



Humor Strategies through the Flouting of the Cooperative Principle in the *Logickah?* Podcast: A Pragmatic Analysis

Sopia Nurjanah^{1*}, Iib Marzuqi², Miftahul Huda³

¹²³Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas Islam Darul ‘Ulum, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

*E-mail: sopia.2022@mhs.unisda.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Humor is one of the communication strategies widely employed in digital media to create engaging and entertaining interactions. One mechanism for generating humor is through the flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle. Unlike previous studies that primarily focused on identifying floutings of the Cooperative Principle, this study examines such floutings as pragmatic strategies for constructing humor in digital communication. This study aims to describe the mechanisms of humor through floutings of the Cooperative Principle in the “*Logickah?*” podcast. This research employed a descriptive qualitative approach, with the data consisting of utterances from four episodes of the *Logickah?* podcast. The data were collected using the non-participatory observation technique (*Simak Bebas Libat Cakap* [SBLC]) and note-taking through the transcription of spoken utterances into written form. The data were then analyzed using the extralingual matching method. The findings revealed 118 instances of Cooperative Principle floutings used as humor strategies, comprising 6 floutings of the maxim of quantity, 12 floutings of the maxim of quality, 91 floutings of the maxim of relation, and 9 floutings of the maxim of manner. These maxim floutings function as humor strategies through the inference of conversational implicatures derived from the conversational context, thereby producing humorous effects. The findings indicate that floutings of the Cooperative Principle should not merely be regarded as communicative deviations but can also serve as effective pragmatic strategies for constructing humor in digital media.

Keywords : humor strategies, flouting, cooperative principle, pragmatic

INTRODUCTION

Digital communication is the process of conveying messages via digital technology-based media. As it has evolved, digital communication within society has expanded, enabling individuals to interact more easily through various social media platforms. Social media allows individuals to readily reach a wide audience for communication purposes. One form of digital communication is content; a type of content frequently featured on social media is the podcast. A podcast is audio or visual content consisting of conversations, discussions, or stories centered on a specific topic. Some content relies on humor as its primary draw, utilizing various jokes and punchlines. One podcast that employs this approach is *Logickah?*

The *Logickah* podcast is published on YouTube—affiliated with Deddy Corbuzier's

channel—and hosted by Indra Frimawan. The podcast features casual conversations with various guests, presented in a comedic atmosphere. As the host, Frimawan often introduces absurd humor by responding to or asking questions in a random manner. The humor arises from Frimawan's responses, which defy the expectations of his conversation partners. He frequently employs wordplay, ambiguity, and contextual shifts as forms of humor within the podcast.

Humor is a form of communication capable of eliciting amusement or laughter. According to the KBBI (Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language), humor refers to something funny, drollery, or a source of amusement. In communication, humor can serve as a persuasive strategy to alleviate tension and create a more relaxed atmosphere,

Submitted
25/09/2026

Accepted
28/09/2026

Published
30/09/2026

Citation	Nurjanah, S., Marzuqi, I., & Huda, M. (2026). Humor Strategies through the Flouting of the Cooperative Principle in the <i>Logickah?</i> Podcast: A Pragmatic Analysis. <i>Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra</i> , Volume 5, Nomor 5, September 2026, 4629-4642. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v5i5.1774
----------	---

Publisher
Raja Zulkarnain Education Foundation

thereby making the message or information easier to accept. This aligns with the views of Febri Arifiati and Wahyuni (2019:114), who state that humor functions as an important and effective learning tool to engage listeners and serves as an effective instrument of persuasion. Rustono (cited in Yuwana, 2019:02) categorizes humor into two types: verbal humor and non-verbal humor. Verbal humor relies on linguistic elements such as wordplay, puns, and ambiguity, whereas non-verbal humor is conveyed through expressions, images, or gestures. Verbal humor is produced by a speaker through linguistic play—specifically, by deviating from standard meanings to create an element of oddity or unnaturalness in language use. Consequently, an utterance that might initially be understood in a conventional sense transforms into an absurd linguistic experience, thereby generating humor (Yuwana, 2019:02). In terms of language, verbal humor often employs deviations involving words or sounds as a strategy for creating humor. Attardo (2017:04) explains that, within the field of pragmatics, verbal humor can be understood as a form of deviation from Grice's Cooperative Principle. Based on this view, it can be concluded that verbal humor is a suitable subject for pragmatic analysis, specifically regarding violations of the Cooperative Principle. Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that studies the relationships between the speaker, the listener, and the surrounding context.

Pragmatics is a relevant field for studying language use in communication. According to Marzuqi (2021:07), pragmatics examines how context influences interlocutors in interpreting the meaning of utterances conveyed by a speaker. This indicates that understanding language in communication cannot rely solely on the form of the utterance; it also requires interpreting the surrounding context. Pragmatics offers various approaches for analyzing language use in communicative contexts, such as speech acts, deixis, politeness principles, and the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle is a key area of study within pragmatics, proposed by Grice (1975). Grice asserts that speakers are expected to make contribu-

tions that align with the purpose and direction of the ongoing conversation. There are four maxims within the cooperative principle: (1) the maxim of quantity, where the speaker is expected to provide sufficient information—neither less nor more than required; (2) the maxim of quality, where the speaker is expected to convey information believed to be true and avoid sharing information without strong evidence; (3) the maxim of relevance, where the speaker is expected to make utterances relevant to the topic of conversation; and (4) the maxim of manner, where the speaker is expected to convey messages clearly, unambiguously, and in an orderly fashion. Based on these four maxims, if a speaker appears to violate one of them, the communication process may be disrupted, leading to confusion or misunderstanding on the part of the listener due to the deviation in language use. Grice (1975) further explains that maxim violations can be categorized into "violations" and "floutings." A violation occurs when a speaker breaks a maxim covertly or inconspicuously, potentially misleading the listener or creating a misunderstanding. In contrast, "flouting" occurs when a speaker openly or deliberately violates a maxim, requiring the listener to interpret the speaker's underlying intent or implicature. In many conversations, speakers frequently violate the Cooperative Principle—specifically by flouting it—as a humorous communication strategy. Thus, flouting the Cooperative Principle serves as a mechanism to generate implicit meanings or implicatures, which then function as a source of humor within the conversation. Consequently, humor can be understood as the outcome of a pragmatic strategy: the flouting of the Cooperative Principle.

Several previous studies are relevant to this research on pragmatics, particularly regarding the Cooperative Principle. The first is a study by Aprinia et al. (2025) titled "Conversational Implicature in the Stand-Up Comedy Humor of Indra Frimawan on the SUCI Program (Stand Up Kompas TV YouTube Channel)." This study aimed to describe the forms of conversational implicature appearing in Indra Frimawan's stand-



up comedy routines. The research employed a descriptive-qualitative method, utilizing "listen and note" (*simak dan catat*) techniques for data collection. The findings revealed that Indra Frimawan consistently violated all four conversational maxims, thereby generating implicatures that played a crucial role in creating verbal humor.

Second, Abadi et al. (2024) conducted a study titled "Adherence to and Violation of Grice's Cooperative Principle in Denny Sumargo's YouTube Podcast: A Pragmatic Study." This research aimed to describe the adherence to and violation of Grice's Cooperative Principle, as well as the implicatures present in Denny Sumargo's YouTube podcast, employing a qualitative descriptive method with the *simak bebas libat cakap* (SBLC)—non-participatory observation—technique. The results indicate that adherence to the Cooperative Principle in the podcast tends to manifest as observance of the Maxim of Relevance, whereas violations predominantly occur regarding the Maxim of Quantity. The dominant implicature found in the podcast is the clarification of information.

Third, a study by Sagita et al. (2026) is titled "Maxim Violations in the 'Purbaya Yudhi Sadewa' (Chairman of the LPS Board of Commissioners) Podcast: Was LPS Attacked by Hackers?" This research aimed to reveal how spontaneous communication strategies in oral conversation can deviate from Grice's Cooperative Principle. A qualitative descriptive method was used. The findings identified seven instances of violations across four maxims: four violations of the Maxim of Quality, two of the Maxim of Quantity, and one of the Maxim of Manner. Overall, the findings suggest that maxim violations in the context of sensitive issues—such as customer fund security and cyberattacks—are intended to reassure the public and foster a positive image and a sense of security through persuasive communication.

Based on previous research, studies regarding violations of the Cooperative Principle in podcasts generally focus on the forms of maxim violations and conversational implicatures; meanwhile, research specifically examining the role of

Cooperative Principle violations as a humor strategy in dialogic conversation remains limited. Therefore, the novelty of this study lies in its specific research focus. Based on the background, the research problem addresses how violations of the Cooperative Principle are utilized as a humor strategy in the *Logickah?* podcast. Accordingly, the objective of this study is to analyze humor strategies involving violations of the Cooperative Principle within the *Logickah?* podcast. The findings are expected to offer theoretical benefits by enriching the study of pragmatics, particularly regarding the relationship between the Cooperative Principle and communication strategies.

METHOD

This research method uses a qualitative descriptive approach. According to Sugiyono (2013), qualitative methods are used to study conditions or phenomena of natural objects in depth. The qualitative descriptive approach is used to understand, describe, and interpret a phenomenon thoroughly based on data obtained in its natural context. This approach is chosen because it allows researchers to gain an in-depth understanding of a language phenomenon, particularly in understanding Grice's cooperation principles.

The research object is the podcast discourse *Logickah?* hosted by Indra Frimawan and uploaded on Deddy Corbuzier's YouTube channel. The researcher selected four podcast episodes that feature spontaneous conversational interactions and potentially contain floutings of the cooperation principles.

Data were collected using the non-participant observation technique (*Simak Bebas Libat Cakap/SBLC*) and note-taking technique. Data was collected by listening to all utterances in the podcast, then transcribing them, meaning converting spoken words into written form, and then marking the parts that contain floutings of the cooperation principles, namely the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner.

Data was analyzed using the extralingual equivalence technique. Mahsun (2017:115), emphasizes that analysis with the extralingual equiva-

lence technique is done by connecting linguistic elements with non-linguistic elements, such as the context of the utterance, speech situation, speaker, and interlocutor. Through this technique, the data is analyzed to identify floutings of the cooperation principles based on the context surrounding the utterance and to analyze its role as a humor strategy in the *Logickah?* podcast.

RESULTS

1. Humor Strategies through Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

According to Grice's theory, the maxim of quantity requires speakers to provide an adequate amount of information according to the interlocutor's needs, neither too little nor too much. The following presents data illustrating a flouting of the maxim of quantity that is utilized as a humor strategy.

Data (28)

Context : Deddy previously performed a mentalism trick by asking Frimawan to think of a number from 1 to 10. However, Frimawan answered 11 instead. Deddy then attempted to explain the correct way to perform the trick.

Deddy : "Pertama kan pikirin..."
["First, think of..."]

Frimawan : "Oke. Kenapa harus dipikirin? Kayaknya banyak beban hidup yang harus dipikirin dibanding angka 1-10. **Banyak. Kosan belum saya pikirin. Iya kan. Orang rumah belum saya pikirin. Makan besok, belum saya pikirin. Terlalu banyak. Ini mas siapa sih sebenarnya? Kayak ngatur-ngatur apa yang harus saya pikirkan. Hahh.**"

["Okay. Why do I have to think about it? I feel like there are so many life burdens I have to think about rather than numbers 1 to 10.

A lot. I haven't thought about my rent yet. Right? I haven't thought about my family at home. What I'm going to eat tomorrow, I haven't thought about that yet. Too much. Who are you, anyway? You're acting like you can tell me what I should think about. Huh."]

Based on the context of the utterance, Deddy attempts to instruct Frimawan to think of a number from 1 to 10 as part of his mentalism trick. However, Frimawan responds by stating, "*A lot. I haven't thought about my rent yet. Right? I haven't thought about my family at home. What I'm going to eat tomorrow, I haven't thought about that yet...*" This response provides information beyond what Deddy requires when asking Frimawan to think of a number from 1 to 10. Therefore, the utterance indicates a flouting of the maxim of quantity. The flouting generates an implicature that Frimawan indirectly intends to convey that he has many things to think about and therefore does not have time to think about the number requested by Deddy. However, this meaning is deliberately expressed in an exaggerated manner and does not correspond to the actual context of the conversation. Frimawan's excessive response, which violates the maxim of quantity, is utilized as a strategy to create a humorous effect.

Data (38)

Context : Previously, Maell talked about his hometown, Aceh, and his experience of moving to Jakarta.

Frimawan : "Di Jakarta juga ada Jalan Aceh"
["There's also an Aceh Street in Jakarta."]

Maell : "Ada?"
["There is?"]

Frimawan : "Ada"
["There is"]

Maell : "Wah, di mana tuh?"
["Wow, where is it?"]



Frimawan : **"Di Jalan Aceh"
["On Aceh Street."]**

Based on the context of the utterance, Maell explains that he moved from Aceh to Jakarta, after which Frimawan informs him that there is an Aceh Street in Jakarta. Maell then asks for more specific information about the location of Aceh Street. However, Frimawan's response does not provide the information required by Maell, as he merely states, **"On Aceh Street."** This utterance indicates a flouting of the maxim of quantity because the information provided is insufficient for the interlocutor's needs. The flouting implies that Frimawan deliberately avoids providing more specific information, resulting in a humorous effect through an uninformative response. Thus, the flouting of the maxim of quantity functions as Frimawan's strategy for creating humor in the conversation within the podcast.

2. Humor Strategies through Flouting the Maxim of Quality

According to Grice's theory, the maxim of quality requires speakers to provide information that is truthful, factual, and supported by clear evidence. The following presents data illustrating floutings of the maxim of quality that are utilized as humor strategies.

Data (32)

- Context : Frimawan and Deddy are discussing breakfast.
- Frimawan : "Sarapan pagi biasanya pakai apa? Deddy : Sarapan pagi? pagi tadi nasi kuning."
["What do you usually have for breakfast?"]
- Deddy : "Sarapan pagi? pagi tadi nasi kuning."
["Breakfast? This morning, I had yellow rice"]
- Frimawan : "Kenapa? Emang harus hati-hati ya makan nasi kuning?"

["Why? Are you supposed to be careful when eating yellow rice?"]

Deddy : "Huh?"

Frimawan : "Pas ijo, kayaknya baru nih, bisa dimakan, Kalau nasi merah kan, stop makan nasi merah!"
["When it's green, I guess it's ready, you can eat it. But when it's red, stop eating red rice!"]

Data (42)

Context : Frimawan and Maell are discussing Maell's work in Jakarta as a content creator.

Frimawan : "Kalau yang YouTube, YouTube kan YouTuber."
["As for YouTube, someone on YouTube is a YouTuber."]

Maell : "YouTuber."
[YouTuber]

Frimawan : "Iya, kalau konten, yang suka bikin konten kan kontener."
"Yeah, and someone who makes content is a contener."

Based on the context of Data (32), Frimawan and Deddy are discussing breakfast. Deddy responds that he had yellow rice (*nasi kuning*) for breakfast that morning. Frimawan then creates an association or wordplay by relating yellow rice to the concept of traffic lights. This can be seen in the utterance, **"Why? Are you supposed to be careful when eating yellow rice?"**, followed by **"When it's green, I guess it's ready, you can eat it. But when it's red, stop eating red rice!"** These utterances indicate a flouting of the maxim of quality because the statements are not based on factual information. The implicature generated by this flouting is that Frimawan intends to invite Deddy to follow his absurd association by connecting *yellow rice* with the concept of traffic lights. The flouting is utilized as a humor strategy by creating an absurd logical association.

Based on the context of Data (42), Frimawan and Maell are discussing Maell's work as a content

creator in Jakarta. However, Frimawan refers to someone who creates content as a “*contener*.” This can be seen in the utterance, “*and someone who makes content is a contener*.” Frimawan deliberately creates an analogy based on the word-formation pattern of *YouTube* into ‘*YouTuber*’, and applies the same pattern to ‘*content*’, resulting in the invented term ‘*contener*’. This utterance violates the maxim of quality because ‘*contener*’ is not the actual term for someone who creates content.

The implicature generated is that Frimawan does not intend to introduce an actual term but deliberately creates a new term through wordplay as a humor strategy.

Data (64)

- Context : Frimawan previously played with the word *tomyam*, turning it into *Tom & Jerry* and eventually *Tomcat*. Jirayut then asked about the meaning of the word *Tomcat*.
- Jirayut : “*Tomcat itu apaan Tomcat?*”
[“*Tomcat? What is a tomcat?*”]
- Frimawan : “*Tomcat itu.. Buat pemirsa yang belum tau. Tomcat adalah sejenis serangga. Yang kalau dipencet. Itu dia bunyi ‘Tom’*”
[“*A tomcat is... For viewers who don’t know, a tomcat is a type of insect. When you press it, it makes the sound ‘Tom.’*”]

Data (93)

- Context : Frimawan tells a story about once stealing crackers (*kerupuk*) from a food stall.
- Frimawan : “*...Saya ambil kerupuk satu di warung. Ambil kerupuk satu, terus saya inget. Oh Mama saya juga pengen kerupuk. Saya ambil satu lagi. Oh Adik saya juga mau kerupuk. Saya ambil satu lagi. Pas saya mau pulang, di tengah jalan, saya inget dosa saya. Balik lagi.*

Wah, inget dosa saya juga pengen kerupuk itu gimana, Bib?

“...I took one cracker from the stall. I took one cracker, then I remembered, ‘Oh, my mother also wants a cracker.’ So I took another one. ‘Oh, my younger sibling also wants a cracker.’ So I took another one. When I was about to go home, halfway there, I remembered my sin. So I went back. **Wow, what if my sin also wants a cracker because I remembered it, Bib?**”

Based on the context of Data (64), Frimawan previously engaged in wordplay by transforming the word *tomyam* into *Tom & Jerry* and eventually into *Tomcat*. Since Jirayut did not know what a *tomcat* was, he asked Frimawan for an explanation. However, Frimawan responded by stating that a *tomcat* is an insect that makes the sound “*Tom*” when touched. This can be seen in the utterance, “*A tomcat is a type of insect. When you press it, it makes the sound ‘Tom.’*” The statement contradicts factual information and appears to be fabricated, indicating a flouting of the maxim of quality. The implicature generated by this flouting is that Frimawan does not intend for his explanation to be taken as factual information but rather uses it as part of a humor strategy.

Based on the context of Data (93), Frimawan is telling a story about having stolen crackers from a food stall. He then describes an imaginary event by personifying the abstract concept of “*sin*” as if it had a desire to eat crackers (*kerupuk*). This can be seen in the utterance, “*Wow, what if my sin also wants a cracker because I remembered it, Bib?*” This statement violates the maxim of quality because it presents an impossible event as though it were possible. The implicature generated by the flouting is that Frimawan deliberately presents an event that does not actually occur. Therefore, the flouting is utilized as a humor strategy by creating an absurd situation within the conversation.



3. Humor Strategies through Flouting the Maxim of Relevance

According to Grice, the maxim of relevance requires speakers to provide information that is relevant to the topic of conversation. The following presents several data illustrating floutings of the maxim of relevance that are utilized as humor strategies.

Data (01)

Context : Frimawan often mistakenly calls Deddy “Denny.” Deddy then attempts to clarify his correct name.

Frimawan : “Denny Deddy?”

Deddy : “Bukan. Denny-nya nggak ada”
[“No. There is no Denny.”]

Frimawan : “Denny-nya nggak ada? Kemana dia?”
[“There’s no Denny? Where did he go?”]

Data (37)

Context : Maell Lee is describing his experience of moving from Aceh to Jakarta.

Maell : “Wahh, waktu aku merantau.”
[“Wow, when I moved away.”]

Frimawan : “Merantau? dari mana?”
[“Moved away? From where?”]

Maell : “Dari Aceh.”
[“From Aceh.”]

Frimawan : “Dari Aceh ke?”
[“From Aceh to?”]

Maell : “Ke Jakarta.”
[“To Jakarta.”]

Frimawan : “Oh, itu AC-nya berapa PK?”
[“Oh, how many horsepower is the AC?”]

Data (68)

Context : Jirayut explains that he represented Thailand in the DAA (*Dangdut Academy Asia*) competition. Unlike DAA, Liga Dangdut is a dangdut competition for contestants from provinces across Indonesia.

Jirayut : “DAA. Asia itu baru ada dari luar. Kalau Liga Dangdut itu khusus dari Provinsi Indonesia.”

[“DAA. Asia is where participants from other countries compete. Liga Dangdut is specifically for participants from Indonesian provinces.”]

Frimawan : “Oke. Berarti ikutnya Liga Inggris?”
[“Okay. So, did you compete in the English League?”]

Based on the context of Data (01), Frimawan mistakenly refers to Deddy as “Denny,” prompting Deddy to clarify that there is no “Denny.” Instead of interpreting Deddy’s statement as a correction of his name, Frimawan interprets it literally as if “Denny” were a person who is absent. This is reflected in the utterance, “*There’s no Denny? Where did he go?*” The response is irrelevant to the actual topic because Deddy is referring to his name rather than the whereabouts of another person. Therefore, the utterance violates the maxim of relevance. The implicature generated is that Frimawan deliberately misinterprets Deddy’s statement to create an unexpected meaning. This deviation is utilized as a humor strategy through a misunderstanding of meaning.

Based on the context of Data (37), Maell is discussing his experience of moving from Aceh to Jakarta. Frimawan initially follows the topic by asking where Maell moved from and where he moved to. However, after Maell answers “To Jakarta,” Frimawan suddenly asks, “*Oh, how many horsepower is the AC?*” The utterance is irrelevant to the ongoing discussion because the abbreviation “AC” is interpreted as *air conditioner* rather than referring to “Aceh”. Thus, the utterance violates the maxim of relevance. The implicature is that Frimawan deliberately shifts the interpretation of “AC” from Aceh to *air conditioner*, creating an unexpected association. This flouting is used as a humor strategy through wordplay and a shift in context.

Based on the context of Data (68), Jirayut explains the distinction between DAA and Liga

Dangdut. However, Frimawan responds, **“Okay. So, did you compete in the English League?”** The response is irrelevant to the topic because Frimawan associates the word “Liga” with *Liga Inggris* (the English Premier League), rather than understanding it as the name of a dangdut competition. This utterance violates the maxim of relevance. The implicature is that Frimawan deliberately interprets “Liga Dangdut” based on another meaning of the word “Liga” to create an unexpected association. The flouting is therefore utilized as a humor strategy through wordplay and a shift in meaning.

Data (11)

Context : Deddy and Frimawan had previously been discussing the gym, but their conversation had shifted to another topic. Deddy then attempted to return to the discussion about the gym.

Deddy : *“Kita kan lagi ngomongin Gym tadi.”*
[“We were talking about the gym earlier.”]

Frimawan : *“Kita ngomongin Jim... dan Jum. Jim dan Jum. Jim dan Jum” *bernyanyi**
[“We’re talking about Jim... and Jum. Jim and Jum. Jim and Jum.” *singing*]

Data (46)

Context : Maell Lee explains that his gangster persona only appears in his content and differs from his actual personality in real life.

Maell : *“Maksud aku asli sifatnya. Asli sifat aku ngga...”*
[“What I mean is my actual personality. My actual personality isn’t...”]

Frimawan : *“Luarnya ini galak ya.”*
[“You look tough on the outside, right?”]

Maell : *“Betul”*
[“Exactly.”]

Frimawan : *“Dalemnya bisa aja kolam renang ada di dalam.”*
[“On the inside, you could have a swimming pool in there.”]

Data (101)

Context : Habib Ja’far explains the concept of “the end of the world” as a figurative expression rather than a place with a definite physical existence.

Habib : *“.....Kayak. Saya jalan ke ujung dunia. Itu kan gak ada, Pak. Ujung dunia.”*
[“...Like, I’m walking to the end of the world. That doesn’t exist, sir. The end of the world.”]

Frimawan : *“Ada A.”*
[“There’s an A.”]

Based on the context of Data (11), Deddy attempts to bring the conversation back to the topic of the gym. However, Frimawan responds with **“We’re talking about Jim... and Jum. Jim and Jum. Jim and Jum,”** while singing it. The response is irrelevant to Deddy’s statement because Frimawan deliberately transforms the word *gym* into *Jim and Jum* through wordplay. Therefore, the utterance violates the maxim of relevance. The implicature generated is that Frimawan does not intend to respond directly to Deddy’s statement but instead deliberately shifts the topic through wordplay. This flouting is utilized as a humor strategy by creating a playful reinterpretation of the word *gym*.

Based on the context of Data (46), Maell and Frimawan are discussing Maell’s gangster persona portrayed in his content. Maell explains that this persona does not reflect his actual personality. Frimawan’s statement, **“You look tough on the outside, right?”** creates an expectation that the expression “on the inside” will refer to Maell’s inner character or personality. However, Frimawan interprets “on the inside” literally as referring to the interior of a building by stating, **“On the inside, you could have a swimming pool in there.”** This

utterance violates the maxim of relevance because it shifts away from the topic of personality. The implicature is that Frimawan deliberately exploits another interpretation of “*on the inside*”, shifting the conversation from a person’s character to the interior of a building. This shift is used to create a humorous effect.

Based on the context of Data (101), Habib Ja’far explains that “*the end of the world*” (*Ujung Dunia*) is merely an expression and does not refer to an actual place. However, Frimawan responds by saying, “***There’s an A***” from word ‘*ujung dunia*’ which is unrelated to the topic being discussed. Therefore, the utterance violates the maxim of relevance. The implicature generated is that Frimawan deliberately provides a response that contradicts the context of the conversation. This flouting is utilized as a humor strategy by creating a sudden shift in context and an unexpected response.

4. Humor Strategies through Flouting the Maxim of Manner

According to Grice’s theory, the maxim of manner requires speakers to convey information clearly and avoid ambiguous, overly elaborate, or disorderly expressions. The following presents several data illustrating floutings of the maxim of manner that are utilized as humor strategies.

Data (43)

- Context : Maell Lee explains that his work as a content creator focuses on comedy.
- Frimawan : “... *Konten kreator apa itu?*”
[“...What kind of content creator are you?”]
- Maell : “Komedì”
[“Comedy.”]
- Frimawan : “*Kok Medì?*”
[“**Why, medy?**”]
- Maell : “*Huh?*”
- Frimawan : “*Selain di Medì.*” **bernyanyi**
[“**Other than in ‘Medì.’**”
singing]

- Maell : “*Arahmu mau kemana?*”
[“Where are you going with this?”]

Data (67)

- Context : Jirayut previously explained that he needed two months to learn Indonesian.
- Frimawan : “*Kalau misalnya belajar bahasa Indonesia itu dua bulan. Kalau misalnya belajar bahasa bulan itu butuh berapa Indonesia?*”
[“If learning Indonesian takes two months. **If learning the language of the moon, how much Indonesian does it take?**”]
- Jirayut : “*Bahasa bulan?*”
[“The language of the moon?”]

Based on the context of Data (43), Frimawan asks Maell about the genre of content he creates. Maell answers that his content focuses on comedy. However, Frimawan deliberately breaks the word “*komedi*” into “*kok*” and “*medi*,” as reflected in the utterance “***Kok medi?***” [Why medi?], followed by “***Other than in ‘Medi,’***” which he sings. This utterance violates the maxim of manner because it is unclear and cannot be immediately understood by Maell as the interlocutor. The implicature generated is that Frimawan deliberately breaks the word “*komedi*” into smaller sound units and associates “*medi*” with a song lyric. In other words, Frimawan does not intend to respond to Maell’s explanation but deliberately exploits the sound of the word as a humor strategy. Based on the context of Data (67), the conversation begins with Jirayut explaining that he learned Indonesian over a period of two months. Frimawan then asks an absurd question by rearranging the sentence into “***If learning the language of the moon, how much Indonesian does it take?***” The utterance violates the maxim of manner because Frimawan delivers the statement in an unusual and disorganized structure, making it difficult for Jirayut to immediately understand his intended meaning. The implicature generated by this flouting is that Frimawan deliberately produces an

incomprehensible utterance through an unconventional sentence structure as part of his humor strategy.

Data (106)

Context : In the middle of the conversation, Frimawan suddenly takes off his glasses, causing his vision to become blurry.

Frimawan : **takes off his glasses**

Habib : “Kenapa?”
[“Why?”]

Frimawan : “**Pandangan saya kabur, Bib**”
celingak-celinguk
[“**My vision is blurry, Bib.**” **looks around**]

Habib : “Terus? Dicari gitu?”
[“And then? Are you looking for it?”]

Frimawan : “Iya”
[“Yes.”]

Based on the context of Data (106), Frimawan takes off his glasses in the middle of his conversation with Habib Ja’far. Habib then asks him about his action. Frimawan responds with “**My vision is blurry, Bib,**” while looking around as if he is searching for something. The utterance creates ambiguity through the word “*kabur*” (*blurry*). In its initial interpretation, “*kabur*” refers to Frimawan’s impaired vision caused by not wearing his glasses. However, his accompanying gesture of looking around suggests another interpretation, as if he were searching for something that had “*run away*.”

This ambiguity indicates a flouting of the maxim of manner. The implicature generated is that Frimawan deliberately delivers the utterance while looking around to create wordplay based on the multiple interpretations of “*kabur*” (“*blurry*” or “*to run away*”). Thus, the ambiguity is utilized as a humor strategy.

DISCUSSION

The findings show that the *Logickah?* podcast uses flouting of the four maxims of the Cooperative

Principle as a way of creating humor. The floutings do not occur randomly, but are closely related to the way Frimawan interacts with his guests. In many cases, an utterance that initially seems inappropriate or unexpected becomes humorous when it is interpreted together with the preceding conversation. This suggests that the humorous effect is not produced simply by breaking a conversational rule, but by creating a difference between what the interlocutor expects and what the speaker actually says.

Humor Strategies through Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

The flouting of the maxim of quantity is found less frequently than the other types of maxim flouting. This type of flouting occurs when the speaker gives either more information or less information than the interlocutor needs. In the *Logickah?* podcast, the humorous effect can be seen when a simple conversational prompt receives an unnecessarily long or exaggerated response. For example, when Deddy asks Frimawan to think of a number from one to ten, Frimawan does not simply follow the instruction. Instead, he responds, “*Banyak. Kosan belum saya pikirin. Iya kan. Orang rumah belum saya pikirin. Makan besok, belum saya pikirin. Terlalu banyak*” [“**A lot. I haven’t thought about my rent yet. Right? I haven’t thought about my family at home. What I’m going to eat tomorrow, I haven’t thought about that yet. Too much.**”]. The response contains much more information than Deddy needs at that moment. Rather than focusing on the number requested, Frimawan brings up rent, family, and food. The humor comes from the exaggerated way in which an ordinary instruction is connected to various “life burdens.”

A similar pattern appears when Maell asks where the Aceh Street in Jakarta is, and Frimawan answers, “*Di Jalan Aceh*” [“**On Aceh Street**”]. The response repeats the name of the place without giving the location that Maell is actually asking for. In this case, humor is created through an intentionally unhelpful answer rather than through



excessive information. These examples show that quantity flouting can create humor in two directions: by giving too much information or by deliberately withholding the information that is expected. This finding is in line with Grice's view that the maxim of quantity concerns the amount of information contributed to a conversation. It also differs from Abadi et al. (2024), who found quantity flouting to be the dominant type in Denny Sumargo's podcast. The difference suggests that the use of maxim flouting is influenced by the conversational style and communicative purpose of each podcast. In *Logickah?*, quantity flouting appears mainly as a way of exaggerating or withholding information for humorous purposes rather than as the main form of conversational deviation.

Humor Strategies through Flouting the Maxim of Quality

Flouting of the maxim of quality is used when Frimawan intentionally presents information that does not correspond to factual or logical knowledge. Rather than attempting to make the audience believe the statement, he uses an obviously unreasonable interpretation to create a humorous response. The audience can recognize that the statement is not intended to be taken literally, and this recognition becomes part of the humor. One example occurs when Deddy says that he had *nasi kuning* for breakfast. Frimawan then responds, "*Pas ijo, kayaknya baru nih, bisa dimakan, Kalau nasi merah kan, stop makan nasi merah!*" [**"When it's green, I guess it's ready, you can eat it. But when it's red, stop eating red rice!"**]. Frimawan connects the color of rice with the colors of traffic lights. There is no factual relationship between the color of *nasi kuning* and traffic-light instructions, but the unexpected connection makes the response humorous. Similarly, when discussing content creators, Frimawan refers to a content creator as a "*contener*." The invented word does not represent the actual term, but its formation resembles the way words such as *YouTuber* are formed.

Another example can be found when Jirayut asks about a *tomcat*. Frimawan explains, "*Tomcat adalah sejenis serangga. Yang kalau dipencet. Itu dia bunyi 'Tom' "*" [**"A tomcat is a type of insect. When you press it, it makes the sound 'Tom.'"**]. The explanation deliberately creates a false connection between the name *tomcat* and the sound "Tom." Likewise, when telling a story about stealing crackers, Frimawan asks, "*Wah, inget dosa saya juga pengen kerupuk itu gimana, Bib?*" [**"Wow, what if my sin also wants a cracker because I remembered it, Bib?"**]. The abstract concept of "sin" is treated as if it could want to eat crackers.

These examples suggest that quality flouting is closely associated with absurdity and fabricated associations. The speaker intentionally creates information that is recognizable as unreasonable, allowing the audience to infer that the utterance is part of a joke rather than a factual explanation. This finding supports Grice's view of the quality maxim and is also consistent with Aprinia et al. (2025), who found that flouting of the conversational maxims contributes to the creation of humor in Indra Frimawan's discourse. However, the present study examines Frimawan in a different setting. Aprinia et al. (2025) focused on his stand-up comedy performance, while this study examines his interaction with different guests in a podcast. The similarity between the findings suggests that deliberate departures from factual meaning are part of Frimawan's humorous language use across different contexts. At the same time, the podcast setting shows that these departures can emerge spontaneously during interaction rather than only as part of a prepared comedic performance.

Humor Strategies through Flouting the Maxim of Relevance

The most prominent finding is the frequent use of relevance maxim flouting. This pattern is closely related to the spontaneous and playful interaction that characterizes the *Logickah?* podcast. Frimawan often takes an expression from the ongoing conversation and connects it to another

meaning, sound, or context. As a result, his response may appear unrelated at first, but the connection becomes recognizable once the wordplay or reinterpretation is understood. For example, while Maell is talking about moving from Aceh to Jakarta, the conversation develops as follows: “*Dari Aceh?*” [“**From Aceh?**”], “*Ke Jakarta.*” [“**To Jakarta.**”], followed by Frimawan’s response, “*Oh, itu AC-nya berapa PK?*” [“**Oh, how many horsepower is the AC?**”]. Here, *Aceh* is reinterpreted through the sound *AC*, which then refers to an air conditioner. The response is no longer relevant to Maell’s story, but the shift creates a humorous association between the place name and another meaning. A similar pattern occurs when Jirayut explains the difference between DAA and Liga Dangdut. Frimawan responds, “*Oke. Berarti ikutnya Liga Inggris?*” [“**Okay. So, did you compete in the English League?**”]. Instead of interpreting *Liga Dangdut* as the name of a dangdut competition, Frimawan associates the word *liga* with *Liga Inggris*. In another example, when Deddy says, “*Kita kan lagi ngomongin Gym tadi*” [“**We were talking about the gym earlier**”], Frimawan responds, “*Kita ngomongin Jim... dan Jum. Jim dan Jum. Jim dan Jum,*” while singing. The word *gym* is shifted into *Jim* and *Jum*, creating a new association rather than continuing Deddy’s intended topic.

These examples show that relevance flouting is not simply a sudden change of topic. The humorous response usually maintains a connection with an element of the previous utterance, such as a similar sound, word, or expression. The humor emerges when the audience recognizes the unexpected connection. This explains why relevance flouting occurs more frequently in the data than the other types: the conversational format gives Frimawan many opportunities to respond to a particular word or expression with a different interpretation.

This finding differs from Abadi et al. (2024), who found that quantity flouting was more prominent in Denny Sumargo’s podcast. The difference can be related to the different

conversational orientations of the two podcasts. In *Logickah?*, the interaction is explicitly built around comedic responses, making wordplay and unexpected associations especially useful for maintaining the humorous atmosphere. The finding also extends Aprinia et al. (2025), who examined Frimawan’s humor in stand-up comedy and found the use of conversational maxim flouting in creating humor. The present study shows that similar pragmatic strategies also operate in a more spontaneous, dialogic podcast setting.

Humor Strategies through Flouting the Maxim of Manner

The flouting of the maxim of manner occurs when Frimawan deliberately plays with clarity, ambiguity, or the form of an expression. Compared with relevance flouting, this type appears less frequently in the data. Nevertheless, it remains important because ambiguity provides Frimawan with another way of producing an unexpected interpretation.

One example occurs when Maell answers “*Komedi*” [“**Comedy**”] when asked about the type of content he creates. Frimawan responds, “*Kok Medi?*” [“**Why Medi?**”], and then continues with “*Selain di Medi*” [“**Other than in ‘Medi’**”] while singing. Instead of treating *komedi* as a single word, he breaks it into another possible sound sequence, “*kok*” and “*Medi*.” The response is difficult to interpret as a normal answer because Frimawan is deliberately manipulating the form of the word. Another example appears when Jirayut explains that he learned Indonesian for two months. Frimawan then asks, “*Kalau misalnya belajar bahasa Indonesia itu dua bulan. Kalau misalnya belajar bahasa bulan itu butuh berapa Indonesia?*” [“**If learning Indonesian takes two months. If learning the language of the moon, how much Indonesian does it take?**”]. The unusual construction makes the utterance difficult to process as an ordinary question. The humor arises when the audience recognizes that Frimawan has rearranged the linguistic structure of the original statement to create an absurd expression.



The same strategy appears in the utterance “*Pandangan saya kabur, Bib*” [“**My vision is blurry, Bib**”], which is accompanied by Frimawan looking around after taking off his glasses. The word *kabur* can be understood as “blurry” in relation to vision, but it can also mean “to run away.” The accompanying action encourages the second interpretation and turns an ordinary statement about blurry vision into a humorous wordplay.

These examples indicate that manner flouting is mainly used to create humor through ambiguity and manipulation of linguistic form. The speaker does not simply make the utterance unclear; rather, the lack of clarity provides an opportunity for the audience to discover another interpretation. This is consistent with Grice’s concept of the maxim of manner, which emphasizes clarity and the avoidance of ambiguity.

The finding is consistent with Aprinia et al. (2025), who identified the involvement of all four maxims in Frimawan’s humorous discourse. However, the present study shows how ambiguity and unusual linguistic forms operate specifically within spontaneous podcast interaction. Compared with Sagita et al. (2026), who identified only one instance of manner flouting in their podcast data, the present study similarly shows that manner flouting occurs less frequently than some other types of flouting. The difference in communicative purpose is also important: while Sagita et al. discussed maxim flouting in relation to persuasive communication, the present study shows its use in constructing humor.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that the four maxims contribute to humor in different ways. Quantity flouting creates humor through excessive or insufficient information, quality flouting through unreasonable or fabricated information, relevance flouting through unexpected associations and shifts in interpretation, and manner flouting through ambiguity and manipulation of linguistic form. Among these, relevance flouting appears most frequently, suggesting that shifting or reinterpreting the meaning of an ongoing

conversation is an important part of the humorous style found in the *Logickah?* podcast.

Compared with previous studies, the present study places greater emphasis on the function of maxim flouting as a humor strategy rather than merely identifying types of flouting or conversational implicatures. Aprinia et al. (2025) examined implicatures in Frimawan’s stand-up comedy, Abadi et al. (2024) examined the Cooperative Principle in a different podcast, and Sagita et al. (2026) examined maxim flouting in a podcast with a persuasive communicative context. The present study connects these pragmatic phenomena with humor construction in spontaneous podcast interaction. This focus provides a more specific view of how deviations from conversational expectations can be deliberately used to produce humorous meanings.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that the flouting of Grice’s Cooperative Principle plays an important role in creating humor in the *Logickah?* podcast. The four conversational maxims—quantity, quality, relevance, and manner—are flouted in different ways and produce humor through unexpected interpretations of the ongoing conversation. The humorous effect does not arise merely from violating conversational expectations, but from the audience’s ability to recognize the implied meaning behind the unexpected utterances. Each maxim contributes to humor through a different pattern. Quantity flouting creates humor by providing either excessive or insufficient information, while quality flouting produces humor through unreasonable, fabricated, or absurd associations. Relevance flouting is the most prominent pattern in the data and is mainly realized through unexpected associations, shifts in meaning, and wordplay based on elements of the preceding conversation. Meanwhile, manner flouting creates humor through ambiguity and deliberate manipulation of linguistic form.

The findings also show that the use of maxim flouting is closely related to the spontaneous

interaction between Frimawan and his guests. Rather than functioning only as a violation of conversational norms, flouting becomes a strategy that allows Frimawan to transform ordinary conversational elements into humorous utterances. In this sense, the humor develops through the gap between the meaning expected by the interlocutor and the unexpected meaning introduced by Frimawan. Compared with previous studies, this research contributes a more specific perspective on the relationship between conversational maxim flouting and humor construction in podcast interaction. While previous research has examined maxim flouting in stand-up comedy, podcasts, and persuasive discourse, this study highlights how the same pragmatic strategy operates within spontaneous comedic interaction. Therefore, the study demonstrates that the Cooperative Principle can be used not only to explain conversational implicatures but also to understand how humorous meanings are deliberately constructed in digital-media discourse.

Deepest gratitude is extended to my parents, whose unwavering moral and material support enabled the smooth completion of this scholarly article. Their prayers, care, and constant encouragement served as a source of motivation and strength throughout every stage of the research.

REFERENCES

- Abadi, S. C., Salliyanti, & Siregar, A. (2024). Kepatuhan dan Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Grice pada Podcast Denny Sumargo di Youtube: Kajian Pragmatik. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 8(1), 6265–6272. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v8i1.13356>
- Aprinia, R., Murdianingsih, A., & Jumadi. (2025). Implikatur Percakapan dalam Wacana Humor Stand Up Comedy Indra Frimawan Pada Acara Suci Di Channel Youtube Stand Up Kompas Tv. *Argopuro: Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu Bahasa*, 2, 1–12. <https://doi.org/https://cibangsa.com/index.php/argopurojournal/article/view/2815>
- Arifiati, R. F., & Wahyuni, E. S. (2019). Peningkatan Sense of Humor untuk Menurunkan Kecemasan pada Lansia. *Indonesian Journal of Islamic Psychology*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.18326/ijip.v1i2.139-169>
- Attardo, S. (2017). Humor in Language. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, February, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.342>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mahsun, M. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa, Tahapan, Strategi, Metode, dan Tekniknya*. Depok: Rajawali Pers.
- Marzuqi, I. (2021). *Pragmatik (Dari Teori, Pengajaran, Hingga Penelitiannya)*. Lamongan: Pustaka Ilalang.
- Sagita, E. M., Triandi, S., Ohsyahida, H. D., A. P, P. A., & Tiara. (2026). Pelanggaran Maksim dalam Podcast “Purbaya Yudhi Sadewa (Ketua Dewan Komisiner LPS): LPS Diserang 3 M Hacker?” *Pentas; Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 12, 27–34. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.52166/pentas.v12i1.12524>
- Sugiyono, S. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif Dan R&D*. Bandung. Alfabeta.
- Yuwana, R. (2019). Strategi Penciptaan Materi Humor: Analisis Transistivitas. *Leksana; Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 4(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v4i1.1478>