I bought it at Implora Distro next to our campus.

According to the conversation above, John has provided complete information by what was asked by Alex. John mentioned the name of the distribution where he bought a jacket, even the location of the distro. Therefore, what John said is following the maxim of manner.

Violation of Cooperative Principle

According to Wijana (2003), there are four types of violation of cooperative principle in pragmatic studies: (1) Violation in the maxim of quantity occurs when the participant does not provide as much information or as much as needed by the other person. (2) The violation in the maxim of quality occurs when the participants do not say the truth. (3) The violation in the maxim of relevance occurs when the participant does not make relevant contributions in a conversation. (4) The violation in the maxim of manner occurs when the participant speaks in an unclear, too excessive and not coherent.

Theory of Humor

Ross in his book *Language of Humor* (1998) defined the word humor as something that makes people laugh or smile. Humour usually occurs because of violations made by the participants. The definition of humor by Ross is also reinforced by a statement of humor by Attardo (1994): "Many linguists have taken humor as a category which converses any events or objects that elucidate laughter, amuses, or feels to be funny."

According to Attardo (1994: 47), the situation of humor can be formed because of the violation of the cooperative principle between participants in the conversation. There are several classifications of humor theory according to Attardo (1994):

Incongruity Theory

This humor occurs because of irregularities or the difference between what is expected and what happens later. Based on this theory, the situation of humor can be created because of an understanding of the various kinds of meanings implied by a word, the existence of an ambiguity, and the existence of irregularities in a conversation.

Hostility Theory

This humor occurs when one of the speech act participants feels the 'victory' suddenly because the participant of the speech act feels more potent than the other speech act participants.

Release Theory

This theory sees humor as something that can trigger one's tension and energy as an effect of the pressure on the situation around or on the mind. Through humor, people who feel depressed tend to laugh as hard as they can to reduce their feelings of distress.

METHODOLOGY

This research is a qualitative descriptive study in which *Be Like Bro* cartoon comic data is taken from a Facebook account. Four hundred twenty-seven photo chronologies are related to the problem of humor, but the researchers only limit the dialogue that occurs between two figures named Bro and Bro that were uploaded during 2017. The researchers applies pragmatic theory, context, and conversational implicature, to see the situation of real comedy. Then the theory of cooperative principle and the theory of violation in cooperative principle are used to see the deviation of the cooperative principle as what happened in the *Be Like Bro* funny cartoon as well as the answer to the first problem statement. Furthermore, the theory of humor will be used by researchers to answer the second problem formulation related to how the violation of cooperative principle can create a humour situation in the comic cartoon.

DISCUSSION

1. Violation of Cooperative Principle

Data 1

17

The comic cartoon was uploaded on April 7, 2017. The situation in the dialogue for this comic cartoon occurred when Bro 1 met Bro 2. The topic of the conversation between the two was related to information that Bro 1 would marry his girlfriend. If there is good cooperation in the conversation, then when Bro 2 asks 'when will you get married,' Bro 1 should answer explicitly according to the date on which they will marry so that the answer from Bro 1 is the answer expected by Bro 2. However, the reality is when Bro 2 asks "Wow. When?" Bro 1 replied with "Me on March 15 and my girlfriend on August 27". Based on this, it can be seen that Bro 1 violates the maxim of relevance because Bro 1 does not build the same context as the context built by Bro 2. The context understood by Bro 2 is the date on which both (Bro 1 and his girlfriend) will marry, while the answer from Bro 1 is the date on which both will get married, but on different dates. That means in reality, both of them have separated, and both will be married to their respective partners.

Data 2

The comic cartoon was uploaded on February 13, 2017. The situation in the *Be Like Bro* comic cartoon happened when Bro 1 met Bro 2. Through the short conversation above, Bro 1 asked Bro 2 what kind of Apple brand gadgets Bro 2 could buy, according to the amount of money in Bro 2's account. If the conversation is built by the principle of the maxim, then the answer that should be raised by Bro 2 is an iPhone, iPad, or mac book. However, in reality, Bro 2 answers "Apple juice" where the answer from Bro 2 is not by the expectations of questions from Bro 1. It shows that the answer from Bro 2 violates the maxim of relevance because the answer does not reflect the answer desired by the questioner.

Also, we can also see that there are other meanings implied by the answers that Bro 2 said. When Bro 1 asks "With your current account balance, which Apple product can you buy?" Then Bro 2 answers "Apple juice." This also confirms that basically the amount of money on Bro 2's account is not much, the money can only be used to buy apple juice which is the cost is under Rp 10,000, -

Data 3

The comic cartoon was uploaded on January 21, 2017. The situation that occurred in the dialogue was when Bro 1 met Bro 2. Bro 1 was curious about what Bro 2 was doing, so he asked: "Hey bro, what's up?" Also, Bro 2 said "Nothing much. They were converting oxygen into carbon dioxide". Because Bro 1 still did not understand Bro 2's answer, he asked again about the purpose of things being done by Bro 2, and Bro 2 answers "Breathing ... Dude". Based on the short conversation above, there is a violation of the maxim of quantity, because the sentence from Bro 2 "Nothing much. Converting oxygen into carbon dioxide" is too much, making Bro 1 unable to capture the intended answer. If Bro 2 responded directly to the word "Breathing ... dude", then there will be no violation on the maxim of quantity.

Data 4

The comic cartoon was uploaded on January 15, 2017. The situation occurred when Bro 1 met Bro 2, and they had a short conversation. Through this brief conversation, Bro 1 asked Bro 2 about what shampoo, soap, and brand lotions used by Bro 2 in his daily life. To create cooperation in a conversation, when Bro 1 ask "Which shampoo do you use?" (And so on), Bro 2 should answer explicitly the name of shampoo, soap, and lotion that he uses in his daily life. However, there is a violation of the maxim of a manner in the dialogue. After several times Bro 2 answered the question, it turned out that what Bro 2 meant was not the name of shampoo, soap, and lotion used. Bro 2 only answers "No! Mark is my roommate! " at the end of the conversation. It proves that Bro 2 has vague, unclear, and not directly to the point of answering the question. Besides, the last answer from Bro 2 also has no line with the expectations of the Bro 1 because, in the conversation, both of them have different concepts.

Data 5

The comic cartoon was uploaded on January 16, 2017. It told about Bro 1 and Bro 2 who talked about the date and year of Bro 1's birthday. If there was good cooperation in the conversation, then when Bro 1 asked "Which year?", Bro 2 should answer with the year of his birthday. In reality, Bro 2 replied with "Every year, bro." This shows that in the conversation, there is a violation on the maxim of relevance because the answer from Bro 2 deviated from the context proposed by Bro 1, even though Bro 2's answer is correct because we celebrate birthdays every year.

Data 6

The comic cartoon was uploaded on April 5, 2017. The situation in the conversation occurred when Bro 1 met Bro 2. Both of them had a dialogue about what gift Bro 1 should give to his girlfriend. However, the answer made by Bro 2 was not in line with the expectation of Bro 1. Instead, Bro 2 offers Bro 1 to give his telephone number to the boyfriend Bro 1. This of course violates the maxim of manner, because Bro 2 should be able to give clear answer for what Bro 1 asked.

The Violation of the Cooperative Principle Can Create Humor Situation

The mismatch between what is expected by someone and what happens in the conversation.
Based on the humor theory that has been described, the violation of cooperative principle can create a humorous situation because of an odd idea or perception between what is expected by someone and the reality that occurs in the conversation. This can be seen in data numbers 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. The conversations in comic cartoons occur because of the difference between what answers are expected and the reality of the answers in the conversation.

For example data number 1. Bro 2 asks about the date of the wedding to be held by Bro 1 and his girlfriend. Logically, the answer given by Bro 1 refers to a date on which they will be officially married. However, in reality, the answers given are not in line with the expectations asked by Bro 2. The incompatibility of what is expected also occurs in comic cartoons number 2, 4, 5 and 6.

Feeling release to express something in excess.
Based on the humor theory that has been described, it is found a comic cartoon where the humor situation is created from excessive feelings towards something. It can be seen in data 3, where Bro 2 answers Bro 1's question excessively "Nothing much — converting oxygen into carbon dioxide". The answer from Bro 2 shows how he is very expressive in explaining something, even though Bro 2 actually can explain Bro 2 through a simpler word, which is 'breathing'.

CONCLUSION
The results of the current analysis reveal that the violation of the cooperative principle can create a humorous situation. From total six data used in this research, the data number 1,2,4,5, and 6 lead to the mismatch between what is expected by someone and what actually happens in the conversation and it creates humorous situation. It is in accordance with Attardo (1994) statement that the humor situation can be create because of the violation of the cooperative principle between participants in the conversation. This research only covers a certain amount of time which was during 2017 and is only limited by conversation conducted by characters Bro and Bro. Further research can be carried out broadly, for example with comic cartoon humor involving more than two participants and in a longer period of time. In addition, this research can also be analysed deeply by examining the function of humor presented in a comic cartoon.

REFERENCES
Attardo, S. (1994) *Linguistic Theory of Humor,* Berlin and New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
Be Like Bro (2017), *Facebook,* diakses tanggal: 6 Juni 2017.
Cutting, J. (2002) *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students,* London,
        Routledge.
Levinson, S.C. (1983) *Pragmatics,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Ross, A. (1998) *Language of Humor,* London, Routledge.
Suwanto, A.A.S. (2012) *Analisis Wacana Humor Verbal Bahasa Inggris (Studi Kasus pada
        Serial Komedi Situasi How I Met Your Mother),* unpublished postgraduate thesis,
        Universitas Gadjah Mada.
Triandana, A. (2014) Analisis Wacana Humor Dalam Film *Kill the Messenger* (Studi
        Kasus Stand-Up Comedy Chris Rock), Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis,
        Universitas Gadjah Mada.
Wijana, I.D.P. (2003) *Kartun: Studi tentang Permainan Bahasa,* Yogyakarta, Penerbit Ombak.
Yule, G. (1996) *Pragmatics,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.