Implication of Humor in Human Conversations: Seeing from Pragmatics Point of View

Kristina Gultom
SMAN 3, Pekanbaru

Suci Chairunnisa
SMA Seri Rama YLPI, Riau

Risma Sari
Universitas Lancang Kuning, Pekanbaru

Ega Sauly Sitio
SMAN 7, Pekanbaru

Abstract
Pragmatics can be defined as a branch of linguistics that studies deiksis, presupposition, discourse analysis and conversational implicature. Implicature can be interpreted as a hidden intention behind the speech. Meanwhile, conversational implicatures are only known by most people who know the context tuturannya alone. Conversational implicatures are trying to analyze a conversation in order to obtain the correct meaning. Humour is the mental ability to discover, express or appreciate something funny or something really unusual. Funny is an adjective that means making people laugh out loud or through absurdity, strangeness, something excessive or real eccentricity.

Keywords
pragmatic, context, implicature, joke conversational

Corresponding author:
Kristina Gultom, SMAN 3, Pekanbaru, Riau 28266, Indonesia
Phone: +6285272995348
Email: gultomkristina98@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Humans must interact with each other. In that interaction, it is necessary to have a means of communication, namely the use of language and a set of spoken tools. One form of interaction is to have a conversation. The understanding conversation is an oral interaction with face to face between the two or more participants and more than just exchanging information (McMahon, 1994). According to Bublitz and Norrick (2011) conversations that occurs is largely determined by the context of the actor (speaker and interlocutor) age, gender, where the conversation takes place and so on. It is in this conversation that pragmatic science is applied.

Pragmatic understanding according to Levinson (1983) is the study of language use or the study of language and functional perspectives. This study tries to explain aspects of the structure of language by referring to non-language influences and causes.

Nababan (1987) said that pragmatics is the study of "indexical" or "deictic". In this sense, pragmatics relates to the theory of reference or deixis, namely the use of language that refers to certain references according to their use. Furthermore, a philosopher and logician, Yule (1996) explains that pragmatics studies abstract concepts. Pragmatics studies the relationship of concepts which are signs.

Nadar (2009) defines pragmatics as the use of language to communicate (communicate) in accordance with and in relation to the context and situation of the wearer. Pragmatics has many studies, including deixis, presuppositions, conversational implicature, language acts, and discourse analysis. Pragmatics that is applied is often used to refresh the atmosphere, to satirize subtly, and so on but it gives a pleasant impression.

Based on the background of the problem that the author has described above, the writer formulates the problem in this paper as follows: analysis of the application of pragmatics in conversations. It contain fresh humour in general and the objectives to be achieved by the authors in this paper is to find a description of the application of pragmatics in conversations that contain humour that often occurs in everyday life. The benefits that can be obtained through this paper include: being able to know the application of pragmatics in daily life, especially in conversations that contain fresh humour, can use pragmatics well in conversation because everyone will not be separated from the conversation as a form of interaction with others.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term pragmatics had been used by the famous philosopher Austin (1962). This philosopher does have great attention to the study of sign systems (semiotics). Pragmatics refers to the study of meaning in interactions that include the meaning of the speaker and the contexts in which the utterances are issued.

Alston (1964) stated that nonverbal communication in children before issuing meaningful forms is actually a pragmatic ability of children. They say that the child already knows about the essence of using language when the child is several weeks old. Bronowski (1973) even said that even fetuses have been exposed to human language

through the intrauterine environment. It then appears from the joy of his mother's voice than the voice of others. The difference between an adult and a baby is that the baby responds to the words of the adult not verbally. Smiles, laughter, crying, and small screams are all pragmatic tools for children.

Wijana (1996) argues that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the structure of language externally namely how linguistic units are used in communication. So the meaning that is studied in pragmatics is context-bound meaning or in other words, examines the meaning of the speaker.

Leech (1983) viewed pragmatic as one of linguistics fields that has semantic link. This connection is called semanticism, which sees semantics as part of pragmatics and complementarity or sees semantics and pragmatics as two complementary fields. Pragmatics can be divided into two aspects, namely:

1) Pragmatics as something that is taught, this can be divided into two, namely pragmatics as a field of linguistic studies and pragmatics as one aspect of language;
2) Pragmatics as something that colours the act of teaching

Pragmatics refers to the ability to use language in communication that requires an adjustment in the form (language) or a variety of languages with determinants of communicative actions. It basically pays attention to aspects of the communicative process which covers four main elements, namely the relationship between roles, a setting of events, topics, and the medium used (Levinson, 1983).

Pragmatics is also interpreted as conditions that result in the harmonious use of language in communication; aspects of language use or context outside the language that contribute to the meaning of utterance (Kridalaksana, 1993). According to Sarwiji (1996), pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that discusses what is included in the structure of language as a means of communication between speakers and listeners, and as a reference to language signs in "extra lingual" matters being discussed.

Yule (1996) defines pragmatics as a study of the meaning of utterance using context-bound meanings. Whereas treating language pragmatically is treating language by considering its context, that is, its use in communication events. One of the most important concepts in pragmatics and the one that emphasizes pragmatics as a branch of language is the concept of conversational implicature.

Implications of the conversation proposed by Eco (1984) to overcome the problem of the meaning of the language that cannot be solved by ordinary semantic theory. Cummings (2005) argues that the implicature is an expression which implies something different from what was actually spoken. Something different is the purpose of the conversation which is not stated explicitly. In other words, implicature is the intention, desire, or even the hidden expressions of the heart.

Implications are also interpreted as the intention that is hidden behind the speech (Wiedarti, 2005). In other words, when someone speaks or writes, something that is said or written is not the same as intended. There are two kinds of implicature, namely conventional implicature (conventional implicature) and conversation implicature (conversation implicature). Conventional implicatures are those that are known to

everyone, while conversational implicatures are those that are only known to certain people who know the context of the speech.

Context is things or elements whose existence is very supportive of communication, both for the speaker and listener. The characteristics of context according to Hyland and Paltridge (2011) cover:

1) Chance (channel), which is how the relationship between participants in the event is maintained with discourse, writing, signs;
2) Code, language, dialect or style of language used;
3) Message-form (the form of the message), which is what form is intended, such as chat, debate and others;
4) Event

Macrostructural context is the context of the situation and cultural context. The context of the situation is the immediate environment in which the text actually functions. The context is used to explain the reasons certain things are spoken or written on an occasion. Someone does certain things on an occasion and gives them meaning and value, such a condition is called culture.

The conversation is one example of a speech event. The rules for conversation can be distinguished from the rules for other types of speech events, such as lecture arguments, discussions, and religious ceremonies, trials in outside the hearing, interviews, debates, and meetings (Ismari, 1995). Each speech event is distinguished based on differences in the number of conversation participants as well as the type and number of talks expected from the conversation participants at each speech event.

Lakoff (1973) argues that sentences can be conveyed more than the literal meaning. The sentence "In this cold room", when spoken by a boss to his subordinates can mean "close the window". But that does not mean that the analysis "In this cold room", includes the state of the command power indicator in the "inner structure". Gordon and Lokoff suggested that speakers and speakers interpret such sentences with reference to the postulate of the conversation. So "whimperatives" should be interpreted grammatically as simple question sentences but interpreted as command sentences through conversation postulates. As pointed out by Bruner (1977), it is remarkable that speakers make indirect requests by utilizing social conventions that include the use of appropriate forms of questions.

Maksim is a rule of speech in a normal speech. Grice in Rohmadi (2004) distinguishes maxims into four types, including:

1) Maxim of quantity, that is, a fair expression in communication is that which expresses sufficient things, is not excessive and is not lacking to convey information;
2) Maxim of quality (maxim of quality), that is, what is expressed is true;
3) Maxim of relevance, that what is expressed is relevant to the situation that exists in and around language;
4) Maxim of manner (maxim of manner), that what is expressed is quite clear and meaningless.

A philosopher named Austin (1962) states that there are thousands of verbs in English such as: ask, ask, require, order, plead, all of which mark speech acts. Searle (1980) classifies speech acts based on the intention of the speaker when speaking into five large groups.

1) Representatively, this speech act has the function of telling people something
2) Commissive, this speech act states that the speaker will do something
3) Directive serves to make the speaker do something
4) Expressive functions to express feelings and attitudes about the state of the relationship
5) Declarative describes a change in a relationship state.

Leech (1983) states aspects that must always be considered in pragmatic studies are:

a. Speakers and interlocutors
   Basically, this concept covers between communicator and communicant. So there is a message sender and there is a message recipient. Aspects related to the concept of the speaker and interlocutor are age, socioeconomic background, gender, level of intimacy and others.

b. Speech context
   It is the context in all aspects of the physical or social settings relevant to the speech in question. This context is essentially all background knowledge that is understood together by the speaker and the interlocutor.

c. The purpose of the speech
   Various forms of speech can be used to express one purpose of speech and conversely one purpose of speech can be expressed with various types of speech forms.

d. Speech as a form of action or activity
   Pragmatics related to verbal actions that occur in certain situations. In this case, pragmatics handles language on a more concrete level compared to grammar.

e. Speech as a verbal act

The five aspects according to Leech (1983) must always be considered in studying each utterance because every utterance will always be bound to the context that surrounds it. This understanding can be used in the context of the reference to the theory of social psychology used, namely symbolic interactionism. This perspective helps researchers in observing the use of language as a means of understanding social position because of the personal identity of the language (Brown & Yule, 1983).

Humour is a mental ability to find, express, or appreciate something funny or something that is really unusual. Humour is diverse, there is negative humour, and there is positive (Moss, 2004). Negative humour is humour that contains something that is not good that smells of SARA, porn, insults and reproaches or contains something that is not good. While positive humour is humour that can arouse something good for the listener. It may be that people who hear humour feel moved by their lives to be the best,

it may be that people who hear positive humour feel criticized for being a good person, and so forth. Humor that contains social and cultural content cannot be taken lightly.

In a conversation often found the use of pragmatics that contain humour, sometimes it is only realized later because it happens spontaneously does not have to be arranged or designed in advance. Conversations between two or more people, for a speaker, can be considered humorous, but not necessarily someone else. This is greatly influenced by the sensitivity and level of understanding of each person (Moss, 2004).

RESEARCH METHOD

The place used to conduct small research to compile this article is at SMA Negeri 3 Pekanbaru and its surroundings, while the time during the learning process takes place. Sources of data obtained in the preparation of this article are:

1) Informants, namely people both friends of the writer and teacher at the time of providing learning that among the informants this conversation takes place.
2) Events, namely events where the conversation that contains humour.

This study used descriptive qualitative approach by elaborate on the findings that the author found after conducting the observation with observation techniques. The author observed and pay attention to the conversation that occurs. The role of the writer is taken, sometimes acting as a non-participant, that is, only listening and paying attention to conversations that happen among fellow students, with the writer not involved in it and the presence of the writer is not recognized by them.

The technique used to collect data or samples in the preparation of this paper is to use purposive sampling, meaning that sampling is based on a specific reason or purpose. The sample taken is the conversation felt by the author that the conversation was is a pragmatic application that contains humour.

Sometimes the writer plays an active participant that is directly involved in the conversation that occurred and sometimes the writer acts as a passive participant, that is, not directly involved in the conversation event but the author's presence is known by the perpetrators of the conversation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The assumptions are based on rational considerations and can be formulated as a guide for using language effectively and efficiently in conversation. The guide is called as a maxim of conversation (maxim of conversation) or general principles that underlie the use of language based on cooperation efficiently. The unity of all four maxim conversations is called the principle of cooperation (co-operative principle). There is a close relationship between the basic rules of cooperation with the expectations and presuppositions contained in human interaction. An utterance can imply a proposition, which is not actually part of the utterance and is also not a logical consequence of the utterance, to more clearly consider the following example of speech.

Anis   : *Piye makalahe Adi Sutarno, S.Pd. kae ?*
        [How is the Adi Sutarno's paper?]

Bian   : *Wah, bahasa Indonesiane apik banget.*
             [Wow, Its Indonesian language is very good.]

Bian's answer implies that Adi Sutarno's paper, S.Pd. in terms of content it might not be good, only right language.

There are three things that need to be considered in the example of the implicature: (1) the implicature that Adi Sutarno's paper, S.Pd. Not good is not part of Bian's speech because he does not say so, (2) the implicature is not a logical consequence of that Bian's speech, (3) it is very likely that a speech has more than one implicature, this depends on the context. From Bian's answer, it can also be drawn the inference that the paper Adi Sutarno, S.Pd. different from other papers, the Indonesian language is ugly. Bian's answer also implies that the papers presented in a seminar that the Indonesian language is not as good as the paper Adi Sutarno, S.Pd. Almost every utterance has additional meaning or information that is not spoken by the P. Even though the P is not spoken of, the extra meaning can be captured by the listener as long as it has communicative competence in the language concerned.

Following are the results of the Analysis of the Application of Pragmatics in Conversations Containing Fresh Humor.

1) Too late

Conversations in this discourse occur between students and teachers. The location of the conversation was in the classroom when the lesson was taking place there was a student who was late and that was not only done once but he did it often when he entered the class all his friends laughed because it was not just once and was almost half late more hours and he was not ashamed of his tardiness.

Student 1   : *"Assalamu"alaikum, maaf pak terlambat"*.
                ["Assalamu Alaikum, I am sorry, Sir, I am late."]

(spontanously, all students in the classroom laughed)

Teacher   : *"Ya sudah, silakan masuk!"*
                ["Yes, no problem. Come in."]

(suddently, a student spoke)

Student 2   : *"Wah, itu tadi berangkat dari rumah jam 5 subuh ya? Ntar malam tidur di sekolah aja, biar tidak terlambat lagi!*
                ["Wow, you left your home at 5, didn't you? It is better if you stay at school tonight, so you will not be late again"]

The purpose of student 2 is that student 1 is not late anymore so he said with a harsh sentence, whether the insinuation sentence with student 1 will change it (change) or will be late again.

2) Coldness

This conversation occurs between a mother and her child, this event takes place in their own home. Humour in this conversation occurs when a mother asks her child, sees her child look different then a mother asks her child.

Ibu   : *"Ndi malam-malam begini kog pakai sepatu emangnya mau kemana?"*

[You wear yous shoes in the evening at this situation, where will you go?]

Anak : *"Abis lari-lari kog Bu...!!!"*

[I was just jogging, Madam.]

Ibu : *"Malam-malam lari-lari, jangan-jangan kamu kesurupan?"*

[Jogging in the night? Are you okay?]

Anak : *"Nggak ding Bu, saya kedinginan jadi pakai sepatu".*

[Sorry, not jogging, Madam, I wear my shoes because I am feeling cold.]

The purpose of the child is not to get cold and then he wears shoes. Shoes are not only used for exercise but can also be used to warm the body, especially the feet. So, the boy is well-groomed and wears shoes at night because he is cold.

3) Students are Like Lecturers

In a lesson, a teacher invites a student who arrives late or after lectures begin.

Teacher (speaker 1) : *"Silakan masuk, Pak. Tidak biasanya bapak terlambat"*

[Please come in, Sir. It is unsal you are late.]

Sudent (speaker 2) : *"Maaf, Pak"*

[I am sorry, Sir.]

(most students laughed)

This humour is acceptable because most students who laugh have the same background of association, perception or understanding with the teacher as the first speaker. With the same understanding and referral association, humorous communication can work well because there has been an understanding of the meaning between the speaker and the interlocutor. This understanding of communication is supported by the appearance that looks as if the late student is a teacher because of his appearance like a teacher.

CONCLUSION

From this study, it can conclude that pragmatic is a branch of linguistics that studies the structure of language externally that is related to how the language unit is used in communication. When it related to interacting with people, a conversation is an oral interaction with face to face between two or more participants; As a result, the use of pragmatics in conversations that contain humour is widespread in everyday life, which can be in the form of satire, ridicule, humorous flattery.

REFERENCES

Alston, P. W. (1964). *Philosophy of Language. Prentice Hall Inc., London.* London: Prentice Hall Inc.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Word* (2nd ed.). Oxfod: Oxfod University Press.

Bronowski, Y. J. (1973). *The Ascent of Man.* Boston: Little Brown.

Brown, & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1977). *The Process of Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N. (2011). *Foundations of Pragmatics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.

Cummings, L. (2005). *Pragmatics: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Eco, U. (1984). *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hyland, K., & Paltridge, B. (2011). *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Ismari. (1995). *Ismari. 1995Tentang Percakapan*. Jakarta: Ismari. 1995. Tentang Percakapan. JakartaAirlangga University Press.

Kridalaksana, H. (1993). *Kamus Linguistik* (3rd ed.). Jakarta: Gramedia.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The Logic of Politeness: or, Minding your p's and q's. In C. Corum, T. C. Smith-Stark & A. Weiser (Eds.), *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 345–356). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Inc.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

McMahon, A. (1994). *Understanding Language Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moss, S. (2004). *Humor Segar*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.

Nababan, P. W. J. (1987). *Ilmu Pragmatik (Teori dan Penerapannya)*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Nadar, F. X. (2009). *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Rohmadi, M. (2004). *Pragmatik Teori dan Analisis*. Yogyakarta: Lingkar Media.

Sarwiji. (1996). *Pragmatik*. Surakarta: Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Searle, J. R. (1980). *Speech Acts An Essay in The Philosophy of Languange*. Sidney: Cambridge Univerisy Press.

Wiedarti, P. (2005). *Menuju Budaya Menulis: Suatu Bunga Rampai*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.

Wijana, I. D. P. (1996). *Pragmatic Basics*. Yogyakarta: Andi Publisher.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.