Infringing of The Maxims as Humor in Mind Your Language: Season 1

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

[1] Postgraduate Program, Department of Linguistics, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

[2] Professor, Linguistic Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

[3] Doctoral, Linguistic Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This research focuses on how infringing of the maxims becomes the humor construction in the sitcom Mind Your Language: Season 1. Briefly, this research has two aims. The first aim is to find what types of infringing of the maxims whereas the second aim is to find the type of humor created by infringing of the maxims in Mind Your Language: Season 1. In order to do that, this research uses pragmatics approach to find the types of infringing as well as the types of humor. The humor is divided into two types namely irony and pun. This research is considered as descriptive qualitative research for the context cannot be taken away from the data. The data analysis technique of this research is ethnographic methods as what Spradley in Santosa (2021) states. The analysis starts from domain, taxonomy, componential, and cutural theme analysis. The results show that there are 33 data in total. For the infringing, there are 27 data whereas cognitive impairment only appears 6 times. As for the humor, 19 data belong to pun while 14 data belong to irony. This research concludes that Mind Your Language: Season 1 constructs its humor with asking-answering incorrectly but not intentionally because the humor is basically constructed with infringing, both and pun.

Keywords: *Infringing of The Maxims; Humor; Pragmatics*

Introduction

Humor in movies, series, or sitcoms varies from intentional and unintentional humor. Intentional humor refers to that humor where the speaker or the initiator performs the humor either to create comedic situation or just to produce an implicature (Dynel, 2014; Klika, 2010). On the other hand, unintentional humor refers to the condition where the speaker or the interlocutor does not intend to create a comedic situation but what comes after is the laughter or comedic situation (Aarons & Mierowsky, 2017). In detail, unintentional humor happens when the speaker either fails to understand the conversation or when the interlocutor fails to understand the conversation (Nemesi, 2020). Thus, unintentional humor has a more complex construction than intentional humor because the stages, set up and punchline, depend on both the speaker and the interlocutor (Nemesi, 2020; Wieczorek, 2019).

Furthermore, unintentional humor has something to do with one of the concepts in pragmatics' non-observances of maxims which is infringing of the maxims. What unintentional humor and infringing of the maxims have in common is how the mistake is constructed. Unintentional humor starts with one utterer or the interlocutor not understanding the gist of the conversation. Therefore, infringing is not so different. Infringing happens when either one of the utterers fail to understand the message of the conversation (Fitriyani et al., 2020). Additionally, infringing happens due to two reasons namely linguistics barrier and cognitive impairment (Mbisike, 2021). Linguistics barrier deals with the condition of either the speaker or the listener that has imperfect language skills so one of them may interpret things differently (Thomas, 2014). On the other hand, cognitive impairment deals with the condition where the speaker or the listener fails to comprehend the conversation due to nervousness, fear, panic, or loss of focus (Grice, 1975; Thomas, 2014). Thus, infringing and unintentional humor are somehow related in the construction. Also, this sort of humor appears in several shows both in cinemas or in TV shows.

One of the TV shows that display unintentional humor is sitcoms. Sitcoms tend to show daily live activities such as lives in a house, office, or even schools (Mills, 2014). Also, sitcoms tend to show humor in daily activities. One of the sitcoms is Mind Your Language: Season 1, which will be shorten as *MYLS1* later on. This sitcom shows the condition of a class full of foreigners who are taking their English course. Additionally, MYLS1 displays several types of humors such as irony, sarcasm, puns, and some more. Even so, puns and irony tend to happen more in MYLS1 due to several reasons. The first reason is the settings itself. The setting in MYLS1 is an English for foreign students class. The class itself consists of students who do not have proper English skills which tend to lead into misuse of language unintentionally. Secondly, irony in MYLS1 often happens when a speaker or interlocutor is having some nervousness, fear, or losing focus while having a conversation. Hence, these aspects create such humor in MYLS1. Furthermore, the appearance of humor in MYLS1 is in line with what this research focuses on which is humor constructed with infringing of the maxims.

In order to perform this research, there are several previous studies that are used to support the analysis. Firstly, there are research on infringing (Fitriyani et al., 2020; Mbisike, 2021; Rohmadi et al., 2019) but none of these works combine the types of humor on analyzing the infringing of the maxims within their research. Secondly, there are several works on humor (A. Al-ZubeiRy, 2020; Attardo & Raskin, 2017; Bischetti et al., 2023), but none of them discuss that the humor is constructed with infringing. Lastly, there are works on humors in pragmatics (Aarons & Mierowsky, 2017; Asahi, 2019; Fubara, 2020), but none of these works combine infringing of the maxims and the types of humor in their research.

After doing the review, this research finally has two gaps. The first gap is the analysis of infringing of the maxims in Mind Your Language: Season 1. The second gap is on the analysis of types of humor behind infringing of the maxims in the sitcom Mind Your Language: Season 1. After seeing the research gaps, this research has two research objectives. The first objective is to find the types of infringing of the maxims in the sitcom Mind Your Language: Season 1 whereas the second research objective is to find the types of humor within infringing of the maxims in the sitcom Mind Your Language: Season 1.

Methods

This research is descriptive qualitative. The descriptive paradigm comes from how the data are described not with numbers, but with contextual explanation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Whereas the qualitative paradigm comes from the entirety of the data and the context that cannot be separated at all (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The research location is the source of data is from three episodes of the sitcom *Mind Your Language: Season 1* whereas the data are the utterances of the students and the teachers which contain infringing of the maxims. Apart from that, the utterances with infringing must be humor since the aims of this research is to find the humor created by infringing of the maxims.

Additionally, the data are coded into several codes based on the episode namely MYLS (Mind Your Language Season 1)/E1 (episode1), E2 (Episode 2), and E3(episode 3). As for the data category, the codes are LB (Linguistics barrier). CI (cognitive impairment), P (Pun), and I (Irony). This research uses four steps of data analysis as what Spradley (2016) states in (Santosa, 2021). The analysis starts from domain analysis as context analysis, followed by taxonomic analysis as focus analysis, and componential analysis to find the patterns of behavior, and ends with cultural theme analysis which combines the theories, reviews, and the research findings to obtain a novelty from this research.

Result and Discussion

Within this research, the types of infringing of the maxims that are found are two namely linguistics barrier infringing and cognitive impairment infringing. Linguistics barrier infringing refers to a condition when either the utterer or the interlocutor missuses a language but without any desire to create an implicature. Next, cognitive impairment infringing refers to a condition where the utterer or the interlocutor does not use language properly due to several factors like nervousness, grogginess, fear, or simply loss of focus on the conversation. Apart from just finding the types of infringing, the results also show the humor that are created by infringing of the maxims. The humor is divided into two types which are pun and irony. Pun refers to wordplay humor. The term pun here does not mean that the utterer uses word incorrectly because they intend to do it, but they fail to use the correct term or choice of words. Thus, this humor still resembles infringing of the maxims. The next humor is irony. Irony in this research refers to situational irony. Unlike regular irony which needs a double meaning, situational irony in this research refers to the situation where the speaker expects or interprets a conversation differently than the fact that happens during the scene. Furthermore, the findings of each category are as follows.

The Types of Infringing of the Maxims

This section shows the findings which belong to the first aim of the research. Thus, this section displays the types of infringing in MYLS 1. This research finds that there are 69 data in total. Furthermore, 50 data belong to linguistics barrier infringing whereas 19 data belong to cognitive impairment infringing. In brief, the linguistics barrier data belong to a condition where the speakers mistakenly use a word without any intention of implicate. On the other hand, cognitive impairment data belong to the condition where the speaker or the interlocutor misunderstands the gist of the conversation because they are either losing focus, not paying attention, scared, or nervous. Further display and explanation are as follows.

1. Linguistics Barrier Infringing

There are 50 data that belong to linguistics barrier infringing in this research. The linguistics barrier infringing data happen when the speaker or interlocutor fails to use or understand the right words, phrases, proverbs, or figure of speech. For instance, in data 1, a student fails to use a word so he misuses another word that almost sounds identical to the correct word that he should use. The explanation is as follows in data 1 and the others are presented in data 2 and data 3.

(1) **Context:** Mr. Brown is listing his students as today is his first day working as an English teacher for the English for Foreigners program. Mr. Brown starts listing from Maximillian Papandrious, a Greek student. Max tells him his full name, then Mr. Brown asks him what he does for a living. It turns out that Max mistakenly uses the word *sheep* while he actually needs to use the word *ship*.

Utterance:

Mr. Brown: What is your job?

Max: I work with sheeps

Mr. Brown: with sheeps, like a shepherd? You work in a farm?

Max: No no, not farm

Mr. Brown: But you said you work with sheeps

Max: Sheeps, big sheeps (menirukan suara kapal)

Mr. Brown: Ah, ships!

Max: Yes.

(10/MYLS1/E1/LB/P/)

Based on data (10/MYLS1/E1/LB/P), Max's utterance, "I work with sheeps", is clearly an answering action. Mr. Brown's question, "What is your job?", explicitly asks Max to provide information about his job. Max's utterance is a direct response to the question. However, there is an interesting aspect to Max's answer that is in line with linguistics barrier infringing. The way Max says the word "sheeps" (a nonstandard plural) and the gesture of imitating the sound of a ship indicate a miscommunication between Max and Mr. Brown. Max most likely wants to say "ships" but was constrained by his limited language skills. This mistake creates a typical humorous situation in MYLS1.

Despite the error in language use, Max's speech can still be categorized as an act of answering. This shows that communication does not always go smoothly, especially in the context of foreign language learning. Mistakes like this are a source of humor and provide insight into the language acquisition process. Thus, it can be concluded that Max's utterance, "I work with sheeps", is an example of an "answering" speech act that is influenced by factors such as vocabulary limitations because Max does not know the correct word for "ship" in English and thinks both sheep and ship are the same word.

(2) Context: Mr. Brown is trying to condense the class as it is his first day teaching English as A Foreign Language for Beginners. Mr. Brown is trying to make the class quiet because many students are still busy by themselves. Suddenly a new student entered his class. The student is Juan Cervantes who is Spanish. Juan finally asked Mr. Brown a question.

Utterance:

Juan: Es la primera ves que vengo. Es esta la clasa para prender Ingles?

Mr. Brown: I'm the faintest idea what you're saying but I'm sure you're not trying to find the needlework class.

Juan: Por favor?

Mr. Brown: It doesn't matter.

Juan: Por favor?

Mr. Brown: Have a seat! (menunjukkan kursinya)

Juan: Si (duduk di kursi Mr. Brown)

9/MYLS1/E1/ME/LB/P/D.

In data 2 (9/MYLS1/E1/LB/P), the initial speech between Juan, a Spanish student and Mr. Brown, an English teacher, shows that communication barriers caused by language differences can be the source of humor. The humor is also in line with the notion of infringing of the maxims Mr. Brown's simple utterance makes Juan confused and finally asks Mr. Brown back. By looking at the context that Juan did not understand Mr. Brown's speech, it can be said that Juan asked without the intention to cause implicate.

Thus, Juan's question is the starting point of a series of humorous events that develop throughout the episode. The language barrier between Juan and Brown is a way to create an entertaining situation of humor. It is important to note that although this speech contains comedic elements, the humor in this situation comes from an unintentional misunderstanding, not from mockery of a particular language or culture, which is in line with the concept of linguistic barrier infringing of the maxims.

(3) Context: The scene takes place in Ms. Courtney's office, the principal. Ali, a new student from Pakistan, enters the room. Ali just opened the door and smiled at Ms. Courtney, then Ms. Courtney responded with "you're early". The pronunciation of "early" is mistaken by Ali for "Eli", so Ali thinks that Ms. Courtney misheard his name, even though Ali is the one who is wrong.

Utterance:

Ms. Courtney: Oh, you're early.

Ali: Oh no, I am Ali.

(1/MYLS1/E1/LB/P)

The third data data (1/MYLS1/E1/LB/P), Ali experienced a misunderstanding when Ms. Courtney said the word "early". Ali thinks that "early" is "Eli" which at first glance sounds similar especially when pronounced with a British accent. The way Ms. Courtney pronounces the word "early" is /ˈərlē/, so Ali thinks that the word is /ˈɑːli/. The similarity in Ali's ears caused her to misunderstand. However, Ali does not have the intention to cause implicature or pretend to misunderstand in order to have an implicit message in his speech with Ms. Courtney.

Ali's ignorance here is purely because she is not a native English speaker, and also she is still a first-level student in learning English. This is evident from the type of class she goes to later is a beginner class with students whose English skills are still similar. In addition, Ali's ignorance creates a comedic impression that will be similar to each other due to language limitations, so that one of the characters speaking will think a word is similar to another word, even though it is not.

Cognitive Impairment Infringing

This research finds 19 data that belong to cognitive impairment infringing. Within this category, the data are conversations where the speaker or the interlocutor mistakenly understands the conversation, but not because they don't understand the language used in the conversation. The mistake happens where one of the speakers get nervous, scared,

(4) Context: Ms. Courtney is telling that the teacher before Mr. Brown is no longer teaching due to pressure from the students in the English class that Mr. Brown will be teaching. Ms. Courtney explains that what the previous teacher did was very embarrassing. Mr. Brown thinks that what he says to Ms. Courtney convinces her about Mr. Brown's confidence, but it turns out that Ms. Courtney already anticipated the upcoming incident that will likely happen.

Utterance

Ms. Courtney: *it was really quite disgusting really*.

Mr. Brown: *what did he do*?

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*

Ms. Courtney: *it has nothing to do with confidence*

Mr. Brown: *But…*

Ms. Courtney: *we've had the window frames nailed down*

Based on the data above, basically, the speech is a response to Ms. Courtney's statement, "I know you aren't". Mr. Brown seems to be thanking Ms. Courtney for the trust she has placed in him. He assured Ms. Courtney that he would not do the same ridiculous act as the previous teacher. Similar to the other speech acts data, Mr. Brown's thankful speech is not based on ignorance, but also influenced by nervousness. This leads into the definition of cognitive impairment in infringing of the maxims where Mr. Brown mistakenly interprets what Ms. Courtney says to him because Mr. Brown is nervous and wants to impress Ms. Courtney, but it ends up differently.

However, in the conversational context of the words used, is clear that there is a strong element of irony in Mr. Brown's speech for several reasons. Firstly, there is a contrast with the context in which Ms. Courtney recounts the teacher's very embarrassing actions. Against this backdrop, Mr. Brown's statement that he "couldn't possibly" do something similar sounds very exaggerated and unrealistic.

(5) Context: Ms. Courtney was talking to Mr. Brown and telling him about the state of the English for foreign students' class because the previous teacher had departed. Mr. Brown mistakenly thought that the word "departed" meant to die, whereas Ms. Courtney meant to leave because she was crazy.

Utterance
Ms. Courtney: I requested a new female teacher in view of what happened with Mr. Warburton
Mr. Brown: Mr.. Warburton?
Ms. Courtney: Yes, he was teaching English for foreign students last term I'm afraid he only lasted a month then he departed
Mr. Brown: Dead?
Ms. Courtney: Demented!

(6/MYLS1/E1/BE/CI/I/D)

The next data that belongs to the cognitive impairment infringing category is the conversation between Mr. Brown and Ms. Courtney when discussing the state of the English for foreign students' class. Based on data (6/MYLS1/E1/BE/CI/I/D), Ms. Courtney mentioned that the previous teacher, Mr. Warburton, "departed," meaning that he left due to a mental disorder. However, Mr. Brown, who was nervous and distressed because he was meeting Ms. Courtney for the first time and facing a new situation, mistook the word "departed" to mean dead. This can be seen when Mr. Brown asks, "Dead?" which Ms. Courtney corrects with a firm, "Demented!"

This misinterpretation is not due to Mr. Brown's limited understanding of English, but rather due to psychological factors, namely nervousness and lack of focus on the conversation. This created a cognitive impairment infringing condition because even though Mr. Brown had adequate language skills, his anxiety in the situation made him fail to grasp the true meaning of the word "departed." In this context, Mr. Brown is not intentionally violating the conversational maxim, but rather distracted by his mental state. This misunderstanding adds an element of ironic humor to the interaction due to the drastic difference in meaning between "departed" as dead and "departed" as a mental disorder. Mr. Brown's nervous reaction shows how emotions and psychological state can affect one's understanding of language.

(6) Context: Ranjeet tells Mr. Brown that Ms. Courtney is looking for Mr. Brown, but Mr. Brown tries to insinuate Ms. Courtney by referring to Ms. Courtney's body shape with the word "large". Ranjeet tries to remind her that Ms. Courtney is waiting for Mr. Brown behind her. Finally, Mr.

Brown almost mistakenly greets Ms. Courtney.

Utterance

Ranjeet: I am remembering her name, missy Courtney!

Mr. Brown: Miss Courtney

Ranjeet: Yes, absolutely

Mr. Brown: The lady with the large…

Ali: But she is already waiting.

Mr. Brown: She might be the principal, but I have a class to teach (mundur dan menabrak Ms. Courtney) – Ah, ms large…Ms. Courtney.

41/MYLS1/E2/MB/CI/I/JG

The cognitive impairment infringing data is the conversation between Mr. Brown and Ranjeet which leads to a misunderstanding when Mr. Brown almost mispronounces Ms. Courtney. Based on data (41/MYLS1/E2/MB/CI/I/JG), Ranjeet tells Mr. Brown that Ms. Courtney is looking for him. In a tense and busy state, Mr. Brown tries to insinuate Ms. Courtney by mentioning her physical characteristics using the word "large". Ranjeet and Ali then reminded him that Ms. Courtney was waiting behind him, but Mr. Brown, nervous and unaware of Ms. Courtney's presence, almost mistakenly called her "Ms. Large". He realized his mistake immediately when he confronted Ms. Courtney, and he hurriedly corrected his words to "Ms. Courtney".

This situation illustrates cognitive impairment infringing because Mr. Brown is tense and unfocused and unaware of the situation around him. Although he had no language barrier, his nervousness and unawareness of Ms. Courtney's presence resulted in a misunderstanding that almost embarrassed himself. This was not due to language barriers, but rather cognitive impairment caused by the urgency of the situation. Then, the humor in this interaction arises from the moment when Mr. Brown almost says something inappropriate in front of Ms. Courtney, which eventually brings out the comical tension between Mr. Brown's sarcasm and the fact that Ms. Courtney is nearby.

2. The Types of Humor of Infringing of the Maxims

This section shows the second variable of this research which is the types of humor of infringing of the maxims. The findings show that there are two types of humor. The first type is pun or wordplay whereas the second type of humor is irony, specifically situational irony. The humor pun refers to unintentional word play that comes from the limitation of English so that the speaker creates a mistake whereas situational irony refers to the opposite fact or expectation of what the speaker thinks. The further data display and explanation are as follows.

A. Pun

The research finds that there are 36 data that belong to pun.

(7) **Context:** Mr. Brown is calling out the student's name to check whether or not they are present. The first student that Mr. Brown calls out is Giovanni. Unfortunately, Giovanni addresses Mr. Brown incorrectly. Mr. Brown does not want to be adressed as *professori*, but as a *Sir*. On the other hand, Giovanni thinks that the term *Sir* refers to a knighthood, while it is actually the correct term to adress an older male. Thus, Mr. Brown tries to correct Govanni's mistake. But again, Giovanni makes a mistake on using the word '*knighted*' into '*knotted*', and again, Mr. Brown revises Giovanni's mistake.

Utterance

Mr. Brown: *Giovanni Cuppello?*

Giovanni: *Si, proffessori!*

Mr. Brown: *No, Giovanni, no proffessori*

Giovanni: *No proffessori*?

Mr. Brown: *No, you should address me as Sir*!

Giovanni: *Si*.

Giovanni: *Now I understand, you have been to get knotted*!

Mr. Brown: *Come again*?

Giovanni: *Well, to become a Sir, you got to be knotted by the queen*.

Mr. Brown: *The word is knighter! And, I'm not that kind of sir*

Giovanni: *Scusi*!

59/MYLS1/E2/LB/P

Within the data (59/MYLS1/E2/LB/P), there was a conversation between Mr. Brown and Giovanni about how to address Mr. Brown. At first, Giovanni calls Mr. Brown "professori," but Mr. Brown immediately corrects Giovanni and asks him to use the nickname "Sir". Giovanni then misunderstood the word Sir and assumed that Mr. Brown was a nobleman who had been "knighted" by the queen. However, Giovanni misinterpreted the word knighted to knotted, which means "tied." This misunderstanding creates humor in the form of a pun.

The type of humor that arises is pun because the pun occurs when Giovanni mistakenly thinks that to become a Sir, one must be knotted by the queen when the correct word is knighted. The word knotted literally means tied, which is clearly irrelevant in the context of a noble title. Giovanni's mistake in understanding and associating these two similar-sounding words was the source of much amusement. Mr. Brown then explains that he is not a Sir in the sense of peerage, but Giovanni is already mistaken.

(8) Context: Ms. Courtney took over the English for Foreign Students class temporarily as Mr. Brown was not present. Ms. Courtney tries to see how far the students in Mr. Brown's class have progressed. However, a mistake was made when Ms. Courtney gave the students the task of constructing a sentence with the word 'catalyst'. A student named Juan answered incorrectly because Juan thought the word catalyst was Catholic. Ms. Courtney was shocked by Juan's answer. However, Juan still did not realize that 'catalyst' and 'catholic' are two different words.

Utterance

Ms. Courtney: Very well. let's see if we can find out how much you've learned from Mr Brown. Can anyone give me a sentence containing the word uh 'Catalyst'?
(The students are confused)
Ms. Courtney: Come along, somebody 'catalyst'!
Juan: Por favor, senora?
Ms. Courtney: Yes?
Juan: In my country, Spain, most of the people are Roman Catalyst (smiling in relief)
Ms. Courtney: What? (confused)

72/MYLS1/E3/LB/P

Secondly, this data (72/MYLS1/E3/LB/P) shows that Ms. Courtney tried to test the students' progress by asking them to make sentences using the word "catalyst." However, Juan, one of the students, misunderstood and thought that the word "catalyst" referred to "Catholic." However, Juan, one of the students, misunderstood and thought that the word "catalyst" referred to "Catholic". He then made a sentence stating that most people in Spain are Roman Catalyst, which should mean "Roman Catholic". Also, the misuse of this word brings out the humor in this scene.

Then, the type of humor used in this data is word play or pun. This pun arises because of the similarity in sound between two words that have very different meanings: catalyst which in chemistry means a substance that accelerates a reaction without permanently changing, and Catholic which refers to religion. Juan's ignorance of the true meaning of the word catalyst led him to construct an erroneous yet humorous sentence. Juan's misunderstanding falls under linguistic barrier infringing because he did not intend to create an implicature but was constrained by the limitations of the English language. Juan incorrectly associates the given word with a word that is more familiar to him, Catholic. This creates cuteness due to his inability to understand the nuances of the English language, and Ms. Courtney's shocked reaction reinforces the comedic atmosphere of the situation.

B. Irony

Lastly, this research finds 33 data of infringing of the maxims that belong to the humor irony. Once again, the irony in this research is not irony that refers to intentional misuse of words, but situational irony. The data that are Situational irony refers to the condition where the real situation is not as what the speaker expects to be. Furthermore, the data findings and discussion are as follows.

> **(9) Context**: Four people are in the corridor in front of the class. The four people are Ms. Courtney, Ranjeet, Jameela, and Juan. Ms. Courtney asked about Mr. Brown's whereabouts. At first Ms. Courtney thinks that she can talk to Ranjeet, as earlier, Juan and Jameela had angered Ms. Courtney with their inability to speak English. However, when Ms. Courtney told him his name to tell Mr. Brown later, Ranjeet thought that Ms. Courtney was asking him to meet her.

Utterance

Ms. Courtney: Do you think you can give him a message?
Ranjeet: certainly
Ms. Courtney: I am Ms. Courtney…
Ranjeet: And I am Ranjeet Singh
Ms. Courtney: At this moment, I'm not bothered who you are, I just want you to give him my message

39/MYLS1/E2/CI/I

Within the data (39/MYLS1/E2/CI/I), Ms. Courtney asks Ranjeet to deliver a message to Mr. Brown, but Ranjeet misunderstands the context of the conversation. When Ms. Courtney introduced herself as Ms. Courtney, Ranjeet thought that it was an invitation to get acquainted, and he introduced himself while offering a handshake. This misunderstanding caused confusion, and Ms. Courtney quickly corrected that she only wanted Ranjeet to deliver a message, not to get acquainted.

Thus, the type of humor used in this data is irony. The irony arises because Ranjeet misunderstands Ms. Courtney's intention as he considers the introduction to be a personal interaction, whereas Ms. Courtney is only focused on the professional purpose of delivering a message. Ranjeet's inability to grasp Ms. Courtney's true intent reinforces the element of irony as there is a discrepancy between what Ms. Courtney expects and the response given by Ranjeet. In addition, this humor also includes cognitive impairment infringing, where Ranjeet makes mistakes not because of language limitations, but because of confusion or unfocus on the context of the conversation.

Finally, in order to see the complete findings, this research formulates the findings using componential analysis so that the research's domain and taxonomy are clearly displayed and the patterns of behavior can be clearly seen. The componential analysis can be seen in the table 1.

Table 1. Infringing as Humor in Mind Your Language: Season 1

Types of Infringing of The Maxims	Types of Humor		TOTAL
	Pun	Irony	
Linguistics Barrier	48	34	82
Cognitive Impairment	2	20	22
TOTAL	50	54	104

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, this research concludes that the sitcom Mind Your Language: Season 1 creates its unintentional humor mostly with linguistics barrier infringing of the maxims. Later on, the linguistics barrier infringing constructs puns and ironies. The construction of humor is created by several steps. The first step is that the utterer mistakenly uses a word and then creates a background laughter. The second step is that the interlocutor tends to tell the utterer the right term of the word. These constructions although they seem similar, but the type of humor is different due to two outcomes. The first type, as shown in the findings, is humor irony, whereas the other type is irony. Finally, this research also concludes MYLS1 relies on the use of unintentional humor to create comedic situation, especially by using the student's language limitation in English which connects to the linguistics barrier infringing.

References

A. Al-ZubeiRy, H. Y. (2020). Violation of Grice's maxims and humorous implicatures in the Arabic comedy Madraset Al-Mushaghbeen. *Dil ve Dilbilimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, *16*(2), 1043–1057. https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.759363.

Aarons, D., & Mierowsky, M. (2017). How to do things with jokes: Speech acts in standup comedy. *The European Journal of Humour Research*, *5*(4), 158–168.

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.

Attardo, S., & Raskin, V. (2017). Linguistics and humor theory. In *The Routledge handbook of language and humor* (pp. 49–63). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315731162-5/linguistics-humor-theory-salvatore-attardo-victor-raskin.

Bischetti, L., Ceccato, I., Lecce, S., Cavallini, E., & Bambini, V. (2023). Pragmatics and theory of mind in older adults' humor comprehension. *Current Psychology*, *42*(19), 16191–16207.

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.

Fubara, S. J. (2020). A pragmatic analysis of the discourse of humour and irony in selected memes on social media. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, *2*(2), 76–95.

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.

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.

Nemesi, A. L. (2020). Semantic and Pragmatic Mechanisms of Humour in Animal Jokes. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, *12*(2), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.2478/ausp-2020-0010.

Rohmadi, M., Sudaryanto, M., & Ulya, C. (2019). The Infringement of Maxim and the Perspective of School Teachers toward the News in Mass Media. *INCOLWIS 2019: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Local Wisdom, INCOLWIS 2019, August 29-30, 2019, Padang, West Sumatera, Indonesia*, 268. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YPv6DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA268&dq=Rohmadi,+M.,+Sudaryanto,+M.,+%26+Ulya,+C.+(2019,+August).+The+Infringement+of+Maxim+and+the+Perspective+of+School+Teachers+toward+the+News+in+Mass+Media.+In+INCOLWIS+2019:+Proceedings+of+the+2nd+International+Conference+on+Local+Wisdom,+INCOLWIS+2019,+August+29-30,+2019,+Padang,+West+Sumatera,+Indonesia+(p.+268).+European+Alliance+for+Innovation.&ots=hMexBvtvuE&sig=62mIvi6Ixnc9lvCb24GRCzZnCuk.

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

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.

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.

Wieczorek, M. (2019). *Humour in relevance theory: A pragmatic analysis of jokes*. University of Natural Sciences and Humanities : Scientific Publishing House of University of Natural Sciences and Humanities.

Copyrights