

**PRAGMATICS OF HUMOR ACROSS CULTURES : STAND-UP
COMEDY OF PANDJI PRAGIWAKSONO AND CHRIS ROCK
THESIS**

By:

Ahmad Fadi Danial Varhan Nugroho

NIM: 210302110068

Advisor:

Dr. Ulil Fitriyah, M.P.d.,M.E.d.

NIP: 198208232023212021



**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK
IBRAHIM MALANG**

2026

**PRAGMATICS OF HUMOR ACROSS CULTURES : STAND-UP
COMEDY OF PANDJI PRAGIWAKSONO AND CHRIS ROCK
THESIS**

Presented to

Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for The Degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S)

By:

Ahmad Fadi Danial Varhan Nugroho

NIM 210302110068

Advisor:

Dr. Ulil Fitriyah, M.P.d.,M.E.d.

NIP: 198208232023212021



**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK
IBRAHIM MALANG**

2026

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

I state that the thesis entitled "Pragmatics of Humor Across Cultures : Stand-Up Comedy Of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock" is my original work. I do not include any materials previously written or published by another person, except those cited as references and written in the bibliography. Hereby, if there is any objection or claim, I am the only person who is responsible for that.

Malang, 11 Juni 2026

The researcher



Ahmad Fadi Danial Varhan Nugroho

NIM 210302110168

APPROVAL SHEET

This is to certify that Ahmad Fadi Danial Varhan Nugroho's thesis entitled
"Pragmatics of Humor Across Cultures : Stand-Up Comedy of Pandji Pragiwaksono and
Chris Rock" has been approved for thesis examination at Faculty of Humanities,
Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, as one of the requirements for
the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S.).

Malang, 11 Juni 2026

Approved by

Advisor,



Dr. Ulil Fitriyah, M.P.d., M.E.d.

NIP: 198208232023212021

Head of Department of

English Literature,



Dr. Agwin Degaf, M.A.

NIP: 198805232015031004

Acknowledged by

Dean



Dr. M. Husol, M.Ag.

NIP: 19781101 2003 12 1 003

LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that Ahmad Fadi Danial Varhan Nugroho's thesis entitled "Pragmatics Of Humor Across Cultures : Stand-Up Comedy of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock" has been approved by the Board of Examiners as one of the requirements for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S.) in department of English Literature.

Malang, 11 Juni 2026

Board of Examiners

Signatures

1. Dr. Ribut Wahyudi, M.Ed., Ph.D (Main Examiner)
NIP. 198112052011011007



2. Dr. Ulil Fitriyah, M.Pd., M.Ed (Advisor)
NIP: 198208232023212021



3. Dr. Ika Fariyah Hentihu, M.Pd (Second Examiner)
NIP. 197003071999032002

Approved by
Dean of Faculty of Humanities



MOTTO

“The only way to do great work is to love what you do”

- Steve Jobs

DEDICATION

Alhamdulillahirabbil ‘alamin, this thesis is dedicated to myself, as a result of my determination and courage to rise again against difficult times at the end of my college journey. The process and tests were not always easy and tested my patience, but I managed to rise above the various obstacles and always strive to give my best.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to my parents, especially my mother, Dina Fatmawati, whose endless love, support, and prayers have enabled me to stand here today. Furthermore, I am equally thankful for my family's vital role in my life, particularly my two grandmothers, Sofiyah and Sri Afiningsih, for their continuous affection. I am also deeply grateful to my extended family including my younger brother Hafizh, my aunt Rina Widayanti, and all other members whose advice and encouragement have always helped me back onto my feet during this life journey.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Ulil Fitriyah, M.Pd., for her guidance, support, and valuable advice throughout the completion of this thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Praise the Almighty, Allah SWT, for guiding and blessing me in accomplishing this thesis entitled **“Pragmatics of Humor Across Cultures: Stand-Up Comedy of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock.”** Sholawat and greetings are always presented to our Prophet Muhammad SAW, who will continue to intercede for all of us until the end of time.

I am deeply grateful to Dr. Ulil Fitriyah, M.Pd., M.Ed., as my supervisor, for her insightful guidance and endless patience. Her unwavering support has made this thesis a journey filled with invaluable lessons and stories I will always cherish.

My sincere thanks go to Dr. Ribut Wahyudi, M.Ed., Ph.D., as the main examiner, whose profound scholarly expertise, critical guidance, and meticulous, thorough corrections have elevated the academic quality and depth of this thesis.

I am also highly grateful to Dr. Ika Farihah Hentihu, M.Pd, as the second examiner, for her essential evaluations, kindness, and suggestions that helped refine this thesis.

I extend my sincere gratitude to all lecturers and staff of the Faculty of Humanities at UIN Malang for the invaluable knowledge and academic support provided throughout my studies. My heartfelt thanks also go to my dearest friends, including my housemates at Pak Antok's, colleagues at Simfoni FM, college classmates, and my longtime friend. To everyone else unmentioned, thank you for your unwavering support and the happy moments shared throughout this journey.

ABSTRACT

Nugroho, Ahmad Fadi Danial Varhan (2026). *Pragmatics of Humor Across Cultures: The Stand-Up Comedy of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock*. Undergraduate Thesis, Department of English Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang. Advisor: Dr. Ulil Fitriyah, M.Pd., M.Ed.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Flouting Maxims, Stand-Up Comedy, High-Context and Low-Context Culture

Stand-up comedy serves as a form of creative communication where humor contains implicit social criticism. This study examines how the flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) occurs naturally in the routines of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock, and how these pragmatic choices reflect their cultural backgrounds through Hall's (1976) framework. Analyzing 20 selected data points, the findings indicate that although both comedians manipulate language to produce humor, substantial differences lie in their execution. Chris Rock exhibits low-context cultural tendencies characterized by aggressive hyperbole and blunt social confrontation, where meaning is explicitly located in the spoken words. In contrast, Pandji Pragiwaksono exhibits high-context cultural tendencies, filtering criticism through abstract metaphors, layered analogies, and linguistic mitigation to maintain interpersonal harmony. However, the data also reveals that their delivery styles are not static or rigidly fixed. Out of 10 data points analyzed for each comedian, Chris Rock is found to employ 2 high-context expressions, while Pandji Pragiwaksono utilizes 3 low-context expressions. This distribution shows that both comedians can adapt and shift their communication patterns to fulfill their specific strategic and creative goals on stage.

ABSTRAK

Nugroho, Ahmad Fadi Danial Varhan (2026) *Pragmatik Humor Lintas Budaya: Stand-Up Comedy Pandji Pragiwaksono dan Chris Rock*. Skripsi Jurusan Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Humaniora, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Pembimbing: Dr. Ulil Fitriyah, M.Pd., M.Ed.

Kata kunci: Pragmatik, Pelanggaran Maksim, Stand-Up Comedy, Budaya Konteks Tinggi dan Konteks Rendah

Komedi tunggal (stand-up comedy) berfungsi sebagai bentuk komunikasi kreatif di mana humor mengandung kritik sosial implisit. Studi ini meneliti bagaimana pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Grice (1975) terjadi secara alami dalam rutinitas Pandji Pragiwaksono dan Chris Rock, dan bagaimana pilihan pragmatis ini mencerminkan latar belakang budaya mereka melalui kerangka kerja Hall (1976). Menganalisis 20 poin data terpilih, temuan menunjukkan bahwa meskipun kedua komedian memanipulasi bahasa untuk menghasilkan humor, perbedaan substansial terletak pada eksekusinya. Chris Rock menunjukkan kecenderungan budaya konteks rendah yang ditandai dengan hiperbola agresif dan konfrontasi sosial yang blak-blakan, di mana makna secara eksplisit terletak pada kata-kata yang diucapkan. Sebaliknya, Pandji Pragiwaksono menunjukkan kecenderungan budaya konteks tinggi, menyaring kritik melalui metafora abstrak, analogi berlapis, dan mitigasi linguistik untuk menjaga keharmonisan antarpribadi. Namun, data juga mengungkapkan bahwa gaya penyampaian mereka tidak statis atau kaku. Dari 10 poin data yang dianalisis untuk setiap komedian, Chris Rock ditemukan menggunakan 2 ekspresi konteks tinggi, sedangkan Pandji Pragiwaksono menggunakan 3 ekspresi konteks rendah. Distribusi ini menunjukkan bahwa kedua komedian tersebut dapat beradaptasi dan mengubah pola komunikasi mereka untuk memenuhi tujuan strategis dan kreatif spesifik mereka di atas panggung.

مستخلص البحث

نوجروهو، أحمد فادي دانيال فارحان (2026) *البراغماتية في الفكاهة عبر الثقافات: الكوميديا الارتجالية لباندجي براغيواكسونو وكريس روك*. رسالة جامعية، قسم الأدب الإنجليزي، كلية الإنسانيات، جامعة مولانا مالك إبراهيم الإسلامية الحكومية مالانغ. المشرقة: د. أوليل فينرياه، ماجستير تربية، ماجستير تعليم

الكلمات المفتاحية: البراغماتية، خرق القواعد الحوارية، الكوميديا الارتجالية، الثقافة عالية السياق ومنخفضة السياق

يُعد فن الكوميديا الارتجالية شكلاً من أشكال التواصل الإبداعي، حيث يتضمن الفكاهة نقدًا اجتماعيًا ضمنيًا. تتناول هذه الدراسة كيفية ظهور انتهاك مبدأ غرايس التعاوني (1975) بشكل طبيعي في عروض كل من باندجي براغيواكسونو وكريس روك، وكيف تعكس هذه الخيارات العملية خلفياتهما الثقافية من خلال إطار هول (1976). وتحليل 20 نقطة بيانات مختارة، تشير النتائج إلى أنه على الرغم من أن كلا الكوميديين يستخدمان اللغة لإنتاج الفكاهة، إلا أن هناك اختلافات جوهرية في أسلوب أدائهما. يُظهر كريس روك ميولاً ثقافية منخفضة السياق تتسم بالمبالغة الحادة والمواجهة الاجتماعية المباشرة، حيث يكمن المعنى صراحةً في الكلمات المنطوقة. في المقابل، يُظهر باندجي براغيواكسونو ميولاً ثقافية عالية السياق، حيث يُصغى النقد من خلال استعارات مجردة، وتشبيهات متعددة الطبقات، وتلطيف لغوي للحفاظ على الانسجام بين الأشخاص. ومع ذلك، تكشف البيانات أيضاً أن أساليب أدائهما ليست ثابتة أو جامدة. من بين عشر نقاط بيانات تم تحليلها لكل كوميدي، تبين أن كريس روك يستخدم تعبيرين ذوي سياق عالٍ، بينما يستخدم باندجي براغيواكسونو ثلاثة تعبيرات ذات سياق منخفض. يُظهر هذا التوزيع أن كلا الكوميديين قادران على تكيف أنماط تواصلهما وتغييرها لتحقيق أهدافهما الاستراتيجية والإبداعية المحددة على المسرح.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS	i
APPROVAL SHEET	Error! Bookmark not defined.
MOTTO	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
ABSTRAK	ix
مستخلص البحث	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background of the Study	1
B. Problems of the Study	12
C. Significance of the Study	13
D. Scope and Limitation	14
E. Definition of Key Terms.....	15
CHAPTER II : REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	17
A. Pragmatics of Humor	17
B. Cooperative Principle	18
1. Maxim of Quantity	20
2. Maxim of Quality	21
3. Maxim of Relevance	21
4. Maxim of Manner.....	22
C. Flouting Maxim.....	22
1. Flouting Maxim of Quantity.....	23
2. Flouting Maxim of Quality.....	24
3. Flouting Maxim of Relevance	25
4. Flouting Maxim of Manner	26
D. High Context and Low Context Communication Theory	30
CHAPTER III : RESEARCH METHOD.....	36
A. Research Design.....	36
B. Research Instruments.....	37
C. Data & Data Sources	37

D. Data Collection	38
E. Data Analysis	38
CHAPTER IV : FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	40
A. Findings	40
1. Types of Flouting in Chris Rock & Pandji Pragiwaksono	40
1.1 Flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle by Chris Rock	40
1.2 Flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle by Pandji Pragiwaksono	51
2. Cultural Reflection of Flouting Maxims.....	60
2.1 Chris Rock Data Analysis	60
2.2 Pandji Pragiwaksono Data Analysis.....	69
B. Discussion	77
CHAPTER V : CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	97
A. Conclusion	97
B. SUGGESTION.....	99
REFERENCES	101
CURRICULUM VITAE	104
APPENDIXES	105

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The first chapter of the study is the introduction, providing a general overview related to the title. The researcher organizes the study into five chapters, which include the background of the study, research questions, significance of the study, scope and limitations, and the definition of key terms.

A. Background of the Study

Laughter is one of the results of stand-up comedy performances that rely on language. From discussing preferences and daily activities to discussing culture. Stand-up comedy performances have always evolved in every era and are also used as a medium for conveying politics, cultural stigma, and discrimination. Mocking someone is also often used to elicit laughter. Stand up comedy is a form of entertainment whose success lies in the power of language and delivery to create humorous effects (Joser et al., 2023). The freedom in conveying the content of stand-up comedy performances is not always well received by the audience. For example, during the 2022 Oscar Awards ceremony, Chris Rock made a joke about Will Smith's wife, which led to Will Smith slapping him on stage in front of a large audience.

Not only does this happen abroad, comedian Kiky Saputri also became the talk of Indonesia when she dared to make jokes criticizing officials, which elicited various responses. This serves as evidence that the reactions from the audience reflect how humor can be a double-edged sword in public spaces. The implicit

meaning within humor requires contextual understanding to function effectively, highlighting its sensitive nature and cultural dependence. These varied reactions are a key point of interest in pragmatic analysis.

The pragmatic approach in this study of stand-up comedy humor serves as the main foundation used to understand how humor works, its purpose, and even its implicit meaning, especially in a cross-cultural context. According to Levinson (1983) a statement has an implicit meaning that is shaped by its context and purpose, not just its literal meaning. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies how language is implemented and used in specific contexts.

In everyday life, jokes and humor are inseparable, as if they are part of life, and this is also true in stand-up comedy performances. According to Grice (1975), humor is created when the speaker deliberately flout the principles of cooperation by breaking the maxims, namely quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, in order to build a punchline and laughter. In line with what Chiaro (1992) stated, a humorous atmosphere is created when there is ambiguous meaning resulting from linguistic features. In the world of stand-up comedy, this is often seen in every line. Comedians consciously and deliberately play with language to create irony, satire, and even ridicule.

Furthermore, the uniqueness of stand-up comedy will be more diverse if we explore how speakers with different cultural backgrounds use humor, the types of material they tend to use, and how they use patterns to understand it, because humor develops from pragmatic aspects such as these. According to Hall (1976),

he divides culture into two types: low context culture and high context culture. Implicit meaning, indirect communication styles, and knowledge sharing are characteristics of high-context cultures, while low-context cultures rely more on direct communication styles, explicit information, and rationality. High-context cultures are typical of Asian countries, while low-context cultures are typical of the United States.

Based on these issues, this study focus on analyzing the sentences used by Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock in their stand up comedy performances to build jokes by flout maxims, after which we examine how their speech represents their respective cultural backgrounds. In line with what Grice said in his Cooperative Principle Theory (1975), from a stand-up comedy perspective, success often lies in deliberately flouting communication norms. Pandji Pragiwaksono was chosen as the subject of this study because he is known as a comedian who dares to explore stand-up performances abroad in English, without forgetting to combine language and culture, while Chris Rock was chosen because he is a comedian who consistently incorporates cultural, linguistic, and social reality elements into his speech.

Several previous studies have explored how humor interacts with cultural frameworks and communication patterns, functionally grouped into global cross-cultural dynamics and specific regional pragmatics. In the first group of global cross-cultural studies, Jiang et al. (2019) conducted a systematic review of the empirical literature, including data from the Implicit Association Tests (IAT), to

compare Eastern and Western attitudes toward humor. They established empirical evidence that Westerners explicitly view humor as a natural, positive coping mechanism against stress, and conversely, Eastern cultures heavily influenced by Confucian values show a strong reversal of humor due to fears about their social status. Complementing this macro perspective, Korac-Kakabadse et al. (2001) mapped the behavioral boundaries of cross-cultural encounters by analyzing three cameo case studies and integrating Hall's (1976) context continuum and Hofstede's individualism-collectivism dimension. This study details that low-context individualistic systems systematically prioritize absolute textual accuracy, whereas high-context collective interactions rely heavily on situational reading, where speaking indirectly or using ambiguous language is used as a conscious strategy to avoid direct confrontation.

Furthermore, in previous research that focused on the pragmatic application of humor as a tool of ideological and social critique, Ruiz-Gurillo and Linares-Bernabéu (2019) analyzed 25 monologues divided into 113 humorous sequences delivered by two female stand-up comedians in Spain. Their analysis demonstrated that the comedians manipulated specific discourse strategies such as role-play, quips, and wordplay to produce subversive effects that challenged heteronormative standards and the status quo through their stand-up comedy. Locally, Lesmana (2017) classified texts containing elements of ridicule (ridicule) in contemporary Indonesian media. Using classic humor typologies such as *al-qalbu wa al-aksu* (reversing reality) and *al-ijabat ghayr al-mathlub* (answers that do not match the question), Lesmana determined that humor in Indonesia largely

functions as a platform for presenting entertaining yet non-confrontational humor, wrapped in more subtle satire to convey social criticism in order to maintain public harmony. Synthesizing these group studies, both serve as a vital comparative framework for this research to see how Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono in their stand up comedy styles as individuals with different cultural backgrounds.

Raharja and Rosyidha (2019) applied in qualitative methods to explore the dynamics of stand-up comedy in a local context. Analyzing data consisting of 17 videos of Dodit Mulyanto's performances in Stand Up Comedy Indonesia Season 4, this study tracked violations of Grice's principles. Their research found 49 violations of the cooperative principle across all types of maxims, with violations of the maxim of relationship emerging as the most dominant pattern at 44.9%. These dominant violations occurred because comedians deliberately diverted messages that were completely inappropriate to the ongoing topic, changed topics abruptly, or established false cause-and-effect relationships to trigger audience laughter. Raharja and Rosyidha's study provides a crucial linguistic foundation for this research to structurally evaluate how the cooperative principle is violated by comedians like Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono to fulfill their comedic and performance goals.

More in-depth research on language, ethnic identity, and cultural representation in the Indonesian comedy landscape was explored by Setyaningsih (2016). Using a qualitative approach, Setyaningsih explored the phenomenon of ethnic stereotypes in stand-up comedy presentations by analyzing three

performance videos from three different comedians from Kompas TV's Stand-up Comedy Indonesia (SUCI) Season 3. This study specifically focused on three different cultural backgrounds: the Batak ethnicity represented by Bene Dionysius, the Madurese ethnicity by Aditya Muslim, and Eastern Indonesia by Arie Kriting. Her analysis showed that each comedian's ethnic background significantly influenced their style of delivering jokes. Of these three comedians, each with their own unique style and topics such as the communication style of the Batak people, the characteristics of Madurese work, and the socio-economic conditions of Eastern Indonesia as a means to express cultural pride while drawing national attention to the social issues facing their ethnic groups, Setyaningsih's findings provide a vital socio-cultural foundation for this study to evaluate how the diverse biological and ethnic backgrounds of modern comedians such as Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono are naturally embedded in their delivery styles.

Previous research also focused on domestic comedians, Firdaus et al. (2018) conducted a qualitative study using content analysis of Pragiwaksono's 120-minute special performance titled 'Mesakke Bangsaku'. This study identified 102 linguistic data, determining that the category of cynicism emerged as the most dominant pattern at 38.23% (39 data), followed closely by sarcasm at 36.27% (37 data). Their findings demonstrated that Pragiwaksono relies heavily on rhetorical devices to convey ideological critiques regarding marginalization, disability rights, and the systemic failure of national education. and Leonardo and Junaidi (2020) dedicated their research to evaluating Pandji Pragiwaksono as the main subject of linguistic and social observation. This research investigates

'Pragiwaksono World Tour' using Ferdinand de Saussure's semiotic framework by selecting 9 critical routines and cross-validating their interpretations through comprehensive interviews with Coki Pardede, they show that stand-up comedy effectively functions as a highly structured counter-hegemonic medium for public critique rather than simply surface entertainment.

In terms of looking at the comparison of cross-cultural humor with studies on regional humor, there is a previous study by Triandana and Afria (2023) Exploring how Chris Rock packages his humor communication style by applying qualitative methods. This study also collected data from the documentary of Chris Rock's global tour 'Kill the Messenger' which was located during his performances in Johannesburg, New York, and London. This study found that although Chris Rock structurally flout all four maxims under Grice's cooperative principle, violations of the maxim of quality more frequently emerged as the most dominant strategy in presenting humor. Hyperbole and untrue fictional things were often used in his performances. Triandana and Afria's study provides a vital structural foundation for this study to directly explore how flouting of maxims represent different pragmatic frameworks between speakers like Chris Rock and domestic speakers like Pandji Pragiwaksono.

Winarsih (2020) in her research also emphasized that cultural identity is one of the factors that shapes humor in Indonesian stand-up comedy. Winarsih stated that family background, identity, social groups, or communities are also part of cultural elements. Stand-up comedy is not just an ordinary performance but a

cultural product. Winarsih's research also only focuses on the domestic context and does not examine how it differs from speakers of different nationalities, as will be explored in this study.

Still within the same category of local Indonesian stand-up comedy, a study by Afidah and Wahyudi (2014) further explored these domestic dynamics by conceptualizing the stand-up stage as a collaborative production between the speaker and the audience. Their study highlighted that local comedians tactfully manage specific sociocultural elements, ethnic stereotypes, and religious identity markers such as utilizing the Islamic greeting *Assalamu'alaikum* to activate the background knowledge of Indonesian viewers and establish *panggung* closeness. While Afidah and Wahyudi (2014) provided important insights into the structured interaction of local acts, a gap remains regarding how these cultural identity markers are renegotiated and shifted when a comedian performs outside their home country in front of an entirely foreign audience.

Puspasari and Ariyanti (2019) applied qualitative content analysis comparing Indonesian and American stand-up comedy. This study used video transcript data from YouTube, with Abrud Arsyad as the Indonesian comedian and Kevin Hart as the American comedian. The pragmatic findings of this study show differences between the two. Kevin Hart predominantly flout the maxim of quantity, which is reflected in the direct nature of American communication. On the other hand, as an Indonesian comedian, Abdur Arsyad primarily violates the maxim of quality. He appears to have a pattern of indirect and implicit communication norms

deeply rooted in Indonesian culture. Despite the dominant differences in the violated maxims, both actors similarly use humorous techniques, including paralanguage, ridicule, and satire, to construct humor. Puspasari and Ariyanti (2019) argue that these technical similarities are largely driven by their shared backgrounds as minorities in their home countries. Abdur represents Eastern Indonesia and Hart is an African-American who structurally weaponizes social criticism and minority anxieties as their primary comedic material. Unlike previous studies that present Grice's theory alone, this study fills the gap by integrating high-context and low-context theories in addition to Grice's theory, this study provides a more systematic framework to explore how violations of the cooperative principle reflect the culture and rules of information processing that are rooted among Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono.

Based on the previous studies described above, various studies have been conducted and have contributed to the field of pragmatics, especially stand-up comedy. Flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle are necessary in creating humor, and this success depends on the manner of delivery, the type of material, and the speaker's background. Of all the previous studies that discuss stand-up comedy from a linguistic perspective, there are still few studies that explore it more deeply through Hall's framework of Low and High Context communication. This study will complement this gap by combining Grice's cooperative principle theory (1975) as the main analytical tool and then integrating it with Hall's cultural communication theory. This study explore how implicatures or intentions and even stand-up material are shaped by the cultural preferences of the speaker. Thus, Pandji

Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock were chosen to see how the speaker's communication style influences the pragmatic realization of humor created in jokes.

In research on humor, this study acknowledges that, from a modern pragmatic perspective, there are several alternative frameworks besides Grice's theory, such as the Relevance Theory proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995). In its development, this relevance theory has the ability to reduce flouting maxims into a single cognitive principle that focuses on minimizing the mental cognitive effort received by the listener, while the direction of analysis of this study has a different orientation. This study has Grice's cooperative principle with the main objective of systematically exploring explicit textual strategies, wordplay and mechanical variations used by comedians to construct their humorous situations and utterances. This Grice theoretical framework provides four different maxims, such as quantity, quality, relation and manner that allow for the mapping of linguistic data. Using these four categories, the research direction can identify how certain types of violations directly correspond to or reflect the cultural delivery style of the speaker, in this case stand-up comedy or comics. Therefore, the selection of this theory has the right structural impetus in handling the micro-linguistic and macro-cultural complexities in stand-up comedy utterances.

The application of Grice's theoretical framework to stand up comedy utterances has also been supported and accepted through the substantial emphasis on this theory explicitly put forward by Grice. In his theory, Grice (1975) clearly states, "one of my avowed aims is to view speaking as a special case or variety of

purposive, even rational, behavior." Grice establishes an analytical standard whereby every human interaction fully meets the requirements of his theory as long as it operates as a purposeful and rational endeavor or activity connecting speaker and hearer. In this case, "purposive" behavior means that activity involves conscious effort and the achievement of a goal, while "rational" behavior means using structured and systematic mechanisms designed to be expressed by the other party. Grice even demonstrates the universality of this umbrella theory, which is not limited to conversation.

In his theory, Grice provides strong empirical examples by extending it to aspects of human transactions other than conversational exchanges, stating that "the specific expectations or assumptions associated with at least some of the above maxims have their analogues in the realm of transactions other than conversational exchanges." Grice gives examples such as the activities of two individuals who do not even speak a single word to each other, but are silent but help repair a car, or activities in the kitchen making a cake, where these activities must also comply with maxims.

Within this Cooperative Principle theory, through Grice's inclusion of non-verbal transactions and his overarching analytical standardization of purposive and rational behavior, the operational parameters for data selection are objectively established. A stand-up comedy performance completely satisfies these exact criteria; it is an inherently rational and purposive transaction where the comedian deploys structured linguistic codes and deliberate semantic distortions with the

specific goal of evoking humor, while the the audience actively decode them to find comedic meaning. Furthermore, because both the comedian and the audience interact within a mutually accepted direction, the monologic performance structurally functions as a valid communicative contract under Grice's original framework.

By combining Grice's cooperative principle with Hall's (1976) Cultural Context concept, this study can analyze the linguistic structure and cultural background of comedians simultaneously. While Grice's maxim focuses on how a comedian violates the cooperative principle to create humor, which will then be viewed from the perspective of High Context and Low Context, exploring how the cultural background behind the delivery style. Hall created this theory to analyze and map cross-cultural communication in order to avoid unconscious cultural conflicts due to differences. Hall's theory has academic accuracy to be used in this theory because it provides the right analytical tool to map the cross cultural gap between Chris Rock from the United States and Pandji Pragiwaksono from Indonesia. Therefore, combining these two theories provides a strong foundation to prove that maxim violations are not just random linguistic deviations, but can be a reflection of the speaker's unconscious cultural style.

B. Problems of the Study

Following the background description, the researcher aims to answer the study problems presented below.

1. What kinds of flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle naturally occur within the stand-up comedy routines of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock?
2. How do the flouting of maxims in the stand up performances of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock reflect their respective cultural backgrounds?

C. Significance of the Study

The findings of this study are expected to provide valuable insights and practical benefits for several parties in the fields of pragmatics and cross cultural communication. First, this analysis provides concrete examples of the flouting of maxims in real world creative discourse, which can be highly useful as a reference and case study for linguistic researchers and students. It offers an empirical illustration of how Grice's Cooperative Principle can be applied to analyze monologue data, specifically within the stand-up comedy genre.

Second, this study can help audiences, language learners, and comedy enthusiasts understand that cultural backgrounds can significantly reflect how humor is constructed and interpreted. By contrasting the performances of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock, this research offers a practical understanding of how specific cultural contexts namely Indonesian high-context culture and American low-context culture shape delivery styles, choices of topics, and the realization of implicit meanings embedded within comedic utterances.

D. Scope and Limitation

This research analyzes how humor in stand up comedy are constructed through flouting of the Cooperation Principle, using Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock as the main subjects. By identifying the types of flouting maxims used, this study reflects the identity or cultural background of the speakers. Selected remarks were taken from their stand up comedy performances available to the public, which became the main data in this study.

This study examines the types of flouting of the principles of cooperation, including quantity, quality, relevance, and manner in creating jokes in their implicatures. This is relevant because humor strategies are often used in comedy shows, ranging from wordplay, ambiguities, and even ridicule. It then relates this to Hall's low and high communication theories.

This study has limited scope in its analysis. First, this study does not cover body gestures, facial expressions of the speaker, or even audience responses, but only focuses on the speaker's verbal sentences through videos available to the public. This study relies on transcripts available in the videos. Second, this study does not include live performances or spontaneous improvisations and direct interactions with the audience. Therefore, the limitations of this study prevent it from being used as a benchmark or standard for other research subjects or other types of comedy performances. Further research with different research subjects is needed.

E. Definition of Key Terms

1. **Pragmatics of humor** : Pragmatics is a discipline of linguistics that investigates how context influences meaning. Pragmatics looks at how language is employed in certain social settings and how speakers' intentions influence communication.
2. **Cooperative Principle** : Explains how communication actions are rationally understood so that the purpose of exchanging information can be achieved effectively. This principle consists of four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Flouting of these maxims create certain implied meanings that create humor.
3. **High-Context & Low-Context** : High-Context and Low-Context Communication: A concept introduced by Hall (1976) that is used to map and see how different cultures convey their messages with their own communication styles. High-Context Communication (HC) is a style of speech in which the meaning is not stated directly, is conveyed implicitly and avoids confrontation. In contrast, Low-Context Communication (LC) is a style of speech in which the message must be said clearly, directly, and frankly without any hidden meaning.
4. **Chris Rock** : An American stand-up comedian born and raised in South Carolina, USA, in 1965. Both of his parents were also born in South Carolina. He has African-American ancestry through his great-grandparents. In this study, Chris Rock was chosen as an international subject to examine his communication style in stand-up comedy.

5. Pandji Pragiwaksono : An Indonesian stand-up comedian born in 1979 with a Javanese (Kebumen) and Sumatran (Pagar Alam) family background, he was chosen as a domestic subject in this study to examine his comedic style in creating humor in stand-up comedy.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Pragmatics of Humor

Pragmatics is an important subfield of linguistics for exploring how language has meaning and is used in actual communication, which depends on a specific context. This branch of linguistics plays a vital role because meaning does not only come from spoken words but can also be formed according to the context and purpose of the communication. Attardo (2020) in *Linguistics of Humor*, in subsection 8 entitled “Pragmatics of Humor,” he defines that humor cannot exist without elements of implicature or meaning, which also depend on the social and communicative context. In order to understand humor, pragmatic skills are needed to help understand the purpose and context conveyed, both implicitly and explicitly. According to Yule (1996), pragmatics studies how speakers use language to achieve certain goals and how listeners interpret the intended meaning, which often goes beyond the literal interpretation of words.

Levinson (1983) defines pragmatics as the field of study concerning how language is applied in social interaction, emphasizing the role of the speaker, the listener, and the context of the situation in creating meaning. Furthermore, Yule (1996) provides a framework for a more comprehensive understanding of pragmatics through four main definitions: (1) the study of language as used by speakers and interpreted by listeners, which emphasizes the active role of both parties; (2) the exploration of contextual meaning, which studies how the surrounding situation shapes the interpretation of speech; (3) the investigation of

how the speaker's speech is understood, which focuses on the cognitive processes involved in understanding language; and (4) the analysis of expression in communication, which emphasizes how spatial and social distance shapes the use and meaning of language.

It can be concluded from the opinions of experts that pragmatics is the study of how language can be used for a specific communicative purpose, either literally or through social conventions that govern the meaning of communication. Unlike other linguistic disciplines that explore the internal structure of language, such as phonology, morphology, and semantics, pragmatics emphasizes research on how language is used dynamically to help achieve communicative goals in social interactions, the relationship between speakers and listeners, and their intentions and purposes. In addition, pragmatics also covers understanding how unwritten rules, such as cultural norms, can shape the style and use of language in communication situations.

B. Cooperative Principle

The principle of cooperation was conceived by British linguist H.P. Grice, serving as a basic analytical framework for understanding how meaning is conveyed non literally in communication. This principle defines that speakers in a communication generally adhere to certain maxims. Grice categorizes these into four main maxims: the maxim of quality, which focuses on the importance of honesty and providing accurate and precise information; the maxim of quantity, which requires speakers to be informative and not to exaggerate or understate information; third, the maxim of relation, which emphasizes that speakers must be

relevant in communication, and finally, the maxim of manner, which requires clarity so as not to be ambiguous in communication.

These four maxims must be followed and adhered to as guiding principles for effective and logical communication in order to avoid miscommunication. According to Grice (1975), these rules for efficient and effective communication are known as the Cooperative Principle. Grice explains that speakers must follow these principles when interacting with others in order to produce high quality communication. Grice also explained and did not limit this principle to spoken dialogue. Rather, it essentially applies to all rational human interactions and purposeful exchanges of information, including non-verbal transactions.

"As one of my avowed aims is to see talking as a special case or variety of purposive, indeed rational, behavior, it may be worth noting that the specific expectations or presumptions connected with at least some of the foregoing maxims have their analogues in the sphere of transactions that are not talk exchanges. I list briefly one such analog for each conversational category."

Grice stated that speaking is a form of rational and purposeful human behavior. Therefore, this theory focuses on analyzing and exploring various forms of human behavior as long as they are rational and purposeful. Grice also included non-verbal activities in his theory, such as the activity of people working together to bake a cake. If one person needs sugar for the cake, the other person should not give them salt, or when they need a spoon, they should not give them a fake rubber spoon.

Levinson (1983) also emphasizes that these maxims of cooperation play a crucial role in improving the effectiveness of human communication or vice versa, because these maxims provide a structured approach to information that can be processed rationally and understood based on its context. By following these

maxims, speakers will be able to create a clear communication atmosphere and meaningful information. In the perspective of stand-up comedy, comedians act in the opposite way, where they deliberately violate these principles to achieve certain goals.

In line with what Attardo (2020) said, in certain contexts, ignoring this maxim can also help in achieving certain communicative goals, such as humor, thereby enriching the complexity of communication. Not only used in everyday conversation, the use of this Cooperation principle has a wide scope, such as academic discussions, professional interactions, and various other forms of communication, including stand-up comedy.

1. Maxim of Quantity

The definition proposed by Grice states that the maxim of quantity requires every speaker to follow two rules. First, to contribute as much or as little as is required by the listener. Second, speakers are required not to contribute too much and to meet the needs of the listener. The following is an example of the maxim of quantity.

A : "Where's your phone?"

B : "On the table."

B contributes only as much information as A needs. Thus, B follows the maxim of quantity. Avoids being excessive by not saying something like, *"It's on the table near the window next to the blue book I bought yesterday,"* and B also avoids being insufficient by simply saying, *"Somewhere in the room."*

2. Maxim of Quality

Based on the principles of quality, speakers are required to provide information that is accurate or truthful, clear, and strongly supported by evidence. Examples of the principles of quality can be seen in the following conversation.

A : "Did you bring my bag?"

B : "Yes, I put it on your desk this morning."

B response adheres to the maxim of quality because provides information that he believes to be true and for which he has adequate evidence. He does not say something he knows is false (e.g., "*No, I never saw it*" if B actually did bring the bag), nor does He guess or make an unsupported claim (e.g., "*Maybe it's somewhere in your room*" *without being sure*). The maxim of quality requires that a speaker only says what they genuinely believe to be true and for which they have sufficient justification.

3. Maxim of Relevance

Speakers are expected to provide information or contributions that are relevant and appropriate to the communication situation, which is the definition of the principle of relevance. This principle can help to understand communication that is initially unclear. Examples of the principle of relevance are as follows.

A : "Are you coming to the meeting this afternoon?"

B : "Yes, I'll be there at 3 PM."

In this conversation, it is clear that response B is relevant to question A, answering clearly and without confusion, and certainly not giving an answer that is

unrelated to what A said. For example, if B had answered “I just woke up” or “The weather is very windy today.” In order to avoid unclear conversations, speakers need to understand the principle of relevance so that communication can proceed effectively and clearly.

4. Maxim of Manner

This maxim manner expects speakers to follow it by providing concise and organized information so that it can be understood, is not ambiguous, and is not convoluted. For example, when following this principle, speakers are expected not to say anything complex that is difficult to understand, as in the following example:

A : "Where should I put this package?"

B : "Put it on the brown table near the window."

B answer is clear, straight to the point and unambiguous. B specifically mentions *"the brown table near the window"*, so that A knows exactly where to put the package. B avoids confusing answers such as *"It's up to you"*. Because its make ambiguity.

C. Flouting Maxims

Grice (1975) emphasizes that users of this principle must adhere to these four maxims in order to make communication effective and clear. However, in practice, this principle is not always adhered to in order to achieve certain goals, therefore, some people must flout this maxim principle. When speakers ignore these maxims, it creates a surprise effect, or misunderstanding on the part of the listener, which has its own implications and purposes. In understanding meanings that do not

conform to these maxims, it is necessary to understand both the linguistic elements and the background between the listener and the speaker (Coulthard, 1997). Various objectives depend on the communication situation, which makes this complex and interesting, especially when there is miscommunication and the listener fails to draw conclusions from the conversation. Gazdar (1980) states that failure or violation of this maxim does not mean that communication is unsuccessful, but rather that the listener must be more careful and understand the meaning behind this violation of the maxim. Flouting of the maxim are divided as follows.

1. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Flouting the quantity maxim is equivalent to the speaker providing too little or too much information than is necessary. Nadar (2013) states that speakers are expected to provide appropriate information, neither too little nor too much, in order for communication to be effective. In addition, Yule (2006) also states that conversations should be informative as requested and, secondly, should not make the communication situation more informative, which would render it ineffective.

From the definitions provided by the experts mentioned above, the conclusion regarding the definition of maximum quantity is that users are expected to follow it and not provide insufficient or excessive information. If the opposite occurs, it can be categorized as a violation of maximum quantity, as in the example below.

A : "How was the party last night?"

B : "good."

Here A asks for a description or more information about the party, expecting a more detailed response, such as *“It was fun because we danced and ate a lot of food.”* However, B only provides a very short, vague response with *“good.”* This flouts the maxim of quantity, as it gives Due to lack of information from the questions given. The expected level of detail would have been more extensive, and by offering such a brief answer, B fails to meet the conversational expectations, leaving A to infer that B might not want to share much more about the party.

2. Flouting Maxim of Quality

The idea of flouting the principle of quality occurs when the speaker presents information that is not consistent with the facts. Yule (2006) emphasizes three points in the principle of quality: first, when saying something, provide correct/accurate information; second, do not say something that is wrong; and finally, do not say something if you do not have strong or sufficient evidence.

In general, experts define flouting quality principles as meaning that the speaker lies or gives false information to the listener. They convey information that is not supported by evidence. Using words that may have two meanings and encouraging listeners to interpret the meaning of the statement is also a violation of quality principles. For example:

A : “How was the food at the new restaurant?”

B : “Oh, it was so good, I think it could cure a broken heart!”

In the conversation above, B clearly says something that is untrue and unrealistic in order to express how delicious the food is. B makes a false/incorrect claim about the food “curing a broken heart.” He says this hyperbolically and it is

not factual. This sentence is an example of a quality violation because B is not telling the truth, as the food literally cannot heal a broken heart.

3. Flouting Maxim of Relevance

The importance of relevance in communication is the basis of the maxim of relevance. Rahardi (2005) states that users must provide information that is relevant to the topic being discussed, rather than providing irrelevant information. When users violate this maxim, it will cause confusion.

From the definition provided by Grice and Rahardi, it can be said that this type of violation actually has a simple rule: just be relevant, do not provide information that is not relevant to the topic being discussed. When this maxim is violated, it will cause the listener to seek interpretation of the statement and sometimes lead to misunderstanding, as in the example below.

A : “Hey, have you finished the report for the meeting?”

B : “Oh, did you know they’re opening a new café downtown? I heard their coffee is amazing.”

Notice how B answers A's question. In the conversation, it is clear that B's answer is not relevant to what was asked, and therefore irrelevant. In this case, A needs more information about the meeting results, not information about a new cafe in the city center or about coffee, which A did not mention at all. The change of topic diverted by B could have the implicit meaning that he is not ready to discuss the meeting results or that he wants the conversation to be less formal and more relaxed.

Regardless of whether B says that this has its own implications and reasons, when the speaker does not answer the question directly and precisely as asked, this is a violation of the maxim of relevance. Ignoring this principle can be clearly and easily seen when B diverts directly without any intermediary first.

4. Flouting Maxim of Manner

The last maxim is maxim manner, which emphasizes that users are required to convey information that is unambiguous, clear, and without unnecessary or convoluted details. Yule (2006) states that maxim manner requires four things to be followed, namely: do not say anything that is unclear; second, avoid ambiguity; be concise when speaking; and last but not least, do so regularly. This is supported by Rahardi (2005), who states that the maxim of politeness has guidelines whereby communication must be clear and direct.

Based on this definition, it can be concluded that this manner violation occurs when the user does not ensure that what is conveyed is easily understood or creates an ambiguous situation with its irregularity. For example, using ambiguous language that is unclear, which ultimately confuses the listener as to what is meant. An example is as follows.

A : "What time does the meeting start?"

B : "Well, it's after lunch, sometime when people are awake and ready.

In the conversation above, it is clear that what B said was ambiguous and unclear, which confused A with his answer. B did not say the right thing to answer A's question. For example, he answered "4 p.m." or "after lunch, at 2:30 p.m." This

ambiguity made B's answer unclear. This violates the maxim of manner by not providing a clear and easily understandable answer.

D. Critique of Grice's Cooperative Principle

Epistemologically, although Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) has become a very dominant foundation in mapping how implied meaning (implicature) is produced through linguistic interaction, this theory is not free from analytical debate. As a product of philosophical thought, the maxim formula formulated by Grice is often considered too idealistic because it assumes that all humans operate under the corridor of uniform communication rationality. When this theory is pulled out of the vacuum and confronted with the reality of practical everyday communication or in the heterogeneous cross-cultural realm and artistic discourse full of distortions such as stand-up comedy, significant methodological gaps emerge. Therefore, in order to avoid simplifying the analysis in this thesis, it is important to review the limitations of Grice's Theory through two critical perspectives proposed by previous studies, namely from the sociocultural dimension (Keenan, 1976) and the cognitive-methodological dimension (Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

The first fundamental criticism of Grice's Cooperative Principle focuses on the bias of Western ethnocentrism and the lack of universality of his maxims. Grice's theory (1975) was born and formulated in the socio-cultural environment of Western academic communities, especially in England. This framework of thought operates under the fundamental assumption that human communication is essentially driven by the ideal economic efficiency of language, where information is viewed as a commodity that must be exchanged as clearly, honestly, and efficiently as possible.

However, the linguistic anthropologist, Keenan (1976), challenged this idea. Through his field research, Keenan proved that conversational maxims are actually very tied to a particular cultural system and cannot be generalized to all non-Western societies. Through an empirical study of the Malagasy-speaking community in Madagascar, Keenan discovered a speech phenomenon that completely contradicts Grice's Maxims of Quantity and Maxims of Manner. In the social order of Malagasy society, new information or information of social value is considered a rare commodity and must be closely guarded; Sharing information openly, directly, or completely is considered socially irresponsible, presumptuous, or a violation of interpersonal privacy.

In everyday interactions, a Malagasy speaker asked about the whereabouts of a family member is likely to give a deliberately vague and circumlocutory answer, such as stating that the person is "somewhere not here" or "resembles someone at the market." If analyzed through a strict Gricean lens, this utterance would immediately be classified as a pragmatic failure or a deliberate flouting of the Maxim of Quantity aimed at deception or uncooperativeness. However, within their local communication framework, such indirectness is a necessary politeness strategy to avoid social demands and maintain community harmony. The readability of the implied meaning here is not driven by an abstract adherence to information cooperation, but rather by a collective sensitivity to social taboos.

The second major criticism targets the internal structural design of the Cooperative Principle itself, specifically its categorization of the four maxims of conversation and their tendency to overlap when applied to the analysis of empirical

data. Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson (1995), developing Relevance Theory, argue that Grice's division of conversational rules into four autonomous boxes of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner is an artificial, overly mechanical model that does not reflect human cognitive reality. In spontaneous, real-life communication, the human brain does not process incoming messages by fitting them one by one into four separate lists of maxims. Instead, Sperber and Wilson assert that human communication is governed by one absolute cognitive principle: the search for optimal relevance, which is achieved when the brain achieves the greatest benefit (cognitive effect) from information with the least possible thought effort (processing effort). Because Grice's maxims do not operate in isolation within human psychology, a manipulation or deviation from one maxim almost always triggers a domino effect that further undermines the constraints of the other maxims, thus leading to chronic methodological overlap.

Sperber and Wilson explain that the Maxim of Quality (truthfulness) is key. If a speaker decides to lie or exaggerate something, then the Maxim of Quantity (amount of information) and the Maxim of Manner (clarity) will automatically be disturbed. This overlapping phenomenon most often occurs in stage comedy language. For example, when a comedian uses extreme hyperbole (crazy exaggeration of the story) for the sake of a punchline, his statement clearly violates the Maxim of Quality because what he says is not factually true.

E. High Context and Low Context Communication Theory

The theory of high-context and low-context communication was first proposed by Hall (1976). Hall developed this theoretical framework as a strategic tool for mapping cross-cultural communication patterns and for preventing interpersonal conflicts or deep cultural misunderstandings caused by differences in the way messages are conveyed. Within this theoretical framework, Hall introduced and divided cultures into two categories: low-context and high-context, which have different communication styles. Hall stated that cultural differences also have different communication style characteristics. According to Hall, Low context is dominated by countries such as the United States and Europe, while high context is dominated by countries such as Japan and other Asian countries. The contribution of this theoretical framework is very important because it provides the characteristics of these two cultures. High-context culture has a communication style where messages are implicit, indirect, and dependent on social context and collective habits, avoiding direct confrontation. In contrast to high-context culture, low-context culture has a communication style that is explicit, straightforward, and clear, making it easier to understand.

More specifically, the main classifications in high-context cultures are divided as follows: first, indirect communication patterns and styles, which tend to be implicit and suggestive in meaning; second, a high dependence on nonverbal elements, such as facial expressions, voice intonation, and body language; third, prioritizing values of harmony and togetherness over direct confrontation, and fourth, interpersonal relationships that tend to be long-term and group-oriented.

These four main characteristics are the characteristics of high-context cultures seen in countries such as Japan and other Asian countries.

Unlike high context, low context cultures have the opposite characteristics. First, communication is direct, open, and straightforward. Second, messages are conveyed explicitly, boldly, and logically. Third, honesty and individualism are prioritized. Fourth, there is a tendency to separate the content of communication from social relationships. In general, this low-context communication style is clearer and more direct without needing to consider other people's feelings; the most important thing is to convey messages explicitly and logically.

These behavioral differences are closely related to the distinct historical and structural foundations that shape how each culture communicates. High-context cultures, typically found in Eastern societies, traditionally evolved from deeply rooted agrarian communities. In these societies, people live in stable, long-term communal environments where everyone shares a common history, social norms, and hierarchical structures. Because these communities are highly interconnected, maintaining group harmony, social relationships, and collective civility is a top priority. As Jiang, Li, and Hou (2019) explain, this is also why Eastern cultures tend to have an ambivalent attitude toward humor, as traditional philosophies like Confucianism value seriousness and restraint over blunt expression. Aggressive or overly direct jokes are seen as a dangerous disruption to social balance and the dynamics of maintaining face. Therefore, because everyone already shares a common cultural background, messages do not need to be explicitly explained; instead, communication relies heavily on implicit meanings, shared context, and

subtle linguistic mitigation to convey criticism without escalating to open confrontation.

On the other hand, low-context cultures, prevalent in Western societies like the United States, have historically been shaped by highly diverse, migrant, and individualistic populations. In these societies, people from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds must interact and conduct business with one another without sharing a common past or a set of unwritten social rules. To avoid confusion, the burden of communication shifts entirely to the spoken word, requiring messages to be highly explicit, direct, and transparent. According to Jiang, Li, and Hou (2019), these environments foster individualistic values where humor is celebrated as a positive personal trait, a sign of creativity, and a tool for coping with personal problems. Westerners are much more open to using confrontational or aggressive styles of humor because their social structures highly value personal independence, assertiveness, and a willingness to break down social hierarchies. In these low-context environments, the primary goal of communication is not to protect collective sentiment at all costs, but to ensure that information is conveyed effectively, making messages clear, straightforward, and easily understood.

These differences in communication styles are evident not only in everyday interactions but also within the realm of stand-up comedy performances. In stand-up comedy, the material often tackles highly sensitive topics such as racism, religion, social injustice, and direct roasting which would typically trigger intense communication conflicts and social tension in ordinary life. In low-context environments, speakers are often more inclined to use directness, sharp criticism,

and explicit expressions as transparent tools to construct humor and generate laughter from tension. Conversely, within high-context frameworks, humor is frequently navigated more subtly, where comedians manage sensitive topics by employing implicit cues, layered analogies, and softened linguistic boundaries to deliver sharp messages while carefully maintaining social harmony. This suggests that these differing cultural rules may influence how comedians from different cultural backgrounds structurally approach and execute their routines on stage.

Therefore, Hall (1976) contextual communication theory is suitable for use in exploring the differences in communication styles between two comedians from different cultural backgrounds, namely Pandji Pragiwaksono from Indonesia, which has a high context, and Chris Rock from the United States, which has a low context. The use of this theory shows that humor is not only built on the factor of playing with the flouting maxims technique, but also on cultural factors, where Pandji plays with implicit words to convey meaning in his humor, while Rock is bold, explicit, and straightforward.

F. Critique of High Context and Low Context Communication Theory

Hall's (1976) theory of high and low context culture has also faced criticism. Hall's theory is often considered too rigid because it groups a country's communication characteristics into one absolute label. In the dynamic reality of modern society, especially when observing individual behavior in expressive spaces such as the stand-up comedy stage, Hall's macro model shows significant limitations. To maintain objectivity, several researchers have conveyed aspects such as the dimension of cultural simplification (over-generalization) by Cardon (2008)

and the dimension of context flexibility (situational inconsistency) by Scollon et al. (2012).

The most common criticism of Hall is his theory's tendency to overgeneralize and create rigid stereotypes of a nation. Cardon (2008) conducted a large-scale analysis of cross-cultural communication literature and found that the rigid division between high-context countries (such as Indonesia) and low-context countries (such as the United States) is often not supported by strong empirical data in the field. Hall's theory assumes that everyone in the West speaks directly, and everyone in the East speaks implicitly. Cardon criticized Hall for ignoring internal diversity within a single country, such as differences in ethnicity, social background, gender, and individual personality.

Rigidly applying Hall's macro-categorization of the theory can limit the analytical scope in viewing the uniqueness of communication. In this study, Cardon's critique becomes a highly relevant analytical tool for explaining the dynamics of a communicator's or comedian's speech, which is not always tied to a particular cultural context. Through this critical perspective, researchers can explore that even though a speaker grew up in a specific Western or Eastern culture, as a communicator, he or she still has the creative flexibility to adopt different communication styles, both high-context and low-context, when constructing material or premises on the entertainment stage.

The second criticism focuses on the nature of Hall's theory, which ignores human flexibility in responding to the situation or type of activity being faced (situational inconsistency). Scollon et al. (2012) argue that a person's

communication style is not static, but rather highly fluid and adaptive depending on the situational context, location, and with whom they are speaking. For example, Americans who are usually very low-context in professional business dealings can change to very high-context, such as full of emotional codes and implicit cues, when speaking in the context of family or romantic relationships. Similarly, Indonesians can be very low-context, such as being straightforward and firm in emergency situations or legal formalities.

This critique asserts that the stage setting or type of interaction activity can determine a person's language style more than their geographic or national background. Scollon et al.'s thinking provides a strong scientific foundation for researchers to understand the phenomenon where a speaker from a high-context background can switch to a straightforward, low-context style, or vice versa. This style shifting is seen not as a form of inconsistency with the original culture, but rather as a form of situational adaptation to the demands of stand-up comedy discourse, which requires speakers to manipulate language style to achieve communication effects or instant humorous responses from the audience.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter explains the methodology used in this research, covering key parts like the research design, research Instruments, data sources, data collection methods, and data analysis. Each part is clearly laid out to guide the study and help achieve its goals.

A. Research Design

A qualitative approach is used to examine the utterances within Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock's stand-up comedy routines. This approach is highly appropriate because the study does not deal with statistical data or numerical measurements, but rather focuses on the deep, detailed, and contextual interpretation of spoken words. The primary focus of this research is to analyze the linguistic strategies used by the two comedians to construct humor through the flouting of Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle. By using a qualitative lens, this study can deeply explore how implicit meanings and cultural nuances are structurally embedded within their jokes. Furthermore, this method allows for a detailed exploration of how their respective cultural backgrounds are reflected through Hall's (1976) high-context and low-context communication frameworks, which cannot be captured through quantitative means.

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2011), a qualitative approach is uniquely effective for studying complex social phenomena in their natural settings, which in this case applies to the dynamic performance of stand-up comedy. Examining the

deeper layers of meaning behind stand-up comedy expressions requires an approach that prioritizes interpretation and nuance over generalization. Therefore, this qualitative design is well-suited for capturing the detailed ways in which both comedians deliberately flout conversational maxims and navigate cultural boundaries to create humorous situations on stage.

B. Research Instruments

The main instrument in this study is the researcher himself, whose task is to collect all data, analyze the data, and draw conclusions from the results. According to Ary et al. (2010), humans are the best and most suitable instruments in qualitative research. In addition, not only the researcher himself is the instrument, but supporting instruments are also included for observation and analysis, namely a laptop and transcripts of stand-up comedy videos by Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono.

C. Data & Data Sources

The main data in this study consists of utterances that flout the Cooperative Principle presented by Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono to create humorous situations. For Pandji Pragiwaksono, the utterances data was collected from a series of digital video recordings documentation of his stand-up comedy world tour show in New York, which were published as Instagram Reels on the official account @standupindo.nyc. These Reels videos contain selected segments of Pandji's live performance on stage, with each video clip ranging from 1 to 3 minutes in duration. The utterance data from these videos was specifically chosen based on its relevance

to cross-cultural humor themes and pragmatic elements that flout Grice's maxims to build humor.

Meanwhile, the data collected from Chris Rock was taken from his special performance video on Netflix entitled “Chris Rock Total Blackout: The Tamborine Extended Cut,” which was released in 2021. The video is 1 hour and 37 minutes long. The speech data in this video was selected and classified as utterances that flout Grice's Cooperative Principle, namely quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, which contribute to the humorous effect.

D. Data Collection

In collecting data for this research, the researcher conduct several stages. First, the researcher focus on watching stand-up comedy videos by Pandji Pragiwaksono on the Instagram account @standupindo. These videos were selected based on the research objectives and their relevance, particularly in terms of pragmatic techniques for creating humor. Meanwhile, data from Chris Rock be collected primarily by watching his stand-up comedy video titled “Chris Rock Total Blackout: The Tamborine Extended Cut.” Second, the researcher download transcripts of each comedian's videos to identify in detail the maxim violations they commit. After that, the researcher carefully analyze the video transcripts to identify linguistic strategies, particularly violations of the maxim of cooperation.

E. Data Analysis

This data analysis focus on using qualitative methods with a pragmatic approach. This study follow a structured process in identifying the types of

maximum violations in the collaboration between Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono. Therefore, this data analysis aims to reveal how humor is constructed by both of them in their stand-up comedy. In practical terms, there are several stages that be carried out. First, the researcher identify or categorize the statements made by Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock that contain maxim violations. Second, each utterance be analyzed using the structure of Grice's Cooperative Principle theory, namely the principles of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. The researcher analyze how these violations play a role in creating humor, which is the reason for the disregard of maxims by these two comedians. The next step, after identifying the types of flouting maxims and their meanings in the utterances, is to relate the results to Hall's low-context and high-context cross-cultural communication theory framework to see how cultural background is reflected in Pandji and Rock's utterances that violate the Cooperative Principle.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings and discussion of this study. In the findings, the researcher provides a detailed description of the implied meaning of the stand-up comedy material of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock. In addition, how the flouting of the Grice cooperative principle is carried out. Then the discussion of the study provides a general explanation of the findings.

A. Findings

In this section, the researcher explains the findings of this study. In this study, the objects of research are humor utterances delivered by Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono. Chris Rock's data is taken from his stand up comedy special "Chris Rock: The Tamborine Extended Cut" on Netflix, while Pandji Pragiwaksono's data is obtained from video clips uploaded on the Instagram account @standupindo.nyc. The data is analyzed using the Cooperative Principle theory (Grice, 1975)

1. Types of Flouting in Chris Rock & Pandji Pragiwaksono

1.1 Flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle by Chris Rock

Datum 1a

"it's nice to be here in Brooklyn, Brooklyn where I'm from. Home of biggie and jay. Yes, I'm back. I'm in the neighborhood, You know, the more things change, the more things stay at the same. I'm walking around, looking around today, and I wonder... You would think that cops would occasionally shoot a white kid just to make it look good."

This Utterance appears at the beginning of his stand-up comedy video when Chris Rock looks at his audience whose show is in Brooklyn, United States. Chris Rock discusses something he said many changes and some have not changed after

all this time. Rock tells when he was walking around and thinking about the harsh reality of the problem of racial discrimination against black shootings by saying that the police deliberately shot white children just to look better, in this case it looks balanced with the case of shootings of black people.

In this sentence, it is clear that Chris Rock boldly addresses the issue of discrimination against black people, particularly issues related to American police law enforcement. The context he presents is the injustice that black people experience compared to white people when dealing with the police in the field. Chris Rock clearly and directly presents this message to open the audience's eyes to this unresolved issue in the United States.

Rock flout the principle of quality in this statementt by explicitly making a claim that is not supported by strong evidence. In the sentence “You would think that cops would occasionally shoot a white kid just to make it look good,” Chris Rock boldly straight to the police, as law enforcers, of deliberately making a strategy of shooting white kidss to cover up the imbalance in the number of cases of violence against black people. This claim is unfounded and has no factual evidence to support it. According to Grice's theory, the principle of quality requires speakers not to say things that are believed to be lies or claims that are not strongly supported by evidence. Meanwhile, Chris Rock's statement is absurd and even biased, raising an issue that is sensitive in society. The purpose of this statement is not meant to be taken literally; Chris Rock wraps it in humor to voice the injustice experienced by black people, who are often victims in the field.

Datum 2a

*“You would think that every couple of months, they’d look at their **Dead nigga calender** and they go “oh my god, we’re up to 16, we gotta shoot a white kid quick”*

Analysis of data :

This sentence appeared when Chris Rock expressed his concern about how often police discriminate against black people. He described this frequent situation, which ranges from violence to death, with the phrase “Dead nigga calendar.” In this case, it seems as if he is saying that there is a special schedule or even a strategy related to the large number of cases of discrimination resulting in death committed by state officials. This claim is not supported by strong evidence, and Chris Rock presents it to criticize the uncontrolled and widespread nature of this issue in society.

Rock utterance, “Dead Nigga Calendar,” demonstrates his flout of the principle of quality. This statement is described with a bias that seems to represent police officers as deliberately and systematically oppressing black people, leading to death. In context, Rock does not convey this with strong evidence. According to Grice (1975), when the speaker disregards the principle of quality by providing information that is untrue or not supported by strong evidence, this is what Chris Rock is doing. This sentence is a sentence of anxiety wrapped in comedy. Rock deliberately uses exaggeration to highlight this and create laughter.

Datum 3a

*“Every day before my kids leave for school, I get them at the door, I’m like “lola, zahra, check this out, soon as you leave this door, **Nobody gives a fuck about you.** Nobody in the whole world gives a fuck about you. **Nobody** thinks you’re cute, **nobody.** **Nobody** thinks you’re smart, **nobody gives a fuck** about your opinion. **Nobody** on the whole earth outside of this door gives a fuck about you. **Nobody.**”*

This sentence appeared when he recounted the moment he gave a piece of advice to his daughter inside their home. In his story, Chris Rock was about to walk his daughter to the front door as she was leaving for school. Before she left the house, Rock gave her what seemed like excessive reminders. He described that outside the house, even immediately after stepping out the door, no one cared about her, no one thought about her, and no one thought about how smart she was. Rock's focus was on his daughter focusing on herself without needing to think about other people's responses. Chris Rock conveyed this bluntly and without any implicit meaning to his daughter, openly describing the cultural situation where people are becoming increasingly individualistic and no one cares about others.

The principle of quantity is flout in this statement, as he repeats the same idea with various variations when talking to his daughter. According to Grice (1975), providing excessive information or less than what is needed is a flout of the principle of quantity. In the sentences “Nobody gives a fuck about you” and “Nobody on the whole earth outside of this door gives a fuck about you. Nobody,” Chris Rock exaggerates the message he is conveying, telling his daughter that no one outside cares about her, even if she is smart or cute. Rock's purpose in dramatizing this is to emphasize and convey to his audience the problem of parenting that appears to be overly positive, when in fact no one cares. Rock

describes a harsh and cruel world, so children need to know this as early as possible in order to be confident.

Datum 4a

“When you're in a relationship, you're in a band... and when you're in a band, you have roles that you play in the band. Sometimes you sing lead, and sometimes has to stand in the back and play the tambourine... If you're on tambourine, play it right! Play it with a fucking smile”

In this utterance, Chris Rock is discussing his experience in a unique and complex married household, especially his feelings when he becomes a husband and father. Rock says that a relationship can be defined as a band. When we are in a band, of course there are different roles of the personnel in the band, someone has to be a singer, and there is also someone in the back playing the tambourine and if you are playing the tambourine, Rock says "play it right! Play it with a fucking smile." This Utterance, Rock brings with full analogies in it, he highlights that different roles like in a band also occur in a husband and wife relationship. Through this analogy, Rock wants to explain the reality in a marriage relationship where the position of husband and wife is not always equal in terms of dominance. When the wife takes the role in front as the main vocalist who directs the course of the relationship, then the husband who is in the back position automatically has to give in and comply with the decision. The phrase "play it with a fucking smile" here implies that even though the husband is in his wife's shadow and forced to fulfill her role, he is expected to carry it out without resentment or jealousy. Playing the tambourine means sincerely supporting the partner in front of him to maintain harmony in the household. This analogy elicits laughter.

Based on Grice's Cooperative Principle theory (1975), Rock flouts the maxim of quality and the maxim of manner, where he says something that is literally and realistically untrue, a marriage relationship is not a music group and the couple in it are not playing tambourines. Therefore, this utterance violates the maxim of quality. In addition, he also violates the maxim of manner when he conveys his message with an ambiguous and indirect analogy. Here he does not directly say the message he wants to convey between the problems of husband and wife in a relationship.

Datum 5a

People say "Relationships are tough, they only become tough when only one person is working on it. Two people can move a couch really easily, but one person can't move it at all."

In this utterance, Chris Rock touches on the complexities that occur in society by trying to provide answers to problems in marital relationships. Chris Rock opens with his sentence by dissecting the psychological premise that romantic relationships will basically not feel difficult if both parties put in equal effort "People say relationships are tough, they only become tough when only one person is trying". Furthermore, Rock throws a physical analogy in the form of the activity of moving a sofa "Two people can move a couch really easily, but one person can't move it at all". Through this contextual analogy, Rock wants to explain that heavy household problems can actually be solved very easily if faced together as a team and support system.

Based on Grice's theory (1975), Chris Rock flouted the maxim of quality and the maxim of manner in this utterance. First, flouting the maxim of quality occurs because Rock's statement is literally inaccurate, because a romantic commitment or

household conflict in reality is not a physical object like a sofa that can be moved mechanically. Second, the comedian also flouted the maxim of manner because he conveyed a psychological message with the analogy using ambiguous, indirect, and not literally transparent (obscure) figurative language.

Datum 6a

*"If you think you can help God out, you don't believe in God. If you really had faith you'd really have faith. I mean, check this out. I haven't been to church in ten years. Now that's believing in God. **Shit, you go every week 'cause you don't trust God.**"*

In this utterance, Chris Rock discusses the definition of faith through a satirical lens, focusing on the habits of religious people when they come to worship at church. He begins by explaining that anyone who thinks they need to help or intervene on God's behalf lacks strong faith or what can truly be called faith. He also adds that he hasn't been to church in at least ten years. The punchline of Chris Rock's monologue concludes with a paradox designed to elicit laughter, in which he states that he has never gone to church precisely because he believes in God, and conversely, it is those who go to church every week who do not believe in God. In this humorous narrative, Chris Rock presents information that is factually incorrect and structurally inverted regarding religious belief systems, where the mainstream religious belief universally taught that attending services and praying is defined as an expression of faith and devotion, not skepticism as Chris Rock claims.

Based on Grice's theory (1975), Chris Rock's statement clearly violates the maxim of quality, which states, "Do not say something you believe to be false." In the statement above, Chris Rock reverses the social reality, where attending church

is legally and culturally recognized as an expression of faith, so Chris Rock's literal claim that going to church every week is an expression of disbelief in God is factually incorrect. Here, Chris Rock strategically employs inverted and absurd logic to imply that someone goes to church due to constant anxiety and a need for validation that they wish to fulfill which is the exact opposite of what faith should entail, which is supposed to be calm, trusting, and unwavering.

Datum 7a

*“ we need bullies, how the fuck do you have a school with no bullies? **bullies do half the work, teachers do one half, bullies do the whole other half**, and that's the half you're gonna use as a fucking grown up. Who gives a fuck if you can code, if you start crying because your boss didn't say hi.”*

In this utterance, Rock touched on modern parenting styles that are overly protective and spoil children; he discussed the unexpected needs and benefits of bullying in school. At the outset, Rock stated that half of a teacher's job as an educator is actually done by bullies, who shape children's minds to help them mature. Additionally, Rock also highlights the future benefits for children resulting from this mental toughening. Furthermore, at the end of his speech, Chris Rock poses a question, stating that skills such as computer coding abilities are useless if one cries easily just because their boss didn't greet them. This statement by Chris Rock presents information that is absurd, inverted, and socially deviant because, fundamentally, child development psychology and the education provided in schools define bullying as destructive and dangerous behavior.

Based on Grice's theory (1975), Chris Rock's statement here clearly violates the maxim of quality defined as “do not say something you know to be false” since

bullying is not a framework for cooperation in children's education but rather a dangerous, destructive behavior that can cause psychological trauma in children. Furthermore, bullies are not part of the school curriculum designed for children's development; therefore, Rock's literal claim regarding the educational function of these bullies is factually incorrect. Nevertheless, Chris Rock's intention here is to deliver a satirical critique of the harsh and competitive adult professional world, implying that academic and even technical skills alone are insufficient to navigate professional life mental resilience is essential.

Datum 8a

*"people always say "children are born loving" it's the biggest crock of bullshit i have ever heard in my life. kids are the **most racist, sexist, homophobic, mean motherfuckers, on the face on the earth. kids are mean motherfuckers, okay?***

This line appeared when Chris Rock was discussing the true nature of children, beginning with his critique of the common cliché that children are born full of love a statement he considers a massive lie and generations-old nonsense. He then added to this by claiming that children are actually the opposite that they are, in fact, the most racist, sexist, and homophobic people on earth. In this remark, Chris Rock overgeneralizes and makes a false claim, because factually, children are biologically and psychologically like blank slates and do not yet possess the cognitive and structural capacity or even the understanding to be labeled as racist, sexist, or homophobic.

Based on Grice's theory (1975), Chris Rock's remarks here clearly flout the maxims of quantity and quality, as he makes exaggerated claims about children's behavior by portraying them as racist, sexist, and homophobic claims that are

greatly overstated. Furthermore, the claims Chris Rock makes also state something that is believed to be false, which also violates the maxim of quality.

Datum 9a

“When my kid was two, she was biting kids on the playground, you think I taught her to bite kids? No that was her natural state. She came out of the womb like wolverine, just tearing fucking kids up. Kids are horrible people, so pre-school is just like jail with milk.”

In this line, Chris Rock discusses aggressive behavior or tantrums in children based on his experience as a father. He recounts that his two-year-old daughter often bites other children at the playground, even though he never taught her to do so. Furthermore, in this utterance, Rock draws an analogy suggesting that his daughter was born like the fictional comic book character Wolverine, who loves to tear other children apart and make them cry. Finally, he adds that preschool is no different from a prison except it's stocked with milk. In his monologue, Chris Rock addresses a common parental struggle through a dark analogy: if children aren't closely supervised, they can act wild and do as they please, becoming uncontrollable. It is through this analogy that he creates a comedic effect for his audience.

This utterance by Chris Rock flout the maxim of quality, based on Grice's theory (1975), in which Grice states, “Do not say anything you believe to be false.” In this statement, Chris Rock claims that toddlers' lack of self-control and impulsive nature are comparable to the character Wolverine; furthermore, he adds that preschool is no different from a prison. Chris Rock's literal claim is factually incorrect. In this remark, he uses hyperbole and satirical metaphors to create humor for the audience.

Datum 10a

*God doesn't make mistakes?. Hush your mouth. **God make plenty of mistakes**, you ever see a porcupine? **can't eat it, can't hug it, it's ugly, it's stick, it's shitting all over the place.** It's Mistakes” “God don't make no mistakes? that's pretty ambitious thing to say. No mistakes? You ever read the bible? What does the bible say happened on the seventh day? God rested. **Okay, seems odd that a perfect being would rest.** Have you ever been performing a task? it was going perfect and you took a rest? has that every happened in your life? No! that has never fucking happened to you. God doesn't make mistakes. Hush your mouth. **God make plenty of mistakes.***

This utterance emerged when Chris Rock was making a satirical critique of religious beliefs regarding the absolute perfection of the Creator. In constructing his joke, he used two vivid examples to prove that "God makes mistakes too." First, he highlighted the porcupine as an example of a flaw in natural design because it was considered non-functional, ugly, and un-huggable. Second, he attacked the biblical logic regarding the seventh-day narrative where God is said to have rested, a concept that Rock argued contradicts the definition of a perfect entity.

In this utterance, Chris Rock delivers a sharp satirical critique of religious belief in God. Rock begins his argument by questioning the widely held claim that God never makes mistakes: "God doesn't make no mistakes? God makes plenty of mistakes." Rock proceeds to refute this belief by comparing it to something that exists in the world. First, he uses literal reasoning to the biblical text about the seventh day when God rested, equating the concept of rest literally as an indication of fatigue or imperfection in the work process, as experienced by humans. Second, Rock also offers ridiculous physical evidence in the form of a porcupine. Rock exaggerates the porcupine's characteristics, including its functional defects and uselessness to humans, "can't eat it, can't hug it, it's ugly, it's sticky, it's shitting all over the place."

With this line, Rock conveys an implicit message to undermine the sanctity and beliefs of religious communities. Based on Grice's theory (1975), Utterance is an act of flouting the maxim of quality and flouting the maxim of quantity. Flouting the maxim of Quality occurs because the comic's statement is literally inaccurate and says something that is believed to be wrong regarding the concept of God in religion. Rock also subjectively claims that God creates mistakes as evidenced by the physical failure of porcupines 'God makes plenty of mistakes, have you ever seen a porcupine?'. Rock also mistakenly equates the spiritual concept of God's rest on the seventh day in the scriptures with equating fatigue like human mechanics when working.

In addition to the maxim of quality, in this utterance, Rock also exaggerates the description of the evidence he provides in his attempt to argue that God makes many mistakes. He over-describes the hedgehog and even brings up the contents of the book he describes as God's mistakes. This violates the maxim of quantity, as the rock exaggerates.

1.2 Flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle by Pandji Pragiwaksono

Datum 1b

*“Being reborn as an animal would be an awesome life. Any life that doesn't have dreams and aspirations is an awesome life. **Do you know why birds sing? Because they don't sit in an office at 3 p.m. thinking.**”*

In this sentence, Pandji describes his initial jealousy of animals, who do not need to think about dreams for the future. Pandji highlights that being reborn as an animal is an extraordinary life, saying, “Any life that doesn't have dreams and

aspirations is an awesome life.” Additionally, he touches on how life in the present era is too stressful, especially among young people. Pandji builds on this joke.

This sentence clearly shows that the speaker, Pandji, flout the principle of quality by saying something that is false, such as “Being reborn as an animal would be an awesome life.” This sentence does not represent the facts of the world, and Pandji does not have strong evidence to support it. Based on Grice's theory of cooperative principles (1975), saying something that is not true and has no fundamental evidence is a flout of the principle of quality. Furthermore, in his statement, “Do you know why birds sing? Because they don't sit in an office at 3 p.m. thinking,” Pandji makes a comparison that is clearly not the same and cannot be compared, as birds do not work in offices and experience the stress that humans experience. This sentence appears when Pandji slips in an implication that aims to criticize modern life, which often causes people to lose themselves, become tired and stressed in fulfilling their dreams and aspirations.

Datum 2b

*“There's a stereotype about Indonesian people and the stereotype is that we're lazy. Now I'm here to tell you, **we're not lazy, we're just not accustomed to work hard**”*

This sentence appeared when Pandji was discussing stereotypes about Indonesians who work and have lazy habits. In context, Pandji explained that this has geographical reasons, as Indonesia is a tropical country and did not have deadlines for hunting in the past, so Indonesians always had time for tomorrow. However, Pandji turned it into a joke by saying, “we're just not accustomed to work

hard.” Pandji played with words in his material to create humor through mitigation, saying something and then returning with an entertaining punchline.

In this sentence, Pandji Pragiwaksono flout the principle of quality, where he says, “We're not lazy, we're just not accustomed to working hard.” This sentence is baseless and lacks sufficient evidence. In his sentence, Pandji seems to package his joke with deliberate inconsistency, and this is what makes it funny. According to Grice (1975), if something is said without strong evidence and is believed to be false, it violates the principle of quality. Pandji uses this humor to criticize the Indonesian culture of procrastination, packaging it with sarcastic sentences that do not detract from his main point.

Datum 3b

“Indonesian mom, we lived with badass women all our life. I swear my mom slapped my face so hard, I was like, are you a man?”

Pandji begins this sentence by recounting that he remembers a controversial UFC women's match that ended quickly in just 24 seconds, with the winner coming across as a badass woman. Pandji then relates this to Indonesian culture by saying, “Indonesian moms, we lived with badass women all our lives.” This is meant to convey that mothers in Indonesia are known for being brave, firm, and strict, as if they were badass women. He then added the line, “I swear my mom slapped my face so hard, I was like, are you a man?” This describes the strong figure of a mother, and it was this that sparked laughter in the material Pandji built.

In this sentence, Pandji flout the principle of quality by saying that his mother slapped him like a man, which is not true, as his mother is clearly a woman, not a man. In Grice's theory (1975), do not say something that is believed to be false and

do not say something without sufficient evidence. When Pandji says “are you a man?”, the punchline that triggers laughter is here.

Datum 4b

*“Business in New York like to hire Indonesian, this is true. They say it's because Indonesia don't talk back, it's true. **We talk behind their back. That's our things**”*

In this sentence, Pandji talks about how businesspeople in New York like to hire Indonesians because they think Indonesians don't argue back. After that, Pandji plays with words in his material to create a joke: "We talk behind their backs. That's our thing." He cleverly confirms the stereotype that Indonesians are obedient and do not fight back, then he flips that stereotype on its head with something new and funny. In this case, Pandji deliberately uses this approach to deliver social criticism in a lighthearted way. In this way, Pandji invites the audience to reflect on the existing social reality.

Pandji flout the principle of quality in this sentence by saying, “We talk behind their back. That's our thing.” What he says has no strong factual evidence, and Pandji ends with this punchline to create a joke. As Grice (1975) said, something that is said without strong evidence or is believed to be false is a violation of quality.

Datum 5b

*“Indonesia and Malaysia, we have a very funny relationship. We look like each other, **we don't like each other. I'm just joking. We hate each other.**”*

This sentence came up when Pandji accidentally greeted one of his audience members who turned out to be from Malaysia, which is one of Indonesia's neighbors. After that, Pandji recounted the funny relationship between Indonesia and Malaysia, saying, “Indonesia and Malaysia, we have a very funny relationship.”

Then, using the same joke technique he used in his previous data, he reversed the sentence he had said earlier by saying, “Indonesia and Malaysia, we have a very funny relationship.”

In this utterance, Pandji said something that was not sufficiently substantiated and believed something that was false, namely “We hate each other.” This means that he flout Grice's principle of quality. According to Grice's theory (1975), the principle of quality requires speakers not to say things that are untrue or not sufficiently substantiated. Pandji's claim of “hate” is an exaggeration and is unfounded in order to create humor.

Datum 6b

*“Okay, so when I moved here, zero person know me. I don't have any history, I don't have any track record. I was having an identity crisis, so I think I can just reinvent myself, and nobody would know, right? I was thinking, wow, I can create a whole new identity. My friends are back home, my wife is back home, my kids are back home, so I decided to form a new identity. **I decided to be single.**”*

In this utterance, Pandji explained about his personal life and identity crisis when he first moved to New York. He explained that nobody knew him or his track record in the city, then he gave additional information that his friends, his kids, and his wife were all back home in Indonesia. At the end of his utterance, Pandji concluded that he decided to form a new identity by claiming that he was single. It shows that Pandji was giving incorrect and self-contradictory information because he previously admitted that he already had a family. Giving an information that is contractually false and contradicts the objective reality is part of the quality maxim flout. It means that Pandji was flouting the maxim of quality by giving untrue information to the audience to create a comedic twist.

Based on Grice's theory (1975), the utterance clearly demonstrates the phenomenon of flouting the Maxim of Quality. The Maxim of Quality requires speakers to contribute information that is truthful, factual, and not self-contradictory. In this particular utterance, Pandji explicitly flout this principle at the very end of his narrative by stating, *"so I decided to be single."* This punchline directly conflicts with the objective reality he established just a moment prior, where he openly admitted, *"my wife is back home, my kids are back home."* Since an individual's social and legal marital status does not instantly dissolve due to a mere change in geographical location, Pandji's final assertion is factually untrue and represents a deliberate breach of the quality standard.

Datum 7b

*"Goshen, Indiana, I am here. I'm here. Yes, I'm here. Why am I here? Why am I here? I have no idea about Goshen until a couple of months ago, but I arrived in the afternoon. I took a walk around the town, around the city, and I love, you have a very charming city. I love Goshen. Yes, I took a 15-minute walk, and I think I covered all of Goshen. **I think I covered all of Goshen.**"*

In this line, Pandji explained about his arrival and impression of Goshen, Indiana. At first, he explained that he did not know anything about Goshen until a few months ago and praised the town as a very charming city that he loved. Then, he gave additional information that he took a fifteen-minute walk in the afternoon and concluded that he had already covered the entire city. It shows that Pandji was giving incorrect and exaggerated information because it is geographically impossible to explore an entire city on foot within only fifteen minutes. Giving an information that is factually unrealistic and overly exaggerated is part of the quality maxim flout. It means that Pandji was flouting the maxim of quality by giving

untrue information to the audience to create a satirical punchline about the town's small size.

Based on Grice's theory (1975), this utterance clearly flouting the Maxim of Quality. The Maxim of Quality requires speakers to contribute information that is truthful, factual, and supported by objective reality. Pandji explicitly flout this principle at the very end of his narrative by stating, *"I think I covered all of Goshen."* This punchline directly conflicts with the objective reality because a whole city cannot be fully explored in such a short period. Therefore, Pandji's final assertion is factually untrue and represents a deliberate breach of the quality standard through the use of hyperbole. Pandji strategically deploys this exaggeration to highlight how small and quiet the town is compared to major metropolitan cities, thereby successfully delivering the intended comedic effect while maintaining the cooperative nature of the performance.

Datum 8b

*"Alright, so, don't you think it's funny that the activity of fuckiing is like stabbing, except that nobody dies, but at the same time, **if you pull out, somebody doesn't get to live?** right?"*

In this utterance, Pandji Pragiwaksono presents an absurd analogy between sexual intercourse and stabbing. He states that both activities have the same mechanism and outcome. At the end of his punctuation, he states that if someone pulls out, it will prevent that person from existing, just like stabbing. Pandji's presentation is an extreme, incorrect and inappropriate analogy. He builds humor using the audience's imagination to create something absurd and should not be equated.

Based on Grice's theory (1975), demonstrates a flouting of the maxim of quality and Manner. This maxim requires the speaker not to say something that is false or unsupported by strong evidence, while also requires the speaker to avoid ambiguity and obscurity of expression. Meanwhile, Pandji explicitly states, "the activity of making love is like stabbing." In reality, these two activities are clearly two different things and have opposing moral and biological concepts; therefore, what Pandji says is factually wrong, which systematically triggers a flouting of the Maxim of Quality. Furthermore, the utterance simultaneously flouts the Maxim of Manner due to its heavy reliance on lexical ambiguity, as the core punchline hinges on the phrase "pull out" a term that carries a double meaning by literally referring to removing a weapon in a stabbing context, while functioning as a well known slang for a contraceptive method in an intimate context.

Datum 9b

"The slowest walking Asian are Indonesian, see? And they're proud of it. Indonesians don't walk, we float. We glide."

In this utterance, Pandji is discussing the habits and tendencies of Indonesian people in walking, initially Pandji is discussing how Asian people differ only from the way they walk, such as the most polite pedestrians are Japanese, then he also said that the pedestrians with the best dressed are South Koreans, and he then said that the most relaxed pedestrians are Indonesians, where he compared them with Chinese pedestrians who tend to be fast to catch up on time, while in Indonesia they are too relaxed and waste time. At the end of his speech, Pandji said

that Indonesians move by floating and gliding instead of walking, which is wrong and fictitious and does not comply with the laws of physics and human biology.

Based on Grice's theory (1975), Pandji's utterance violates the maxim of quality by saying that Indonesians do not walk but rather float or glide, whereas in reality, walking is the only movement that occurs; no human being floats. Pandji said this to create humor by satirizing the relaxed and lazy habits of Indonesians who are not punctual, wrapped in a metaphor.

Datum 10b

*“When United States crushed Japan, all the Japanese troop in Indonesia didn't know what to do... What I'm trying to say is, Indonesia's independence was pretty much like **jaywalking**.”*

Based on Grice's theory (1975), Pandji Pragiwaksono's statement flouted the maxim of quality. Grice stated that the maxim of quality requires that speakers refrain from saying something they believe to be false or lacking sufficient evidence. However, in the sentence "Indonesia's independence was pretty much like jaywalking," Pandji intentionally conveys a comparison that is literally incorrect because the process of a country's independence is certainly not the same as jaywalking or illegally crossing the street.

The flouting of the maxim is seen specifically in the phrase “pretty much like jaywalking.” Based on Grice’s principle (1975), Therefore, the audience does not interpret the utterance literally, but the listener is needed to find the implicit meaning behind the analogy that Pandji brings. In this context, Pandji reveals that Indonesia’s position in gaining independence is quite unique and fortunate by taking advantage of the situation that occurred after Japan’s defeat from America, as

someone does jaywalking when seeing an opportunity to cross the road. Thus, based on Grice's theory (1975), this utterance violates the maxim of quality, humor arises because the speaker consciously says something that does not correspond to literal reality so that the audience is encouraged to interpret another meaning behind the utterance.

2. Cultural Reflection of Flouting Maxims

In answering the second research question "How do the flouting of maxims in the stand up performances of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock reflect their respective cultural backgrounds?", in this section the researcher analyze and link between Grice's cooperative principles (1975) and Edward T. Hall's communication context theory (1976).

2.1 Chris Rock Data Analysis

Datum 1a

"it's nice to be here in Brooklyn, Brooklyn where I'm from. Home of biggie and jay. Yes, I'm back. I'm in the neighborhood, You know, the more things change, the more things stay at the same. I'm walking around, looking around today, and I wonder... You would think that cops would occasionally shoot a white kid just to make it look good."

Hall in his theory of high context and low context communication (1976), explains how the way a message is conveyed differs between cultures. He categorizes low context cultures as emphasizing a direct, explicit, and rational communication style. This low context communication style is the opposite of the high-context style, which tends to be implicit, indirect, and emphasizes collectivism.

In this sentence, Chris Rock describes an absurd scenario regarding the issue of inequality in the amount of discrimination by state officials towards black people. When this sentence is analyzed using Hall's theoretical framework, it can be seen that Rock represents the characteristics of low context communication. In the sentence "You would think that cops would occasionally shoot a white kid just to make it look good," Rock directly mentions "police," meaning that he is referring to an official government agency that sometimes deliberately shoots white children to make the situation appear fair in relation to discrimination against black people.

Furthermore, Rock also explicitly mentions "shoot" without implying that this word refers to an act of violence. Rock fearlessly performs this material in front of his audience even though it is a sensitive issue. In addition, the phrase "a white kid" also explicitly reflects his courage in referring to racial issues between black and white people. The explicit words that Chris Rock chose, even though they were packaged with jokes, were not delivered using mitigation techniques to soften or obscure their meaning implicitly. He ensured that the purpose of the sentence was clearly not accepted with various different interpretations. Therefore, this sentence represents Hall's theory of low-context communication style, which Rock clearly and sharply demonstrates in his stand-up routine.

Datum 2a

*"You would think that every couple of months, they'd look at their **Dead nigga calender** and they go "oh my god, we're up to 16, we gotta shoot a white kid quick"*

In this sentence, Chris Rock violates the principle of quality by saying something that has no evidence and cannot be justified factually. "Dead nigga

calendar” is a provocative phrase, which Rock utters explicitly, concisely, and emphatically. This sentence refers to the sensitive issue of black people who often face discrimination, and Rock continues to boldly bring it up.

In Hall's theory (1976), the phrase “Dead nigga calendar” represents a characteristic of low-context communication culture. Rock uses the slang term “nigga,” which refers to issues of racial identity accepted by black people. The prefix ‘nigga’ comes from the word “nigger,” a historical racial slur against black people, especially during the era of slavery. Furthermore, the phrase “calendar” further emphasizes the explicit statement that Chris Rock is trying to convey about the deaths of black people, which seem to be a routine and systematic structure deliberately aimed at their deaths.

In this sentence, Chris Rock does not use any phrases to disguise or soften what he is saying. This sentence also does not rely on symbols that could change the audience's understanding. The laughter generated by this sentence comes from the element of surprise and the explicitness of Rock's delivery. Therefore, Rock represents a low-context culture in line with the characteristics of low-context communication.

Datum 3a

“Nobody gives a fuck about you. Nobody in the whole world gives a fuck about you. Nobody thinks you're cute, nobody. Nobody thinks you're smart, nobody gives a fuck about your opinion. Nobody on the whole earth outside of this door gives a fuck about you. Nobody.”

According to Hall's theory (1976), low-context communication styles are direct, explicit, and clear, requiring no particular understanding of what is being conveyed, leaving little room for different interpretations. In this sentence, Chris

Rock conveys his point repeatedly and explicitly. The word “nobody” is repeated and becomes a strong point that emphasizes that what is being conveyed is explicit and firm.

The phrase “nobody gives a fuck” is a phrase that Rock uses to emphasize to his daughter that nobody cares about her, regardless of what we have, from being smart to being cute, which means that nobody cares about other people. Rock repeats this phrase explicitly and crudely, leaving no room for interpretation. The phrases “Nobody thinks you're smart” and “Nobody thinks you're cute” are explicit ways for Rock to convey a clear and absolute picture of what he is trying to say.

This sentence also appears without relying on symbols or other figurative language. The repetition of the word “nobody” is meant for emphasis and does not need to be interpreted implicitly, because rock conveys this repeatedly and openly in his material. Therefore, in this statement, rock reflects how low context communication is conveyed in a direct, clear manner without softening it gently or implicitly.

Datum 4a

“When you're in a relationship, you're in a band... and when you're in a band, you have roles that you play in the band. Sometimes you sing lead, and sometimes has to stand in the back and play the tambourine... If you're on tambourine, play it right! Play it with a fucking smile”

This utterance appears when Chris Rock expresses his views on the often unique and compromising issues of married life. Rock's humor is built here through symbolic analogies that have implicit meanings. Rock relies on metaphorical sentences to convey an image, such as "When you're in a relationship, you're in a

band." More deeply, the analogy he uses is used to convey the meaning of role division, where not everyone can be the leader in the relationship. He also adds, "Sometimes you sing lead, and sometimes has to stand in the back and play the tambourine."

Based on Hall's (1976) theoretical framework, Rock's statement is the definition of high-context communication. The main idea in Rock's material is conveyed implicitly and uses the metaphor of the band world to convey his message. Rock does not explicitly say that the failure of romantic commitment is caused by selfishness or the husband's refusal to submit to the wife's dominance, but this idea can be seen in the words Rock chooses, namely "play it with a fucking smile." In this sentence, Rock does not explicitly attack any institution or make a definitive statement; he creates humor by reflecting on the failures of his own home life. Therefore, this sentence implies that Rock's communication style is high-context, in line with Hall's theory.

Datum 5a

People say "Relationships are tough, they only become tough when only one person is working on it. Two people can move a couch really easily, but one person can't move it at all."

This utterance appears when Chris Rock expresses his views on the emotional burden of maintaining a romantic relationship, which often feels heavy when carried alone. Rock builds humor with symbolic analogies that have implicit meanings. Rock relies on metaphorical sentences to provide illustrations, such as "People say that relationships are tough." In this case, he illustrates the meaning of the imbalance of effort where a commitment will only feel heavy if there is no equal division of contributions between partners. Rock also adds, "Two people can move

a couch very easily, but one person will not be able to move it at all." Rock drag the audience to realize that selfishness of one party in the modern era causes paralysis in commitment, especially when all the mental burden of the household is only placed on one individual.

Based on Hall's (1976) theoretical framework, Rock's statement is a definition of high-context communication. The main idea in Rock's material is conveyed implicitly and uses the metaphor of physical activity to mitigate the topic of relationships. Rock does not explicitly say that the failure of his personal marriage was caused by a lack of a sense of togetherness, but this idea can be seen in Rock's choice of words, namely, "one person can't move it at all." In this sentence, Rock does not explicitly attack any party or make a definitive statement. Therefore, this sentence implies that Rock's communication style is high-context, as defined by Hall in his theory.

Datum 6a

"If you think you can help God out, you don't believe in God. If you really had faith you'd really have faith. I mean, check this out. I haven't been to church in ten years. Now that's believing in God. Shit, you go every week 'cause you don't trust God."

Based on Hall's theory (1976), the flouting of maxims in Chris Rock's utterance reflects the characteristics of Low Context Culture. Hall defines low context culture as having explicit, direct characteristics and placing its main meaning content that is delivered nakedly. In this utterance, Rock violates the maxim of quality by reversing the general public's belief that worshipping at church is a form of disbelief in God, he delivers it with a bold and confrontational verbal style without being wrapped in mitigation or softening of his delivery.

In the clause "I haven't been to church in ten years, now that's believing in God" here Rock clearly states that he has never been to church even for 10 years and provides additional sharp information to redefine the concept of faith. In addition, in the clause "Shit, you go every week because you don't trust god" he uses "shit" followed by a direct accusation of disbelief in God to people who go to church every week. Overall, Chris Rock's style and communication pattern is carried out with vulgar and offensive verbal confrontations in public spaces without being packaged to mitigate his delivery, he does not have the cultural burden to hide the purpose and meaning of the criticism he brings.

Datum 7a

we need bullies, how the fuck do you have a school with no bullies? bullies do half the work, teachers do one half, bullies do the whole other half, and that's the half you're gonna use as a fucking grown up. Who gives a fuck if you can code, if you start crying because your boss didn't say hi.

Based on Hall's (1976) theory of high and low context culture, Rock's utterance reflects the characteristics of a low context culture, as he violates maxims to create humor. The characteristics of a low context culture are more explicit and direct. In this utterance, Rock makes an absurd, literal claim: "We need bullies," which aims to educate children to be mentally stronger as adults. He also states "Bullies do half the work" directly without euphemism.

Furthermore, Chris Rock in the clause "Who gives a fuck if you can code, if you start crying because your boss didn't say hi" here is a strong low context culture characteristic of Chris Rock where he curses (taboo word) "gives a fuck" which is aimed at satire to people who cry easily even just because their boss doesn't greet them. Not only that, through the individualistic low context characteristics

that are oriented towards practical results reflected in what Rock said "and that's the half you're gonna use as a fucking grown up". Rock invites his audience to get used to processing the truth based on competitive and harsh social realities, mentally strong individuals are needed to get through the harsh world and Chris Rock conveys this explicitly and directly.

Datum 8a

people always say "children are born loving" it's the biggest crock of bullshit i have ever heard in my life. kids are the most racist, sexist, homophobic, mean motherfuckers, on the face on the earth. kids are mean motherfuckers, okay?

This utterances from Chris Rock reflects the characteristics of low-context culture defined by Hall (1976). Rock conveys it directly where he rejects the common view that says "Children are born loving" this view is even directly dismissed as "the biggest crock of bullshit," said Chris Rock, which is seen in his open and confrontational communication characteristics and without using elements of implication.

In Hall's perspective, Chris Rock's demeanor and style convey criticism in accordance with what Hall said where American culture tends to be more low context, where the message is delivered directly, boldly and explicitly without relying on implicit meanings that are inserted. He also added the closing sentence "kids are mean motherfuckers, right?" where he did not use subtle innuendo or implicit statements. The characteristics of low context that dares to discuss sensitive issues openly as brought by Chris Rock.

Datum 9a

When my kid was two, she was biting kids on the playground, you think I taught her to bite kids? No that was her natural state. She came out of the womb like wolverine, just tearing fucking kids up. Kids are horrible people, so pre-school is just like jail with milk.

In this utterance, Chris Rock reflects the characteristics of low-context culture as defined by Hall (1976), where low context tends to be direct, explicit, and does not rely on implicit meaning. In this speech, Chris Rock brings up his problem regarding the behavior of children who are difficult to control. He describes his two-year-old child as a wolverine, even though he never taught him that. Rock also said, "Pre-school is just like jail with milk," showing that he communicates firmly and easily understood.

Based on the description of low-context culture, his communication style tends to be conveyed through direct words rather than through specific contexts or implicit meanings. Furthermore, Chris Rock's use of his own personal experiences as comedic material also demonstrates his individualistic character, open to expressing opinions and experiences in public. In his material, Chris Rock freely explores his experiences, his family's, and even his own children's, despite their negative behavior, to use them as stand-up comedy material.

Datum 10a

God doesn't make mistakes?. Hush your mouth. God make plenty of mistakes, you ever see a porcupine? can't eat it, can't hug it, it's ugly, it's stick, it's shitting all over the place. It's Mistakes"
"God don't make no mistakes? that's pretty ambitious thing to say. No mistakes? You ever read the bible? What does the bible say happened on the seventh day? God rested. Okay, seems odd that a perfect being would rest. Have you ever been performing a task? it was going perfect and you took a rest? has that every happened in your life? No! that has never fucking happened to you. God doesn't make mistakes. Hush your mouth. God make plenty of mistakes, you ever see a porcupine? can't eat it, can't hug it, it's ugly, it's stick, it's shitting all over the place. It's Mistakes"

Chris Rock brings his views on religious beliefs that he considers rigid and inconsistent with real world facts. Rock builds humor with literal sentences that are direct, transparent, and even bold. In this case, Rock relies on direct physical evidence to provide evidence. Rock even dares to allude to what is said in the book

about "God resting" which he thinks is strange because God rests like humans. In addition, the creation of hedgehogs, Rock also adds a about of physical descriptions of porcupine, such as " can't eat it, can't hug it, it's ugly, it's stick, it's shitting all over the place. It's Mistakes. Rock brings the audience to realize that sacred theological claims can be instantly destroyed using the logic of everyday reality that is very profane and ridiculous.

Based on Hall's (1976) theoretical framework, Rock's statement is the definition of low-context communication. The main idea in Rock's material is conveyed explicitly and uses words whose meaning is 100% on the surface of the text without any delay in meaning. Rock explicitly states that claims of the perfection of creation are nonsense, and this idea can be directly seen from the evidence Rock presents. In this sentence, Rock's aggressiveness is demonstrated in this utterance by attacking religious beliefs and making a very frontal definitive statement in pursuit of raw verbal honesty. Therefore, this sentence implies that Rock's communication style is low-context.

2.2 Pandji Pragiwaksono Data Analysis

Datum 1b

"Being reborn as an animal would be an awesome life. Any life that doesn't have dreams and aspirations is an awesome life. Do you know why birds sing? Because they don't sit in an office at 3 p.m. thinking."

This sentence appears when Pandji expresses his jealousy of the lives of animals, which are so different from human lives, especially in the modern era. Pandji builds humor with symbolic analogies that have implicit meanings. When viewed, Pandji relies on metaphorical sentences to give the audience an illustration,

such as “Do you know why birds sing?” In this case, he illustrates the meaning of freedom that humans do not have. He also adds, “Because they don't sit in an office at 3 p.m. thinking.” Pandji draws the audience to realize that routines in the modern era cause fatigue and stress, especially among young people.

Based on Hall's theoretical framework (1976), what Pandji is saying is the definition of high-context communication. The main idea in Pandji's material is conveyed implicitly and uses metaphors. Pandji does not explicitly say that the work culture of today causes stress, but this idea can be seen from the words Pandji chooses, namely “dreams and aspirations.” In this sentence, Pandji does not explicitly attack any institution or make any definitive statements, Pandji makes the audience laugh by reflecting on his life. Therefore, this sentence implies that Pandji's communication style is high context, in line with Hall's theory.

Datum 2b

*“There's a stereotype about Indonesian people and the stereotype is that we're lazy. Now I'm here to tell you, we're not lazy, **we're just not accustomed to work hard**”*

In this sentence, Pandji responds to the stereotype that Indonesians are lazy with the phrase “we're not lazy,” but then immediately turns it around by playing with the words “we're just not accustomed to working hard.” In this case, Pandji creates two layers to build comedy that aims to slip in an implicit meaning rather than an explicit sentence.

From Hall's perspective (1976), this sentence implies a highly contextual communication style by not explicitly saying that Indonesians are lazy or unaccustomed to hard work. Pandji actually says “we're just not accustomed to

work hard,” which creates a joke. The use of this two-layered sentence shows Pandji Pragiwaksono's attempt to soften or mitigate his message so that it is not explicit. In addition, Pandji also uses the word “we” to avoid direct confrontation or offense, expressing himself in general terms. This indirectness makes his criticism subtle and still humorous. Therefore, this statement implies a highly contextual communication style, as seen in Pandji Pragiwaksono's violation of the maxim.

Datum 3b

*“Indonesian mom, we lived with badass women all our life. I swear my mom slapped my face so hard, I was like, **are you a man?**”*

In this sentence, Pandji says that Indonesians live with badass women known as mothers. Pandji implicitly describes the family hierarchy in Indonesia, the values and disciplinary practices in which mothers hold control within the family, as seen in the sentence “I swear my mom slapped my face so hard.” Pandji's intention is to illustrate the power of a mother who is firm, strong, and dominant, even though she is a woman.

The phrase “Indonesian mom” reflects Pandji's further elaboration on the cultural framework of Indonesian mothers. He then adds “are you a man?”, which reinforces the implicit meaning of a mother's power and authority in Indonesia. According to Hall (1976), high-context culture is characterized by being implicit and indirect, but also based on the listener's shared cultural understanding, which Pandji attempts to build upon to elicit laughter. Therefore, this sentence reflects the high-context culture seen in Pandji's utterance.

Datum 4b

"Business in New York like to hire Indonesian, this is true. They say it's because Indonesia don't talk back, it's true. We talk behind their back. That's our things"

This utterance emerged when Pandji was discussing the habits of Indonesians working in New York. Pandji said that Indonesians are liked because they don't like to fight back, then Pandji said, "We talk behind their backs." In this case, Pandji said one thing and then turned it into something contradictory to create a joke.

Pandji's utterance, "We talk behind their backs," is used by adopting a low-context communication style that exposes the passive-aggressive nature of Indonesians nakedly, honestly, and frankly right on the surface of the text. According to Hall's theory (1976), this transparent message delivery is very much in line with the characteristics of low-context cultures that prioritize explicit verbal clarity over hiding intentions behind false harmony.

Datum 5b

*"Indonesia and Malaysia, we have a very funny relationship. We look like each other, we don't like each other. I'm just joking, **we hate each other.**"*

Based on Hall's (1976) communication style theory, in this sentence, Pandji seems to reflect a low-context culture with an explicit and direct communication style. Pandji begins by saying, "Indonesia and Malaysia, we have a very funny relationship." Then he adds, "We look like each other, we don't like each other. I'm just kidding. We hate each other." In this utterance, what Pandji conveys is transparent on the surface of the text without relying on the audience's understanding of the shared cultural context that is implicit.

Furthermore, the following utterance, "we hate each other," serves as a literal and direct statement that brings the core of the conflict directly to the surface of the text. This allows him to discuss sensitive geopolitical issues while adapting to the communication expectations of his American audience, who prefer clear, undisguised verbal honesty over hidden cultural nuances. Therefore, Pandji Pragiwaksono can also deliver a low-context communication style that shapes utterances in stand-up comedy when performing.

Datum 6b

"Okay, so when I moved here, zero person know me. I don't have any history, I don't have any track record. I was having an identity crisis, so I think I can just reinvent myself, and nobody would know, right? I was thinking, wow, I can create a whole new identity. My friends are back home, my wife is back home, my kids are back home, so I decided to form a new identity. I decided to be single."

Pandji Pragiwaksono's utterance show the characteristics of low-context communication in Hall's theory because the humorous message is conveyed quite explicitly and easily understood through direct verbal utterances. Pandji openly explains that he lives far from his wife and children, then immediately delivers the punchline of his joke, "I decided to be single." The humor arises from the obvious contradiction between his original status as a husband and father and the new identity he claims as "single."

Unlike high-context communication, which relies more on implicit meanings and hidden contexts, this utterance doesn't require complex social interpretation. The audience can immediately understand the joke through the explicit verbal information conveyed. Although Pandji is from Indonesia, he doesn't rule out the possibility that his communication style isn't always high-context. This

time, he demonstrates a direct delivery style that isn't tied to implicit meanings or uses mitigation.

Datum 7b

Goshen, Indiana, I am here. I'm here. Yes, I'm here. Why am I here? Why am I here? I have no idea about Goshen until a couple of months ago, but I arrived in the afternoon. I took a walk around the town, around the city, and I love, you have a very charming city. I love Goshen. Yes, I took a 15-minute walk, and I think I covered all of Goshen. I think I covered all of Goshen.

Pandji Pragiwaksono's utterance in this data demonstrates Hall's high-context communication tendencies. He doesn't directly state that Goshen is a small town, but conveys this criticism indirectly through humor and exaggeration, such as the sentence "I took a 15-minute walk, and I think I covered all of Goshen." The primary meaning of the humor stems from the implication that the town is so small that it can be explored in just a short time.

Hall defines high-context communication as often conveying messages through implied meaning rather than fully explicit statements. Judging from Pandji's utterance, he chose a more subtle and humorous approach rather than directly stating, "Goshen is a very small city." Furthermore, Pandji also employed a social mitigation strategy by first praising the city with the phrase "you have a very charming city" before delivering a punchline to flatter Goshen. This pattern demonstrates an effort to maintain a positive atmosphere and avoid the impression of direct attack. In high-context cultures, this kind of approach is commonly used to maintain social comfort while still conveying humorous criticism or observations. Therefore, this utterance reflects a tendency towards high-context

communication because humor is constructed through implication, mitigation, and less direct delivery.

Datum 8b

Alright, so, don't you think it's funny that the activity of fuckiing is like stabbing, except that nobody dies, but at the same time, if you pull out, somebody doesn't get to live? right?

Pandji Pragiwaksono's utterance reflects the characteristics of high-context communication in Hall's theory because humor is constructed through analogies and implicit meanings that must be understood through audience interpretation. Pandji does not directly convey the idea of the relationship between sexual activity, life, and death, but wraps it in an absurd comparison between "fucking" and "stabbing." Thus, the meaning of humor does not lie entirely in the literal utterance, but rather in the conceptual relationship that must be processed by the audience.

Based on Hall's (1976) theory, high-context communication tends to convey meaning through context, association, and indirect understanding rather than through fully explicit statements. Although the topic discussed is vulgar, Pandji's way of constructing humor still relies on conceptual interpretation rather than simply conveying the message literally and directly. Therefore, this utterance reflects a tendency towards high-context communication because humor is formed through implicit analogies and the process of inferring meaning by the audience. In the part "if you pull out, somebody doesn't get to live," the audience needs to understand for themselves the implication that sexual activity can create life, while "pulling out" is associated with preventing birth. Humor arises from a game of logic that is not conveyed directly, but through layered and implicit analogies. This shows

that understanding humor depends on the audience's inference of the hidden meaning behind the comparison.

Datum 9b

“The slowest walking Asian are Indonesian, see? And they're proud of it. Indonesians don't walk, we float. We glide.”

In this utterance, Pandji Pragiwaksono reflects the characteristics of high-context, as defined by Hall (1976), because humor is constructed through implied cultural meaning, not through a completely direct literal statement. Pandji does not explicitly say that Indonesians are lazy walkers or move slowly, but conveys the idea through humorous metaphors such as "we float" and "we glide." The audience needs to understand for themselves that these expressions are a form of hyperbole that satirizes the laid-back stereotype of Indonesian society.

From Hall's perspective, high-context communication tends to rely on implicit meanings and the audience's interpretation of the social and cultural context. The humor in this utterance stems not only from the literal words, but also from a shared understanding of the stereotype of Indonesian behavior, which is considered relaxed and unhurried. Thus, the humorous effect arises when the audience perceives the connection between "slow walking" and the metaphors of "floating" or "gliding" as an indirect allusion to the Indonesian lifestyle.

Datum 10b

“When United States crushed Japan, all the Japanese troop in Indonesia didn't know what to do... What I'm trying to say is, Indonesia's independence was pretty much like jaywalking.”

Pandji Pragiwaksono reflects the high-context characteristics of Hall's (1976) theory, as his stand-up material is built around implicit analogies and shared

knowledge of Indonesian history. "Indonesian independence is like jaywalking," Pandji doesn't explicitly explain what he means by jaywalking. Therefore, his audience needs to process and understand the history, including the role of Japan and America in Indonesian independence.

The humor in this comedy relies on shared historical understanding and is conveyed implicitly. When America defeated Japan, a power vacuum was created, which was exploited to declare independence. Laughter arises when the audience grasps the implicit connection Pandji establishes between the political situation and the jaywalking analogy.

B. Discussion

In this section, the researcher presents the findings discussed earlier. Grice's Cooperative Principle theory is used to reveal the types of flouting that Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock ignore in creating humorous situations. After that, how these flouting maxims reflect the speakers' backgrounds will be examined using Hall's theory of high context and low context communication (1976). This section will deepen the discussion and help answer the two research questions that have been formulated. The first research question is "What kinds of flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle naturally occur within the stand-up comedy routines of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock?" The second research question is "How do the flouting of maxims in the stand-up performances of Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock reflect their respective cultural backgrounds?"

First, this study found that Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono's utterances in their stand-up comedy performances naturally violate the cooperative principle. This study examined a total of 20 utterances, all of which flouted Grice's (1975) cooperative maxims. There are four types of maxims that Grice has divided, including the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner. Chris Rock flouted the maxim of quality in 5 of his data, namely Data 1a, 2a, 6a, 7a, and 9a, and in data 3a he flouted the maxim of quantity. In addition, there were double flouting of principles in some of Chris Rock's data, which included the principle of quality and manner in Data 4a and 5a, and the principle of quality and quantity in Data 8a and 10a. In Pandji Pragiwaksono's data, he flouted the principle of quality in nine utterances: 1b, 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, 7b, 9b, and 10b. He also pointed out an utterance that simultaneously flout the principles of quality and manner, namely Data 8b. Flouting of these principles are the cause of the emergence of jokes in their stand-up comedy material.

These two comedians have a tendency to bring different topics and meanings of jokes, although both have thematic variations, this shows their respective creative focuses which also basically have the same pragmatic goals. Chris Rock has often brought bold and sensitive topics such as religious issues, racial discrimination against black people to the concept of God and religion, such as in his utterance "You would think that cops would occasionally shoot a white kid just to make it look good" what Rock said flout the principle of quality where he said something that is believed to be wrong and does not have strong evidence. On the other hand, Pandji often discusses topics related to cultural issues, daily habits

such as work and funny relationships between Indonesia and Malaysia, an example of Pandji's utterance, "Being reborn as an animal would be an awesome life. Do you know why birds sing? because they don't sit in an office at 3 p.m. thinking." Pandji's utterance here also flout the principle of quality where being born as an animal or human is not something that can be properly compared and does not have strong evidence.

Despite discussing topics and social issues that tend to be different, how these two comedians systematically play and manipulate expressions proves that this flouting maxim incident is not a random communication failure. What happens is the opposite, according to what Grice said, he defined as "purposive, indeed rational, behavior." In the world of stand-up comedy, violating the maxim of cooperation is a calculated and explored strategy together between the speaker and the audience. With this, the audience can follow the flow of rejecting the literal absurdity of the spoken text and decipher the underlying social criticism from the existing meaning.

Furthermore, the purposive rationality evident in both comedians becomes more apparent when there is more than one flouting of the maxim in some data sets. In Pandji's data "Alright, so, don't you think it's funny that the activity of fucking is like stabbing, except that nobody dies, but at the same time, if you pull out, somebody doesn't get to live? right?" He plays with his audience's train of thought, forcing them to navigate double-track thinking by recognizing the literal non-factuality of the analogy as well as the ambiguity of the phrase "pull out," which flouted the maxims of quality and manner. Similarly, Chris Rock

strategically stacked more than one flouting maxim in Data 4a and 5a, namely quality and manner, and Data 8a and 10a, quality and quantity. In Data 8a, he over-scaled information about children's behavior, while in Data 10a, he over-described a porcupine physical deformity and over explained scriptural references to challenge theological claims. These repeated floating maxims increase the absolute absurdity that triggers laughter, proving that this is one of the platforms for intellectual comedy exchange.

These results not only confirm but also expand on the scope of previous research. For example, Raharja and Rosyidha (2019) examined how flouting of the Cooperation Principle were ignored in Dodit Mulyanto's stand up material, finding that Dodit deliberately ignored it to create humor with unexpected and illogical statements that carried implicatures. Raharja and Rosyidha's research only emphasized one specific cultural context, namely Indonesia, and Dodit Mulyanto as the sole object of study. Their findings are reinforced by this study, in which Pandji also flout the principle of Cooperation to create humor.

Second, the 20 utterances that flout the principle of cooperation between Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock that were analyzed reflected their cultural backgrounds and showed different patterns. The theory of high context and low context communication (Hall, 1976) was used to explore this further. Hall defines low-context cultures as having an explicit, direct communication style. Examples of countries with low-context cultures include the United States, Australia, and other European countries. In contrast to low context cultures, high context communication styles are often indirect and implicit.

Before explore into the cultural analysis of each utterance data of Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono here, this study academically establishes that the communication styles of Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono do not represent a generalization or a flattening of the population in America and Indonesia. In this study, the researcher strictly moves within the cultural framework by Hall (1976) who defines the United States as a country with a low-context culture and Indonesia as a Southeast Asian country as a high-context culture. More deeply, the matter of individual human communication within a country has diversity and classification is not treated as absolute and rigid.

Based on the analysis, it is clear that Pandji and Rock have different communication styles. Although they share the same goal of making jokes, they have different cultural backgrounds, as seen in their communication style tendencies, so their communication styles are not the same. For example, the statement "Dead Nigga Calendar" does not use any techniques to soften or disguise what Chris Rock wants to say. He says it directly and explicitly with the aim of commenting on discrimination against black people, which appears systematic and intentional. This transparent verbal confrontation style is also seen in the data "Nobody gives a fuck about you" and in the data "Shit, you go every week 'cause you don't trust God." He alludes to spiritual beliefs with his words. This communication style preference seems to have a tendency to be more in Chris Rock with explicit assertiveness and is in line with Hall's parameters regarding low-context communication, where the burden of meaning lies in the spoken sentence.

On the other hand, Pandji has a different communication pattern. For example, "There's a stereotype about Indonesians and that stereotype is that we're lazy. Now I'm here to tell you, we're not lazy, we're just not used to working hard." Pandji uses an indirect communication pattern by saying "we're just not used to working hard," which he also uses to soften what he says to avoid direct confrontation. In addition, his utterance data is "Being reborn as an animal would be an awesome life. Any life that doesn't have dreams and aspirations is an awesome life. Do you know why birds sing? Because they don't sit in an office at 3 p.m. thinking." Pandji uses animal metaphors to indirectly criticize modern life, which is stressful due to work. Pandji uses linguistic mitigation to soften the criticism, turning permanent negative traits into mere habits that have not yet formed to avoid direct friction. Pandji also alluded to the city's small size in data 7b, using a strategy of first praising him, then stating that he could walk around the city in 15 minutes, representing high-context social mitigation to maintain harmony. Pandji Pragiwaksono employed this pattern. This finding aligns with Hall's definition in his theory of high-context cultural characteristics.

Furthermore, utterances were found in which Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock were not rigidly tied to a single cultural communication style. In several of his utterances, Pandji Pragiwaksono was also found to shift toward a low-context style, a characteristic of Western communication. In Data 5b, "We hate each other" and Data 6b, "I decided to be single," Pandji also managed to abandon implicit and mitigating language. Pandji packaged them without imposing implicit meanings on his sentences. Three utterances were found in

which Pandji used a low-context communication style. This differed from his approach in the other seven utterances, which had a high-context communication style.

Chris Rock's utterances also showed a shift toward a high-context style, characteristic of Eastern or collective communication. In Data 5a, "Sometimes you have to stand back and play the tambourine," and Data 5a, "Two people can move a sofa very easily," Rock also abandoned his typically explicit and confrontational language. Chris Rock structured these utterances by relying heavily on symbolic analogies and implicit meanings embedded in his sentences, which addressed social issues within domestic relationships. Two utterances were found in which Chris Rock employed a high-context communication style. This differed from his approach in the other eight utterances, which largely maintained a low-context communication style.

Based on a comprehensive cultural analysis of the 20 data points collected in this study, the findings on the communication styles of the two comedians underscore the need to avoid becoming trapped in overly simplistic generalizations. This research is based on Hall's theoretical framework, which divides communication styles into two categories: high-context and low-context. However, in more detail, communication styles can also depend on the context, purpose, and even the situation in which the speaker is communicating. The findings of this study demonstrate that classification cannot be treated as absolute, and the communication styles of Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono cannot be used as a generalizing benchmark for judging all of America or Indonesia.

Therefore, the utterances in this study do indeed differ in the patterns of these two comedians' tendencies, with Pandji tending toward high-context and Rock toward low-context. However, the data also demonstrates dynamic and flexible communication: Chris Rock's low-context style dominates in 8 of his 10 data sets, and Pandji Pragiwaksono's high-context style remains dominant, maintaining implicit parameters in 7 of his 10 data sets, consistent with Hall's (1976) reflective framework.

To understand their unique characteristics, a microcosm of the two comedians' backgrounds will be helpful. Chris Rock was born and raised in South Carolina, United States, as were both his parents. However, Chris Rock also has African American ancestry, inherited from his great-grandfather. In previous studies, his explicit communication style has similarities with the African American verbal tradition also known as "street wit," which values emotional transparency and direct confrontation in conveying messages or criticism (Pickford, 2000).

On the other hand, the style presented by Pandji Pragiwaksono who was born in Singapore, but has a Javanese (Kebumen) and Sumatran (Pagar Alam) family background that has the values of interpersonal politeness (*unggah-ungguh*) mutual respect (*ewuh pakewuh*) and indirect communication patterns in maintaining social harmony (Rahmawati, 2023) From most of the data, Pandji Pragiwaksono is presented by avoiding direct confrontation and playing analogies or mitigating layers of humor to maintain social harmony. However, this communication style also seems easy to adapt according to the goals and

context of the speaker as in data 6b, when Pandji performed stand up in front of a western audience in New York where he was also able to present with a low-context communication style.

A more in-depth analysis shows that the results of this study not only validate but also broaden the horizon of several previous studies. Kazarian and Martin (2006) examined how ethnic Armenians in Lebanon used four humor factors examined with the Humor Style Questionnaire (HSQ) consisting of affiliative humor, self-enhancing humor, aggressive humor, and self-defeating humor and found that this minority group obtained significantly lower scores in all four styles compared to Western norms. In their study, lower scores mean that the Armenian minority has a reduced capacity or lower tendency to express any form of humor in their daily lives due to a history of oppression and serious tragedy. This directly reflects how Pandji Pragiwaksono described the basic conditions of Indonesian society in his high-context data, where humor is not explicitly used but is carefully maintained to maintain social harmony. However, this study broadens their focus with a fundamental difference in Kazarian and Martin (2006) who examined these humor styles as static psychological traits measured through quantitative questionnaires, this study directly links them to real-time language communication styles on the stand-up comedy stage.

Furthermore, this study also extends the cross-cultural boundaries of the work of Kalliny et al. (2006) who used Hofstede's cultural dimensions to identify that Americans score significantly higher than Arabs on self-enhancing and self-deprecating humor styles. Kalliny et al. (2006) attributed the high prevalence of

this style of humor to low power distance cultures, where national leaders and ordinary citizens use self-mockery as a means to equalize social status and appear more approachable. Arab cultures, on the other hand, score lower because behavior that diminishes one's status is considered inconsistent with maintaining authority and respect. Unlike previous research, this study extends their framework directly to delivery with an examination of stand-up comedy, where it is this American low power distance trait that allows Chris Rock to comfortably rely on an uncompromising low-context style to be overt. In contrast, Pandji Pragiwaksono's dominant high-context style reflects the Arab pattern, where analogies and linguistic mitigation must be used to actively balance power distance without causing a loss of harmony.

By comparing actual stand-up utterances with a comprehensive cultural review by Jiang et al. (2019), this analysis introduces new findings regarding the fluid communication styles between Western and Eastern cultures that depend on the context, purpose, and even the situation of the speaker. Jiang et al.'s (2019) study also shows that Westerners are highly positive and value assertive humor, as explicitly demonstrated by Chris Rock's unrestrained, low-context aggression and his comfort in exposing raw racial and domestic flaws on stage. This study provides a critical extension by showing that cultural communication styles do not exist in a permanent black-and-white vacuum. Jiang et al. (2019) state that Easterners are constrained by collectivism and Confucian seriousness, making them ambivalent toward humor and deeply afraid of jeopardizing their social status or group harmony.

This research analysis shows how the communication style choices of the two comedians are separated between Chris Rock who aggressively relies on a straightforward low-context style to frame his punchlines, while Pandji Pragiwaksono predominantly utilizes high-context social mitigation. However, fundamental differences emerge when these findings are compared with Korac-Kakabadse et al. (2001) who had a different research object. In addition to finding that low-context cultures prefer to convey information directly and firmly, while high-context cultures do the opposite. Furthermore, Korac-Kakabadse et al. (2001) concluded that inconsistencies or violations of the rules of the cultural context lead to behavioral barriers, relationship conflicts, and communication failures in professional environments. Meanwhile, in the stand-up comedy stage, the application of high or low context communication styles is actually a strategy deliberately adapted to build humor.

The speaker's background has a proven role in what is conveyed in communication, which is why stand-up comedy can also be considered a cultural product. Research by Winarsih (2020) focused on the relationship between culture and language in stand-up comedy in Indonesia. Winarsih's research found that humor has several functions, namely the formation of cultural identity and reflecting the social values of Indonesian society. In addition, it was found that humor in Indonesia tends to be contextual, implicit, and indirectly critical of society in order to avoid confrontation. This finding reinforces the results of this study, in which Pandji Pragiwaksono also reflects on the Indonesian cultural

background, which has a highly contextual pattern with an implicit and indirect style.

Research findings that cultural background plays a role in shaping communication styles are not only evident across countries, but also in studies involving subjects from the same country but different ethnicities, such as the study by Setyaningsih (2013), which confirms that speakers from different ethnicities tend to have different styles of humor and stereotypes. In this study, Setyaningsih examined speakers with Madurese, Batak, and Eastern Indonesian backgrounds, and her findings are consistent with this study, which found that humor is a cultural product shaped by the speaker's background, as exemplified by Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock, who have different nationalities.

In terms of cultural and identity manipulation on stage, this study finds that both Pandji Pragiwaksono and Chris Rock strategically play with their verbal expressions and cultural identities to build a strong interactional connection with their live audience. Still within the same category of local Indonesian stand-up comedy, a study by Afidah and Wahyudi (2014) also examined how local comedians manage their performances. Analyzing 153 lines of YouTube transcription, Afidah and Wahyudi (2014) showed how local comedians use sociocultural elements as a fixed routine to build panggung closeness. They highlighted how Ryan Adryandhi relies on local ethnic stereotypes and how Abdel Achrian utilizes Islamic greetings *Assalamu'alaikum* to activate the background knowledge of Indonesian viewers. However, a fundamental difference emerges between their data and this thesis. While Afidah and Wahyudi (2014) examined

stand-up comedy in a local setting where the comedians and the audience already share the same cultural expectations, this thesis examines an international setting. This study fills the gap by proving that cultural background markers are not just static tools for local audience greetings. Instead, this thesis shows that when performing in front of a foreign audience such as Pandji in New York, global comedians must dynamically shift between high-context and low-context styles to adapt to viewers who do not share their background knowledge.

The findings of this study indicate that Chris Rock strategically explores various types of maxim violations to construct his jokes on topics such as racial, religious, and even domestic issues. This specific mechanism extends the insights of Triandana and Afria (2023), who examined Chris Rock's old performance of "Kill the Messenger" and concluded that the comedian frequently provided exaggerated information and unsubstantiated claims to fuel humor. However, significant differences emerged in terms of data coverage and comparative framework. While Triandana and Afria (2023) limited their analysis to a single-subject study of Chris Rock in "Kill the Messenger" published in 2008, this study updates the data and constructs a cross-cultural comparison with Indonesian comedian Pandji Pragiwaksono. Through this approach, this study not only replicates their conclusions about Rock's maxim violation habits but also uses them as a low-context benchmark to compare how different cultural backgrounds shape different pragmatic styles on stage.

In addition to previous research on Chris Rock, there is also previous research on Pandji Pragiwaksono's stand-up comedy, such as Leonardo & Junaidi (2020),

which focuses on how Pandji conveys his social criticism through semiotics. This criticism is conveyed through humor, satire, and personal stories. Lesmana (2017) also found the same thing. In his research, Lesmana said that the pattern of jokes in Indonesia is indeed a medium of indirect criticism and is often wrapped in implicit language in order to maintain harmony. Therefore, this study provides a broader perspective by illustrating the speech of Pandji and Chris Rock, how they build their comedy with different cultures.

Overall, the findings of this study are reinforced by research from Puspasari and Ariyanti (2019) which focuses on how Indonesian and American stand-up comedians differ in creating humor through flouting maxims. Their research analyzes Kevin Hart as an American and Abdur Arsyad as an Indonesian. Their research found that Abdur Arsyad tends to use an implicit and indirect communication style, which differs from Kevin Hart's straightforward, expressive, and direct communication style. More deeply, these differences include humor strategies and which maxims are predominantly flouted in relation to their cultural backgrounds. In their research, Abdur Arsyad more dominantly violates the principle of quality with indirect criticism, while Kevin more dominantly violates the principle of quantity through explicit direct expression.

Although their research analyzed different comedians, namely Kevin Hart and Abdur Arsyad, the results which successfully proves that this pattern of flouting maxims is related to the cultural background of the speakers, particularly in this case, Indonesian and American culture. Unfortunately, this study does not explicitly explain the linguistic framework of these comedians'

speech in cross-cultural communication, using only the Cooperation Principle to analyze it. Therefore, this study not only reinforces the findings of Puspasari and Ariyanti's research but also fills in the gaps by explaining the cultural mechanisms behind the flouting of the Cooperation Principle.

Based on the analysis, the flouting of Grice's Cooperative Principle is a crucial factor for both comedians to construct humor, but their different communicative mechanisms lie in their structural execution. The overall data shows that the distribution of neglected maxims cannot be separated from the communication styles of comedians who have different cultural backgrounds. According to Hall (1976), the substantive reason for this difference is directly related to how verbal expressions are explicitly or implicitly operationalized on stage. For Chris Rock, the manipulation of Grice's maxims is executed through low-context aggressive hyperbole, raw social confrontation, and irresistible rudeness, where the burden of meaning lies entirely on the sentences uttered to challenge structural discrimination. In contrast, for Pandji Pragiwaksono, the manipulation of maxims is systematically filtered through a high-context lens, using abstract animal metaphors, layered analogies, and linguistic mitigation to convey sharp social criticism while maintaining interpersonal harmony and avoiding confrontational actions.

This pattern reinforces the theory of high-context and low-context communication, which is consistent with the results of this study. Stand-up comedy is not just entertainment, but also a cultural product, because culture plays a role in shaping the pragmatic style and patterns of its speakers. Chen, G., and

Martin, R. A. (2007). Chris Rock, who has African American heritage, exhibits explicit, bold, and straightforward low-context cultural characteristics, while Pandji Pragiwaksono, on the other hand, has Javanese and Sumatran heritage. Although their styles align with Hall's theoretical tendencies, these findings cannot be rigidly generalized, as both comedians maintain dynamic and flexible communication, adapting to the stage context and their audience.

In light of these dynamic findings, critical reflection on the research findings indirectly re-evaluates the limitations of the theory used. The dynamics of the data found in the field yielded different results and successfully tested the scientific limitations of Grice's Cooperative Principle pragmatics and Hall's cultural theory, based on critiques of previous research.

In terms of applying Grice's theory, this study found that all 20 utterances from Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono consistently flout Grice's Cooperative Principle in order to trigger humor. However, the flouting mechanism does not always stand alone rigidly within a single maxim category. The research data shows the phenomenon of double flouting or simultaneous multiple flouting in one utterance. For example, Chris Rock is shown to stack violations of the Quality and Quantity Maxims simultaneously in Data 8a and Data 10a, while Pandji Pragiwaksono combines flouting of the Quality and Manner Maxims simultaneously in Data 8b.

The findings of double flouting validates Sperber and Wilson (1995) Relevance Theory critique of Gricean Cooperative Principle. Sperber and Wilson criticized Grice's division of the four autonomous maxims as an artificial model

that is too mechanical, rigid, and does not reflect the actual cognitive reality of humans. Sperber and Wilson's critique argues that the human cognitive process in communication does not work like a robot that checks a checklist of four maxims separately one by one. Instead, they assert that the human mind is governed by a single cognitive principle, namely the search for optimal relevance between processing effort and the resulting cognitive effect.

Within this critical framework, the Maxim of Quality is positioned as the anchor or main axis that supports the other maxims. When a speaker, in this case a comedian, intentionally distorts the literal truth using extreme hyperbole or sarcasm, this action will inherently damage and shift the structure of the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Manner at the same time. Because, to make a lie or hyperbole sound funny, the comedian must add long descriptive details which can flout the maxims of quantity and use unusual or convoluted diction which can flout the maxims of manner.

In addition to the internal structure of maxims, the findings of this thesis also test the basic assumptions of the communication function in Grice's theory. Grice formulated his cooperative principle under the shadow of the idealism of Western industrial society, specifically England, where successful and rational social interactions must always prioritize directness, information efficiency, and direct honesty without further ado.

This narrow Western perspective sparked cross-cultural ethnocentric criticism from linguist Keenan (1976). Through his study, Keenan empirically demonstrated that Grice's conversational maxims are far from universal, as they

are deeply tied to the underlying Anglo-centric cultural value systems, ideologies, and politeness norms. Keenan (1976) deepened his critique by demonstrating this in other linguistic cultures. In many non-Western societies, such as the Malagasy community he studied in Madagascar, new information is considered a scarce commodity with high social power. Disclosing information explicitly and directly, as if adhering to the Maxim of Quantity, can be seen as violating privacy and risking damage to interpersonal reputation if the information is misplaced, rather than directly violating it as defined by Grice.

Therefore, the practice of withholding details, using vague language, or speaking in circles is not considered a communication failure or a violation of interaction etiquette by local communities. Rather, such indirectness is a sociocultural mandate that must be implemented as a face-saving strategy to avoid direct conflict and maintain community harmony.

Second, regarding the application of Hall's theory, this study also found empirical data indicating the existence of speech flexibility or style-shifting. The data shows that Pandji Pragiwaksono is able to abandon implicit language and use a frank, low-context style in three of his utterances in Data 5b and Data 6b, even though this low-context style in Hall's theory is defined as found in speakers from countries like America. On the other hand, Chris Rock, who grew up in a low-context American culture, also proved to be able to jump to using symbolic analogies and implicit messages typical of high-context Eastern culture in his 2 data, such as in Data 5a when he used a symbolic analogy regarding domestic households through the metaphor of playing the tambourine and moving the sofa.

The style-shifting findings of these two comedians directly provide concrete evidence for Cardon's (2008) critique of over-generalization. Cardon conducted a large-scale analysis of cross-cultural communication literature and strongly criticized Hall's division of high-context and low-context groups as often oversimplifying reality and creating rigid macro-stereotypes, while the communication era continues to develop in the modern world.

The core weakness of Hall's Theory is its tendency to over-generalize a nation's language behavior in a black-and-white manner. Hall's Theory assumes that all individuals within a given geographic region will always communicate in the same way. This reductive view ignores the fact that cultural identity is never singular, static, or monolithic; rather, it possesses massive internal diversity influenced by individual agency, specific ethnic subcultural backgrounds, and the social dynamics of its speakers. Therefore, based on the accumulated data findings in this thesis, the researcher proposes a new theoretical idea and suggestion that cultural communication patterns in modern social reality should be viewed as a completely flexible, fluid, and continuously evolving system. In the current era of massive globalization and digitalization, the cultural context barriers proposed by Hall cannot be simply generalized.

Intensive cross-cultural interactions occurring through global mass media and digital platforms mean that modern humans are no longer confined by the geographical boundaries of their language origins. Through performance data from Pandji and Chris Rock, this study empirically demonstrates that speakers

possess the adaptive capacity to borrow, combine, and operate both cultural contexts interchangeably to achieve specific communication effectiveness.

Responding to the highly dynamic phenomenon of speech variation in this global era, Scollon et al. (2012) have criticized the limitations of Hall's macro theory through the concept of situational inconsistency. They assert that human communication styles are never permanent or locked in a historical vacuum, but rather a highly fluid, flexible, and adaptive form of action depending on the type of event, physical location, type of activity, and various sociological roles behind the scenes. Scollon et al. (2012) explain that this language shift is strongly controlled by the interaction of complex social variables, including gender roles, age groups, social identities, and the demographic characteristics of the audience being addressed. Age factors and generational differences in the digital era influence speakers' openness to new language styles. Furthermore, the international comedy stage and the demands of heterogeneous cross-national audiences can force speakers to use a straightforward, low-context style to equalize the frequency of understanding.

Scollon et al.'s (2012) situational critique concludes the discussion section of this thesis by arguing that Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono's shifting speaking styles are not a sign of cultural inconsistency or a loss of national identity. Rather, they should be viewed as a form of adaptation to globalization designed to evoke incongruity and instant humorous responses from live audiences in the modern era.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter is made as a summary of the result of the analysis that has been found by the researcher. Furthermore, this chapter also discuss the suggestion that are expected for future research.

A. Conclusion

The conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that both Chris Rock and Pandji Pragiwaksono in their utterances found flouting Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) maxim as a performative mechanism to build humor in their material. To answer the first problem formulation regarding the types of floutings that occur, this study shows that both comedians strategically play with language such as through the use of hyperbole, non-factual premises, and absurd analogies. In the world of stand-up comedy, flouting this maxim is not considered a communication failure or social dysfunction, but rather a rational and measured verbal strategy in building jokes. Through this language manipulation, comedians and audiences create a dynamic linguistic interaction space to dismantle social absurdities and convey criticism intelligently.

Furthermore, to answer the second problem formulation, based on the results of the analysis, it is proven that the way these two comedians process and deliver their jokes is closely related to the tendencies of their respective cultural backgrounds, which is in line with Hall's (1976) high and low context theory framework. Although they have the same pragmatic goal of triggering laughter,

their delivery styles show contrasting structural patterns. Chris Rock's style tends to reflect the characteristics of a low-context culture, Rock also comes from a family of African-American origin who is also known to have a verbal tradition of "street wit". This encourages Rock to dominate the stage with aggressive hyperbole, explicit social confrontation, and frank openness where the burden of meaning is placed explicitly on the sentences spoken. In contrast, Pandji Pragiwaksono's communication pattern appears to be filtered or has mitigation to avoid confrontation which is defined by high-context characteristics that are in line with the values of politeness and social harmony typical of his Javanese (Kebumen) and Sumatran (Pagar Alam) family backgrounds. Pandji tends to soften his sharp criticism using animal metaphors, layered analogies, and linguistic mitigation in order to convey the message without triggering direct friction or actions that threaten the audience's self-esteem.

An important finding of this study is that the tendencies of certain cultural communication patterns cannot be treated as rigid generalizations or static stereotypes. Field data proves that pragmatic communication styles on stage remain dynamic, flexible, and highly dependent on the situation or even the speaker's goals. The two comedians do not operate exclusively at one end of the cultural spectrum. This flexibility is clearly visible when Pandji performs before a Western audience in New York, where he can situationally shed his high-context cultural veneer and switch to a straightforward, low-context delivery style that adapts to the understanding of his audience, which is mostly non-Southeast Asian. Ultimately, this study confirms that stand-up comedy functions as a significant cultural product,

where flouting maxims are not merely a means of entertainment, but a fluid linguistic medium for speakers to convey certain messages.

Therefore, this flexible style demonstrates that old cultural theories, such as Hall's division, are too simplistic and cannot be used to assess modern communication in this global era. Cultural communication is no longer a fixed rule based on one's country or passport. In today's world, people can easily learn other communication styles through social media, the internet, global entertainment, or even other external factors. The fact that a speaker can shift from a high-context style to a low-context style proves that cultural communication is flexible and adaptive, not just black and white.

B. SUGGESTION

After completing this research, the researcher realized that there were several limitations that needed to be considered. This research still has limitations in terms of data variation, especially in the material section of Pandji Pragiwaksono, because the available video documentation is limited to uploads from the Instagram account @standupindo.nyc. Theoretically, the analysis conducted also still relies on verbal transcripts and has not reached nonverbal aspects such as gestures, facial expressions, and intonation of the comedian's voice when delivering material on stage. In addition, another limitation found is the small number of local comedians who use English entirely in their performances, thus limiting the volume of data corpus that can be explored in the context of cross-cultural interactions.

Based on these findings, discussions, and limitations, the researcher formulates several substantive recommendations for further research. First, regarding the linguistic framework, future researchers are suggested to complement Grice's cooperative principle with alternative pragmatic or discourse approaches to capture more fluid stage interactions. For instance, next researchers can integrate Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory to better understand the cognitive aspects of humor delivery, or use other discourse frameworks to address the technical limitations of relying solely on flouting maxims in analyzing dynamic comic utterances. Furthermore, subsequent studies are highly recommended to expand the scope and database of the subject by seeking out other cross-cultural comedians with a more extensive data of English language performances.

Second, regarding the cultural framework, future research is recommended to explore more deeply the dynamic and non-static nature of high- and low-context communication patterns based on the findings of this study. Given that this thesis demonstrates that Pandji Pragiwaksono is not always fixated on high-context patterns and that Chris Rock occasionally shifts to high-context styles, future researchers need to examine how this style-crossing phenomenon occurs in other global comedians. To enrich this cultural discussion, next researchers can specifically incorporate key social variables such as gender, age, and specific situational contexts. Examining how male and female comedians from different age generations adapt their communication styles will provide a deeper, more systematic understanding of how these social factors shape the pragmatic realization of cross-cultural humor.

REFERENCES

- Afidah, L., & Wahyudi, R. (2014). How it starts and ends: A study of Indonesian stand-up comedy. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 14(2), 170–189.
https://doi.org/10.17509/bs_jpbsp.v14i2.716
- Attardo, S. (2020b). The linguistics of humor. In *Oxford University Press eBooks*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198791270.001.0001>
- Ary, D. J. (2010). Introduction to research in education (8th ed.) . Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Broeder, P. (2021). Informed communication in high context and low context cultures. *Journal of Education, Innovation, and Communication*., 3(1), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.34097/jeicom-3-1-june21-1>
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). Discourse analysis. Cambridge University Press
- Cardon, P. W. (2008). A critique of Hall’s contexting model. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 22(4), 399–428.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651908320361>
- Coulthard, M. (1997). An Introduction to discourse analysis (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Chiaro, D. (1992). The Language of Jokes: Analyzing Form and Context. Routledge
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. SAGE.
- Firdaus, A. Y., Setiawati, S., & Yulianto, E. (2019b). Satire on stand up comedy “Messake Bangsaku” by Pandji Pragiwaksono. *Hortatori Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(2), 80–86.
<https://doi.org/10.30998/jh.v2i2.67>
- Gazdar, G. (1980). Pragmatics: Implicature, presupposition, and logical form. Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books

- Jiang, T., Li, H., & Hou, Y. (2019c). Cultural differences in humor perception, usage, and implications. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00123>
- Joser, J. R., Dedace, J. R., Daclizon, K., Salvaña, P. L., Nacionales, J., & Claridad, N. (2023). Therhetoric of comedy: exploring the language and humor styles of Filipino stand-up comedians. *Journal of Language and Pragmatics Studies*, 2(2), 71-88.
- Keenan, E. O. (1976). The universality of conversational postulates. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500006850>
- Kalliny, M., Cruthirds, K. W., and Minor, M. S. (2006). Differences between American, egyptian and lebanese humor styles: implications for international management. *Int. J. Cross Cult. Manage.* 6, 121–134. doi: 10.1177/ 1470595806062354
- Korac-Kakabadse, N., Kouzmin, A., & Kakabadse, A. (2001). From tacit knowledge to knowledge management: Leveraging invisible assets. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 8(3), 137–154. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.71>
- Chen, G., and Martin, R. A. (2007). A comparison of humor styles, coping humor, and mental health between Chinese and Canadian university students. *Humor Int. J. Humor Res.* 20, 215–234. doi: 10.1515/HUMOR.2007.011
- Rickford, J. R., Rickford, R., & Smitherman, G. (2000). *Spoken Soul: The Story of Black English*. https://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:443/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=008875122&sequence=000002&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA
- Puspasari, M. A., & Ariyanti, L. (2019). Flouting maxims in creating humor: A comparison study between Indonesian and American. *Prosodi*, 13(2), 75-88.
- Raharja, A. U. S., & Rosyidha, A. (2019). Maxim of cooperative principle violation by Dodit Mulyanto in Stand-up Comedy Indonesia season 4. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(1), 62–77. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v1i1.62-77>
- Rahmawati, W. W., Ruhaena, L., Roby, M., & Kholila, A. (2026). Development of an Ewuh Pakewuh scale instrument based on Javanese cultural values. *Psikoborneo Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 14(1), 212. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v14i1.23114>

- Ruiz-Gurillo, L., & Linares-Bernabéu, C. (2019). The pragmatics of humor in interactive contexts. In L. Ruiz-Gurillo (Ed.), *Metapragmatics of humor: Current research trends* (pp. 1–21). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schwarz, J. (2009). Linguistic aspects of verbal humor in stand-up comedy. <https://doi.org/10.22028/d291-23545>
- Setyaningsih, E. (2013). Humor in stand-up comedy show: A pragmatic study. *Language Horizon: Journal of English Language and Literature*, 1(1), 1–10.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*, 2nd ed. Sperber. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-97355-000>
- Leonardo, R., & Junaidi, A. (2020b). Kritik Sosial dalam Stand Up Comedy (Analisis Semiotika Show “Pragiwaksono World Tour”). *Koneksi*, 4(2), 185. <https://doi.org/10.24912/kn.v4i2.8077>
- Lesmana, A. S. (2017). Humor and social criticism in stand-up comedy: A study of the Indonesian stand-up comedy show “Stand Up Comedy Indonesia (SUCI).” *Humaniora*, 29(3), 235–243. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.28906>
- Lewis, T., Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (1996b). Intercultural Communication: A Discourse approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 366. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588155>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge UP
- Tong, L., & Yuqing, T. (2020). Applying Hall’s high context and low context Cultures model to analysis the implications of cultural differences on functioning in cross-cultural groups. *Academic Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 3(8). <https://doi.org/10.25236/ajhss.2020.030813>
- Paltridge, B. (2000). *Making sense of discourse analysis*. Gerd Stabler Publishing
- Triandana, A., & Afria, R. (2023). Pelanggaran Maksim Kerjasama dalam Stand-Up Comedy Chris Rock. *Titian Jurnal Ilmu Humaniora*, 7(1), 91–104. <https://doi.org/10.22437/titian.v7i1.25436>
- Winarsih, S. (2020b). *Stand-up comedy: The relation between language and culture*. *Kajian Linguistik*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.35796/kaling.8.1.2020.29098>
- Yule, G. (1996). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

CURRICULUM VITAE



Ahmad Fadi Danial V.N was born and raise in Probolinggo on July 8, 2002. SMKN 2 Probolinggo was his last education before entering university. During the school, he participated in several activities. Such as intra-school organizations, reporters, social service activities. He continued his studies in English Literature at UIN Malang. During his university life, he was a very active student, participating in several activities and organizations, such as the English Literature Student Association (HMPS), the Student Activity Unit (UKM) of Radio Simfoni FM Malang, the Malang Campus Radio Union, and many others.

APPENDIXES

List of Chris Rock's Utterances Flouting the Cooperative Principle as a Reflection of Cultural Context

NO	DATUM	UTTERANCES	COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE				HIGH CONTEXT & LOW CONTEXT	
			F Maxim Quantity	F maxim Quality	F Maxim Relevance	F Maxim Manner	HIGH CONTEXT	LOW CONTEXT
1.	1a	"I'm walking around, looking around today, and I wonder... You would think that cops would occasionally shoot a white kid just to make it look good."		✓				✓
2.	2a	"Dead nigga calendar."		✓				✓

3.	3a	“Nobody gives a fuck about you. Nobody in the whole world gives a fuck about you. Nobody thinks you're cute, nobody. Nobody thinks you're smart, nobody gives a fuck about your opinion. Nobody on the whole earth outside of this door gives a fuck about you. Nobody.”	✓	✓				✓
4.	4a	“When you're in a relationship, you're in a band... and when you're in a band, you have roles that you play in the band. Sometimes you sing lead, and sometimes has to stand in the back and play the		✓		✓	✓	

		tambourine... If you're on tambourine, play it right! Play it with a fucking smile”						
5.	5a	People say “Relationships are tough, they only become tough when only one person is working on it. Two people can move a couch really easily, but one person can't move it at all.”		✓		✓	✓	
6	6a	"If you think you can help God out, you don't believe in God. If you really had faith you'd really have faith. I mean, check this out. I haven't been to church in ten years. Now that's believing in God. Shit, you go every week 'cause you don't trust God."		✓				✓

7	7a	“ we need bullies, how the fuck do you have a school with no bullies? bullies do half the work, teachers do one half, bullies do the whole other half, and that's the half you're gonna use as a fucking grown up. Who gives a fuck if you can code, if you start crying because your boss didn't say hi.”		✓				✓
8	8a	“people always say "children are born loving" it's the biggest crock of bullshit i have ever heard in my life. kids are the most racist, sexist, homophobic, mean	✓	✓				✓

		motherfuckers, on the face on the earth. kids are mean motherfuckers, okay?						
9	9a	“When my kid was two, she was biting kids on the playground, you think I taught her to bite kids? No that was her natural state. She came out of the womb like wolverine, just tearing fucking kids up. Kids are horrible people, so pre-school is just like jail with milk.”		✓				✓
10	10a	God doesn't make mistakes? God make plenty of mistakes, you ever see a porcupine? can't eat it, can't hug it, it's ugly, it's stick, it's shitting all over the	✓	✓				✓

		place. It's Mistakes” “God don't make no mistakes? that's pretty ambitious thing to say. No mistakes? You ever read the bible? What does the bible say happened on the seventh day? God rested. Okay, seems odd that a perfect being would rest. Have you ever been performing a task? it was going perfect and you took a rest? has that every happened in your life? No! that has never fucking happened to you.						
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

List of Pandji Pragiwaksono's Utterances Flouting the Cooperative Principle as a Reflection of Cultural Context

N O	DATUM	UTTERANCES	COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE				HIGH CONTEXT & LOW CONTEXT	
			FM : Quantity	FM : Quality	FM : Relevance	FM : Manner	HIGH CONTEXT	LOW CONTEXT
1.	1a	“Being reborn as an animal would be an awesome life. Any life that doesn't have dreams and aspirations is an awesome life. Look at young people today, they look miserable because of their dreams and aspirations. It's		✓			✓	

		stressful. Do you know why birds sing? Because they don't sit in an office at 3 p.m. thinking."						
2.	2a	"There's a stereotype about Indonesian people and the stereotype is that we're lazy. Now I'm here to tell you, we're not lazy, we're just not accustomed to work hard"		✓			✓	
3.	3a	"Indonesian mom, we lived with badass women all our life. I swear my mom slapped my face so hard, I was like, are you a man?"		✓			✓	

4.	4a	“Business in New York like to hire Indonesian, this is true. They say it's because Indonesia don't talk back, it's true. We talk behind their back. That's our things”		✓				✓
5.	5a	“Indonesia and Malaysia, we have a very funny relationship. We look like each other, we don't like each other. I'm just joking. We hate each other”		✓				✓
6	6b	“Okay, so when I moved here, zero person know me. I don't have any		✓				✓

		history, I don't have any track record. I was having an identity crisis, so I think I can just reinvent myself, and nobody would know, right? I was thinking, wow, I can create a whole new identity. My friends are back home, my wife is back home, my kids are back home, so I decided to form a new identity. I decided to be single.”						
7	7b	“Goshen, Indiana, I am here. I'm here. Yes, I'm here. Why am I here? Why am I here? I have no idea about Goshen until a couple of months ago,		✓			✓	

		but I arrived in the afternoon. I took a walk around the town, around the city, and I love, you have a very charming city. I love Goshen. Yes, I took a 15-minute walk, and I think I covered all of Goshen. I think I covered all of Goshen.”						
8	8b	“Alright, so, don't you think it's funny that the activity of fucking is like stabbing, except that nobody dies, but at the same time, if you pull out, somebody doesn't get to live? right?		✓		✓	✓	

9	9b	“The slowest walking Asian are Indonesian, see? And they're proud of it. Indonesians don't walk, we float. We glide.”		✓			✓	
10	10b	“When United States crushed Japan, all the Japanese troop in Indonesia didn't know what to do... What I'm trying to say is, Indonesia's independence was pretty much like jaywalking.”		✓			✓	