Infringing of The Maxims as Verbal Humour on The Sitcom "Mind Your Language: Season 1-Episode 1"

Adhitya Darmawan[1], Djatmika[2], Agus Hari Wibowo[3]

[1,2,3] Program Studi S2 Ilmu Linguistik, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Sebelas Maret,
Jl. Ir. Sutami No. 36 Kentingan Surakarta

Email: adhityadarmawan1998@gmail.com

Abstract: *This research focuses on the infringing of the maxims by applying pragmatics approach. Apart from that, this research also involves the types of speech acts behind the infringing as well as the types of humor that the infringing creates. Furthermore, the paper uses a sitcom entitled Mind Your Language: Season 1 for the research location. This research is qualitative descriptive since the data are multiple, holistically constructed and cannot be separated from the context. The data are collected from the transcription of the dialogues which are then analysed using Spradley's model (1980) that are modified in Santosa (2021). The stage of the analysis start from domain, taxonomy, componential, and cultural theme analysis. The results show that the type of infringing that appears the most is linguistics barrier (24 data), and the speech act that appears the most is assertive (26 data). Lastly, the type of humor that appear the most is pun (30). The conclusion shows that the characters perform infrginging mostly by answering incorrectly due to linguistics barrier which lead them into answering things incorrectly without making implicature. Thus, the combination between answering, infringing, and pun creates humor on the sitcom Mind Your Language: Season 1.*

Keywords: *pragmatics, maxim, infringing, sitcom, stage*

Abstrak: Penelitian ini berfokus pada infringing pada maksim dengan menggunakan pendekatan pragmatik. Selain itu, penelitian ini juga melibatkan jenis-jenis tindak tutur saat infringing itu terjadi serta jenis humor yang tercipta karena infringing. Lebih lanjut, penelitian ini menggunakan sitkom berjudul Mind Your Language: Season 1 sebagai lokasi penelitian. Penelitian ini bersifat deskriptif kualitatif karena datanya bersifat jamak, dibangun secara holistik dan tidak dapat dipisahkan dari konteksnya. Data dikumpulkan dari transkripsi dialog yang kemudian dianalisis menggunakan model Spradley (1980) yang dimodifikasi dalam Santosa (2021). Tahapan analisis dimulai dari analisis domain, taksonomi, komponensial, dan tema budaya. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa jenis pelanggaran yang paling banyak muncul adalah hambatan linguistik (24 data) dan tindak tutur yang paling banyak muncul adalah asertif (26 data). Terakhir, jenis humor paling banyak adalah permainan kata-kata (30), Kesimpulan penelitian ini adalah karakter sitkom melakukan infringing paling sering dengan cara menjawab dengan salah karena keterbatasan bahasa mereka yang menjadikan mereka menjawab pertanyaan dengan jawaban salah tanpa menimbulkan implikatur. Jadi, kombinasi antara menjawab, infringing, dan permainan kata menciptakan humor dalam sitkom *Mind Your Language: Season 1.*

Kata kunci: *pragmatik, maksim, infringing, sitkom, tahapan*

"Merangkai Wawasan dalam Terjemahan, Pragmatik, dan Korpus di Era Kecerdasan Buatan"   https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/prosidingsemantiks

1. INTRODUCTION

The term infringing of the maxim is not as familiar as the other non-observances of maxims like flouting or violating the maxims. Infringing refers to a condition where a speaker cannot deliver the correct logic in the utterance. Apart from that, infringing may occur when a listener does not understand what the speaker says without any intention of deceiving nor creating and implicature like flouting. Moreover, infringing may be a foundation of a humor since its appearance creates an innocent image of the speaker whenever they commit one (Fitriyani et al., 2020). Once infringing is performed for entertainment purposes, then the infringing is considered as a medium for building a joke in comedy (Mbisike, 2021). Thus, infringing of the maxim may appear in both audio and visual comedy.

One of the most common platforms to broadcast comedy is through television programs. One of the programs is a sitcom. Sitcom is defined as a 'sketch comedy' and 'situation drama' (Klika, 2010). But on the other hand, Mills (2014) argue that sitcoms aren't sketch comedy or situation dramas. While they share some traits, sitcoms are unique. Sketch comedy uses short, unrelated scenes with different characters. Situation dramas focus on character development and plot, often with dramatic elements. Thus, sitcoms blend the two by using consistent characters and a familiar setting for comedic situations. By observing this definition, it is safe to say that using sitcom for the research location in this research is a suitable way. This is supported by the fact that infringing somehow builds jokes and jokes build a sitcom.

For instance, there is one data that belongs to linguistics barrier infringing which comes in assertive speech act. The data is "Ali: *Oh no, I am Ali*". This utterance appears after Ms. Courtney says "*Wow, you're early!*". This data refers to linguistics barrier infringing because Ali as the utterer thinks that the word *early* is similar to *Ali*. This infringing happens because Ali does not have sufficient English language skills, which leads him into thinking the word *early* is pronounced similar to *Ali*. Additionally, Ali's utterance belongs to the speech act of answering. It is simply because Ali is answering what Ms. Courtney is asking him.

In order to analyse infringing of the maxim as a foundation of verbal humour, the suitable approach is pragmatics. Pragmatics sees humour as a contextual occurrence with numbers of aspects that coexist (Atei & Al-Azzawi, 2021). Some instances that coexist with verbal humour are namely speech acts, conversational maxims, irony, and pun. Speech acts play the role of how the utterance is produced when the infringing happens. Second, conversational maxim sees infringing as its subordination. Furthermore, the subordination means that infringing is seen as one of the form of non-observances of the maxims. Finally, pragmatics see the coexistence between infringing and irony as well as pun due to what infringing, irony, and pun have in common. The further explanation of these aspects are shown on literature review section.

In order to conduct this research, this research uses several research that focus on infringing and humorous utterances (Al-Zubeiry, 2020; Fitriyani et al., 2020; Mbisike, 2021; Suardana, 2022) and two research that focus on jokes in pragmatics (Asahi, 2019; Atei & Al-Azzawi, 2021). Unlike the previous research that separately analyse only infringing (Fitriyani et al., 2020; Mbisike, 2021; Suardana, 2022) without involving speech acts as their domain nor the type of humor which infringing of the maxims creates. On the other hand, (Asahi,

2019; Atei & Al-Azzawi, 2021) already analyse both the infringing and the type of humor, but none of them involve speech acts as its domain. Thus, this paper has the gap that lays on the type speech acts, type of infringing of the maxims, and the type of humor on the sitcom *Mind Your Language: Season 1* (later on will be addressed as *MYLS1*). Thus, these gaps lead into the research aims.

This research has three aims which are first analysing the speech acts that cause infringing in *MYLS1,* analysing the types of infringing of the maxims in *MYLS1*, and analysing the types of humour constructed with infringing of the maxims in *MYLS1*. Apart from the review of previous research, these research aims are also supported by theoretical framework on speech acts, conversational maxims, and theories of humour. Furthermore, the theoretical framework is on the next section.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The first theory used is speech acts. Speech acts are divided into 5 types namely assertive, declarative, commissive, expressive, and directive. Speech acts are linguistic actions performed by utterances. Assertive speech acts aim to convey information or beliefs, while directives seek to influence the hearer's behavior. Commissives commit the speaker to future actions, expressives convey emotions or attitudes, and lastly, declaratives perform actions through their utterance, such as declaring war or marrying a couple (Searle et al., 1980).

The second theory is the non-observances of maxim theory as what Grice (1975) proposed which was later revised by Thomas (2014). As what Grice (1975); Thomas (2014) stated, there are five non-observances of maxims namely flouting, violating, suspending, opting out, and infringing the maxims. Flouting maxims involves deliberately breaking a maxim to convey a non-literal meaning, while violating maxims involves intentionally misleading the listener. Suspending maxims occurs when maxims are temporarily disregarded due to contextual factors. Opting out involves explicitly indicating an inability or unwillingness to cooperate with a maxim. Finally, infringing maxims happens unintentionally due to factors like linguistic barrier or cognitive impairment.

Finally, the last theory is the theory of humor as what Attardo & Chabanne (1992) and Dynel (2014); Lewin (1988) proposed. Attardo & Chabanne (1992); Dynel (2014) proposed that there are several approaches in linguistics which are able to deal with humor. One of the approaches is pragmatics. Pragmatics see humor as contextual use of language play. One of the word plays is pun. Although Attardo & Chabanne (1992) and Dynel (2014) state that puns often involve deliberate use or intention to create implicature, Lewin (1988) on the other hand state that pun can also be seen as a malapropism or a failure of understanding the correct form of word to use. Thus, this failure of understanding, or linguistics barrier, can be seen as a unintentional mistake which leads into an infringing of the maxims.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This research applies descriptive qualitative paradigm for its data are multiple, holistically constructed and cannot be taken away from its context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The source of data is from the third order semiotic system for it comes from a sitcom whereas the data are from their utterance that contain infringing of the maxims as well as the contexts behind them. This research uses purposive sampling for its source of data since the sampling is done based on the research objectives. Next, the sampling for the data is total sampling. Total sampling

means that all the data are used after purposively sampling the source of data. The data are collected through orthographic transcription of the character's dialogue which contain infringing as well as the context (Abdussamad & Sik, 2021).

Furthermore, as a descriptive qualitative research, Santosa (2021) advices that the research should employ the data analysis procedure from Spradley (2016). The procedure is done by doing domain, taxonomic, componential, and cultural theme analysis. Domain analysis is done for the context analysis. Then, followed by taxonomic analysis to analyse and categorize data based on the research focus. Next, componential analysis is performed to show the findings or the results in a form of patterns of behaviour. Lastly, cultural theme analysis is performed for the discussion or to achieve the substantive theories of the research. These substantive theories are found by discussing the previous research, theories, and the research findings. Therefore, the data are analysed and described with pragmatics theory, primarily speech acts (Grice, 1975; Searle et al., 1980) and infringing of the maxims (Grice, 1975; Thomas, 2014).

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This study attempts to find the types of infringing in *MYLS1* as well as the contexts behind each infringing namely the speech act and the stage. The findings show that there are 4 stages in total namely orientation, complication, evaluation, and resolution. The speech acts that appear in this research are assertive, expressive, declarative, and directive. Next, this research also finds two types of infringing namely linguistics barrier and cognitive impairment. In order to formulize the research findings, then the findings are shown below in the form of componential analysis.

Table 1. Infringing of The Maxims on the Sitcom "Mind Your Language: Season:1"

Speech act	Infringing	Forms of Humour		TOTAL
		Pun	**Irony**	
Assertive	Ling Bar	23	1	24
	Cog Imp		2	2
Expressive	Ling Bar	3		3
	Cog Imp	1	1	2
Directive	Ling Bar	1		1
Declarative	Ling Bar	1		1
TOTAL		29	4	33

1. Assertive speech acts

This research finds 26 data of assertive speech acts which have infringing of the maxims. These assertive speech acts are divided into two types which are questioning (9) and answering (17). Assertive speech acts are the speech acts that appear the most in this research. Furthermore, the description of the data is as what is shown below.

1. Questioning

Context: Mr. Brown is entering the class, but as he enters, there is a small riot between

Max and Giovanni. They want to have a brawl because of some missunderstanding. Max then asks how the proper English expression is to say *knocking someone down*. Unfortunately, Max commits a mistake first before Mr. Brown tells him the right term.
23) Mr. Brown: *What is going on just now?*
Max: ***I'm going to, how do you say, knock his bloody block off?***
Mr. Brown: *wh….*
Giovanni: *Let's see who's bloody blocker is knockered off!*

In the data above, Max's utterance "I'm going to, how do you say, knock his bloody block off?" is a questioning speech act because it contains a clear indication of uncertainty. The phrase "how do you say" suggests that Max is unsure of the exact phrase to use, implying that he is seeking confirmation or clarification from his listener, Mr. Brown. This uncertainty about the appropriate language choice casts doubt on the sincerity of his threat or intention which makes it a questioning rather than a declarative statement.

2. Answering

There are 9 speech act data that belong to answering. Here is one instance of answering speech act.
10) Context: Mr. Brown is asking Max what his job is, but Max incorrectly says *sheeps* instead of *ships*. This is because actually he works in a ship, not with sheep. This is because Max' English is still limited which leads him into thinking the word *sheep* and *ship* are alike.
Mr. Brown: "*What's your job?*"
Max:"*I work with sheeps*"

This utterance is an assertive speech act, specifically answering that Max delivers to Mr. Brown. Max initiates an interaction with Mr. Brown by answering what Mr. Brown asks him. Thus, this utterance is simply a form of answer since Max is responding to Mr. Brown's question about what his job is by saying "*I work with sheeps*". Although Max's answer is wrong since he should answer it with "*ship*".

3. Expressive speech acts

This research finds 5 data of expressive speech acts which are apologizing and hoping. Apologizing refers to the speaker's apology to what the speaker has done to the interlocutor. Next, hoping refers to what the speaker wants from the interlocutor whereas. Lastly, greeting refers to how the speaker addresses the interlocutor by saying hello or calling their name. Furthermore, the data and the explanation are as follows.

a. Apologizing
Context: Ali bumps to Mr. Brown. He tries to apologize to Mr. Brown, but he mistakenly construct his sentence. So, Mr. Brown tells Ali the right structure of his sentence so he can apologize correctly.
3)Ali:"Oh,dearieme,I'mnotgoingwhereI'mlooking"
Mr. Brown: "No, no, it's supposed to be 'I was not going where I was looking'!"

In this data, the expression "Oh, dearie me" is a common expression of regret or disappointment of what someone just committed. And, with the statement "I'm not going

where I'm looking," it clearly shows Ali's realization of a mistake or error, which leads to an apology. Apology expresses his emotional state of remorse or embarrassment (Asahi, 2019). This goes in line what happens with Ali who feels this remorse from bumping into Mr. Brown.

b. Hoping

Context: Mr. Brown mistakenly hears the word *sikh* into sick. This mistake leads Mr. Brown into thinking that Ranjeet is having a serious sickness, so he hopes for him to get better while the fact is that Ranjeet is referring to his belief, not his state of health.
15) Ranjeet: "I am sikh!"
Mr.Brown:"Ohdear,Ihopeit'snotcontagious"

In this utterance, Mr. Brown shows his hope to Ranjeet. Mr. Brown thinks that Ranjeet is referring to "sick" which gets Mr. Brown to responding his hope for Ranjeet to not have a contagious sickness. Mr. Brown's words might seem insensitive at first glance, they can be understood as a form of dark humor or gallows humor. In such situations, people often use humor as a coping mechanism or a way to defuse tension. By phrasing his concern as a joke about contagion, Mr. Brown is likely attempting to show the mood and express his hope for Ranjeet's well-being in a less direct, more humorous way.

c. Greeting

This research finds one data that belong to greeting speech act. Greeting is an expressive speech act that signals recognition and acknowledgment of another person, often conveying pleasure or surprise at seeing them (Searle et al., 1980).The utterance that belong to this data category is as what is shown below.

33) Context: Mr. Brown is leaving his class in a panic, and he enters Ms. Courtney's office. Because of his panic, Mr. Brown mistakenly greets Ms. Courtney as Mrs. His panic attack comes from his first time teaching the class, but it turns out chaotic.
Mr. Brown: "Ah, Mrs. Courtney!"
Ms. Courtney: "Ms!"

This utterance functions as an expressive speech act, specifically a greeting. This brief vocalization serves as a social marker, initiating interaction between Mr. Brown and Mrs. Courtney. The interjection "Ah" is indicative of a positive emotional state, suggesting surprise, pleasure, or recognition. The vocative "Mrs. Courtney" directly addresses the interlocutor, personalizing the greeting and establishing a connection. Thus, this simple phrase performs the communicative act of welcoming and acknowledging the presence of another individual. This utterance later leads into a mistake of adressing the interlocutor because the right way to adress her is Ms. Courtney.

4. Directive speech acts

There is one data in this research that belongs to directive speech act. Directive speech act that is found in this research is requesting. Requesting here happens when the speaker (Max) asks for a repetition to the teacher, Mr. Brown. The data is shown below.

26) Context: Max is asking Mr. Brown to repeat what he says because he is not focused on the conversation. The loss of focus is because Max was still arguing with Giovanni before he talks to mr. Brown

Mr. Brown: Okay, and, are you short sighted as well?

Max**: *"Watchu say?"***

The data "Watchu say?" is a directive speech act functioning as a request for repetition. It's an informal, abbreviated form of the question "What did you say?" Max is seeking to clarify the previous utterance by directly requesting the speaker to repeat it. The imperative tone, though softened by the colloquial form, indicates a clear desire for the information to be provided by Mr. Brown. This utterance is an infringing as well since Max has the difficulties on understanding what Mr. Brown said.

Infringing due to Linguistics Barrier
This research finds 29 data of infringing of the maxims that fall to the type of linguistics barrier. Therefore, they are divided into two types of humour which are pun and irony. There are 27 data that belong to puns and one data which belong to irony.

Linguistics Barrier pun
One of the data in this research that belong to this specific category is data (1). The further description is shown below.

5.   Context: The sitcom starts with Ali entering the principal's office called Ms. Courtney. Ali greets her and she responds with *Oh, you're early*. But, since Ali is a student with considerably bad English, he mistakenly interprets the pronunciation of the word *early* into similar to his own name. This leads him into misinterprets Ms. Courtney's utterance.

Ms. Courtney: Oh, you're early!

Ali: Oh no, I am Ali.

The humor in this exchange comes from a pun, which is a type of wordplay that exploits multiple meanings of a word or similar-sounding words. In this case, the pun happens on the homophonic similarity between "early" and "Ali." Ali's response creates a humorous effect by exploiting this similarity. While the pun is likely unintentional on Ali's part due to his linguistic barrier, it still affects the comedic element of the interaction. The linguistic barrier which causes a misunderstanding and an unexpected response sets the stage for the pun to occur. This combination makes it an important part of the humorous exchange.

*Linguistics barrier iron**y***
This category of infringing means that the speaker's mistake in utterance is not intentionally performed but rather than due to the imperfect language knowledge. Furthermore, once the speaker performs an infringing of the maxim, the comedy is created not by wordplay but rather than by how a utterer's or listener's failure which is then dismissed by the interlocutor. Thus, the further description is shown in the data below.

30) Context: Mr. Brown is giving some simple questions about sex, occupation, and nationality of the students while one students seems to confused with what Mr. Brown is saying. Juan is confused with the simple question when it comes to occupation, hence he asks Mr. Brown in Spanish. The expression "*por favor*" refers to "*please*

repeat" which means Juan is confused.

Mr. Brown: Well, we'll skip you for the moment.

Juan: Por favor? (rising his tone)

Mr. Brown: It doesn't matter, sit down!

The irony in this exchange lies in the unexpected utterance of. Mr. Brown which initially dismisses Juan by stating, "We'll skip you for the moment," suggesting a disinterest in Juan's participation. However, Juan's simple, yet foreign expression, "Por favor?" unexpectedly changes Mr. Brown's mind. This reversal of expectation, from dismissal to inclusion, creates a humorous and ironic situation. Furthermore, Mr. Brown's statement, "It doesn't matter, sit down!" is ironic as it appears to contradict his previous dismissive attitude which adds another layer of irony.

Infringing due to Cognitive Impairment

This research finds 4 data infringing of the maxims due to cognitive impairment. Even so, those 4 data are still divided into 1 pun and 3 ironies. Cognitive impairment infringing pun means the humor comes from the speaker's nervousness which proceeds to mistakenly understand the interlocutor's utterance and the humor is created through word play. Then, cognitive impairment infringing irony is the same concept of infringing, but the humor is created through showing the opposite expectation of the speaker. Furthermore, each data category is shown and discussed as follows.

Cognitive impairment pun

Repeating what is stated above, this category refers to the speaker's nervousness which proceeds to mistakenly understand the interlocutor's utterance, and the humor is created through word play. The word-play here comes from how the speaker mistakenly hears what the interlocutor says. Furthermore, the data description is as follows.

15) Context: Ranjeet enters the classroom, but unfortunately, he is late. Mr. Brown asks him what happened that got Ranjeet late. Next, Ranjeet finally tells what happens. When Mr. Brown asks him to sit next to Ali, Ranjeet refuses, because he is sikh and Ali is Muslim. Mr. Brown seems panicked so he thinks that the word *sikh* is *sick*. Thus, Mr. Brown commits a mistake.

Mr. Brown: "*Perhaps you can sit there?*"

Ranjeet: "*I cannot sit there! It's impossible!*"

Mr. Brown: "*Why?*"

Ranjeet: "*I am sikh!*"

Mr. Brown: "*Oh dear, I hope it's not contagious. Perhaps you come back when you're better!*"

Mr. Brown's response to Ranjeet shows that he is nervous so he does not get what Ranjeet is saying. His nervousness in this scene is shown by his gestures where he covers his mouth and stays away from Ranjeet a little. Thus, Mr. Brown's nervousness leads him into committing an cognitive impairment infringing. Next, Mr. Brown's utterance, "Oh dear, I hope it's not contagious," is a pun that comes from his misunderstanding of Ranjeet's statement. Mr. Brown mistakenly believes Ranjeet said "sick," leading him to use the word "contagious" in a humorous and metaphorical sense. This pun shows Mr. Brown's concern for Ranjeet's cultural identity and the potential challenges he might face, while also highlighting a cultural misunderstanding. The pun adds a layer of humor to the exchange, making it more engaging and memorable.

Cognitive impairment irony

This category refers to the condition where the speaker unintentionally commits mistakes because the speaker is nervous or not focused on what the interlocutor is saying. Then, the humor irony is created by the interlocutor showing the opposite facts of what the speaker assumes. Furthermore, the data and its description is in the following.

7) Ms. Courtney: climbed out of the classroom window onto the roof took off all his clothes and stood there stark naked singing I was a lovely bunch of coconuts.

Mr. Brown: well, there's no need to worry on my account I mean I'm not likely to climb out of the classroom window.

Ms. Courtney: "I know you aren't."

Mr. Brown: "oh thank you for your confidence"

This utterance shows that Mr. Brown gets nervous with the info Ms. Courtney tells about the former teacher who got driven nuts by the student's behavior. Next, Mr. Brown's statement, "well, there's no need to worry on my account I mean I'm not likely to climb out of the classroom window," is a humorous response to Ms. Courtney's recount of a bizarre incident. The irony arises from the contrast between Mr. Brown's assertion and the absurdity of Ms. Courtney's story. By suggesting that he would never engage in such a peculiar behavior, Mr. Brown is essentially acknowledging the absurdity of the situation. His statement implies that he finds the idea of climbing out of a classroom window and singing naked to be ridiculous which highlights the contrast between his own expected behavior and the unusual actions described by Ms. Courtney.

Discussion

This research finds that most of infringing is performed by doing assertive speech acts, especially, answering things unintentionally incorrectly. This later leads into infringing of the maxims which are mostly caused by linguistics barrier for the utterers do not have the proper language capabilities. These unintentional misunderstandings are not caused to produce funny implicatures but just rather done just unintentionally unlike what (Al-Zubeiry, 2020) finds.

Unlike what (Asahi, 2019; Atei & Al-Azzawi, 2021; Fitriyani et al., 2020; Mbisike, 2021) who claim that verbal humor needs the presence of contextual knowledge (Asahi, 2019; Fitriyani et al., 2020; Mbisike, 2021) and some rather direct reference (Atei & Al-Azzawi, 2021), this research finds that humor still rises even with unintentional mistake as in data (10) where the utterer mistakenly says '*sheeps*' intead of '*ship*' when the interlocutor asks what his job is. This research finds it unintentional because the utterer is still a beginner English learner who later on still commits mistakes on his vocabulary.

Moreover, (Fitriyani et al., 2020; Suardana, 2022) state that infringing leads into confusion when it comes to communicative purposes, but that is not totally true. That is true because this research finds that by committing an infringing, both the speaker and the interlocutor carry on understanding the gist of the mistaken utterance through direct correction both in puns and irony. Although most of the infringing of the maxims in MYLS1 lead into humor, but they still act as a medium for constructing the flow of communication between the speaker and the interlocutor.

Additionally, there are directive and expressive speech acts that appear only once throughout the whole episode of MYLS1. The reason why these speech acts do not appear as often as the rest of the speech acts is because infringing of the maxims in this episode mostly appear in the form of answering and asking questions. Thus, this pattern reoccurs several times from the beginning of the episode until the end of the episode. Apart from that,

expressive and directive speech acts only happen once each because the utterer only mistakenly once while apologizing and once when requesting for repetition from the interlocutor. In conclusion, the lack of appearance of these speech act is based on two things. First is because the language barrier of the speakers mostly happen when they are asking or answering a question. Secondly, the patterns of asking and answering questions happen frequently in the episode, which concludes that the sitcom's formula of comedy is based on asking and answering questions.

Finally, this research finds two patterns of behaviors on how the humours in MYLS1 are created. These patterns of humor creation are not found in the previous research for they analyse speech act, maxims, infringing, and the types of humor separately. Thus, these patterns are this research's novelty. The patterns are that the humor is created through asking an interlocutor about something which is then answered incorrectly but without creating any implicature since the humor is mostly based on infringing. Next, after the interlocutor answers the question incorrectly, the speaker then revises it. This comes to a conclusion that the humor that plays in these patterns is pun.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research concludes that the sitcom Mind Your Language: Season 1 formulates its humor with the construction of questioning and answering things incorrectly without creating implicatures or unintentionally answering things incorrectly. This then proceeds to infringing itself, which type is mostly linguistics barrier because the utterers that commit this category are foreigners. Once it reaches the linguistics barrier infringing, the creation of humor then ends mostly with puns. Apart from that, the humour is also created through irony which differs only the involvement of wordplay but situational play from the interlocutor who do not revise the mistake but rather than showing the opposite of what is going on.

Finally, this research is limited only on the types of infringing of the maxims as well as the speech act when the infringing happens, and the types of humor constructed with infringing. The researcher suggests that the upcoming research which focuses either on infringing, humours in pragmatics, or both shall add more variables namely stage, context of situation, or some social variables. The upcoming research are expected to see more patterns of infringing or humor by adding these variables and not only find the simple patterns of humor in a sitcom with seeing the speech acts, infringing of the maxims, and the type of humour itself.

REFERENCES

Abdussamad, H. Z., & Sik, M. S. (2021). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. CV. Syakir Media Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=JtKREAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=met ode+penelitian+kualitatif&ots=vDEstUZ8V5&sig=adrb_ziqBXLs-TCbG81Zapi2kHI

Al-Zubeiry, H. Y. A. (2020). Violation of Grice's maxims and humorous implicatures in the Arabic comedy Madraset Al-Mushaghbeen. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *16*(2), 1043–1057.

Asahi, S. (2019). *The Pragmatic Analysis of Ironies and Jokes*. Department of English Linguistics, Graduate School of Letters, Osaka University. https://doi.org/10.18910/77241

Atei, A. S., & Al-Azzawi, Q. O. (2021). Racial Jokes on Twitter: A Pragmatic Study. *Multicultural Education*, *7*(12), 787–791.

Attardo, S., & Chabanne, J.-C. (1992). Jokes as a text type. *Humr*, *5*(1–2), 165–176. https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1992.5.1-2.165

Dynel, M. (2014). Linguistic approaches to (non)humorous irony. *HUMOR*, *27*(4).

https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2014-0097

Fitriyani, A., Mujiyanto, J., & Suwandi, S. (2020). The impact of Grice maxims infringement in adventure of Tintin towards communication purposes. *English Education Journal*, *10*(3), 266–272.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Brill. https://brill.com/downloadpdf/book/edcoll/9789004368811/BP000003.pdf

Klika, D. (2010). *Comedy and struggle: An analysis of comic operation in the television sitcom* [PhD Thesis, UNSW Sydney]. https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au/entities/publication/57a0398e-a442-47ee-b847-74473465e8a1

Lewin, R. A. (1988). Malapropism? *Nature*, *335*(6188), 306–306.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. sage. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=2oA9aWlNeooC&oi=fnd&pg=PA7&dq=lincoln+and+guba+1985&ots=0vltP9O9wq&sig=uAKe8xw3gLO9OZqkprVvJSbfzbM

Mbisike, R. C. (2021). A Survey of Infringements of Gricean Maxims in Some Precautionary Inscriptions on Medicine Packets. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, *3*(2), 160–172.

Mills, B. (2014). The television sitcom. In *The Routledge Companion to British Media History* (pp. 451–459). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315756202-46/television-sitcom-brett-mills

Santosa, R. (2021). *Dasar-dasar metode penelitian kualitatif kebahasaan*. Surakarta: UNS Press.

Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.). (1980). *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-8964-1

Spradley, J. P. (2016). *Participant observation*. Waveland Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=q7DlCwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=Spradley,+J.+P.+(1980).+Participant+Observation&ots=H0dgO_TS19&sig=-dBWqn_HhyboGEqlTMurAS4u4_w

Suardana, I. P. E. (2022). THE ANALYSIS OF MAXIMS FOUND IN THE NOVEL "NEVER GO BACK." *Focus Journal Language Review*, *1*(2). https://ojs.balidwipa.ac.id/index.php/sfjlg/article/view/24

Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315842011/meaning-interaction-jenny-thomas