



JURNAL PENDIDIKAN DAN SASTRA INGGRIS

Halaman Jurnal: <https://ejurnal.politeknikpratama.ac.id/index.php/jupensi>

Halaman UTAMA: <https://ejurnal.politeknikpratama.ac.id/index.php>



LANGUAGE USE FOR CRITICIZING TROUGH STAND UP COMEDY SHOW: PRAGMATIC APPROACH

Ika Susanti

Ikast1@gmail.com

Abstract

The use of language can be classified into some points. One of them is for criticizing. This paper focused in analyzing the use of language in criticizing. The data was taken from stand up comedy shows. Qualitative is used in elaborating the data of the research. There are 5 stand up comedy videos that was used as data. This papers used three dimensions of theories, those are context, presupposition and implicature, in order to know how the comic deliver a critique in their stand up comedy. As the result, the use of pragmatic can be showed how language can be applied in giving a critique. The information of context and presupposition support in understanding the implicature of the comics' utterance. Briefly, I can conclude that Comic in this paper gave critiques to the government attitude, government policy and enforcer attitude.

Key words: implicature, stand up comedy, critique, context, presupposition

INTRODUCTION

The important use of language as the communication tool can not be separated from human daily life. Language is the way to transfer our idea and feeling, or to explain something. It is also the interaction device for a person to their society. Related to the function of language for sharing our idea, critique is a part of them. Critique can be used to deliver our opinion about other person activity or attitude. It is like evaluated to something or someone. Critique can be given in a lot of ways, such as by using newspaper, social network, and magazine. By the time, the ways of giving a critique also develop. One of the ways is trough a comedy. One of the famous comedy now days is stand up comedy.

Stand up comedy shows are very popular among Indonesia people. It is proven with the emergence of comedians for doing stand up comedy. Stand comedy is a new concept of comedy. It is presented by one person and commonly it delivers with standing position that is one of a reason this kind of comedy is called stand up comedy or we can say that the person do a monologue to create a comedy "One man show". The person who delivers a comedy through stand up comedy called 'comic'. Stand up comedy at the first time emerged around 18 century in Europe. One of a famous stand up comedy was built by peter rosegard (england). By day the enthusiasm of this program are larger. It happens almost in around the world. One of them is Indonesia. One of program that produce some famous comics such as Ernes prakasa, Ryan andriyanto, and Akbar is stand up comedy compas tv (SUCI compas tv). By day the person's enthusiasm for the program is larger, it is showed by a lot of participants on that contest.

The main aim in doing stand up comedy is to entertain audience. For this purposing, comics incline to choose a topic related to their daily life. Some topics are commonly used is related to our routine, artist news, politic, life style and so on. Politic is a common area that are used as a topic. Related to it, comics like to comment about the performance of government of Indonesia in doing their job. But it is still in formed of comedy. In this case, briefly we can say that comics commonly deliver stand up comedy not only deliver a joke but also a critique. These critiques are delivered implicitly while the comic are giving a joke.

Pragmatic is one of discipline in linguistic that study about intended meaning, and we know as "Implicature". Implicature is a study of intended meaning of person utterance. They sometimes send message on their utterance more than they said (Yule, 2003 : 35). Through

implicature, the comic not only can build a listener laughing but also deliver hidden messages. Those hidden message is produced to evaluate someone or something. Most of them commonly is known as critique. Those are one of reason why stand up comedy can be a new media in delivering critique, particularly related to politic issue.

Some researchers had studied about stand up comedy. Many point of view they took. In this paper, the researcher used two journals as previous study. The first researcher is Wang (2011). On his journal Haiyan focused on finding conversational implicature in listening comprehensive. Here, my research focused not only in finding implicature on the comics' utterance but also finding how language can be used to deliver a critique through stand up comedy show. The similarity of both studies is used of the same theory "implicature". The second journal is written by Yuniar (2013). The research explored "ya" as the discourse marker, performed in professional stand up comedy. The similarity of Yuniar's journal and mine is the data. Both of us used stand up comedy show but when we talk about the theory used is different. Yuniar focused in using two function level of language by Briton: textual and ideational level, whereas this research focuses in using theory of implicature by Yule to understand intended meaning. Moreover, I also used the understanding of critique concept in analyzing how the comic's utterance can be identified as a critique.

The objective of this research is to know how the use of language for criticizing in stand up comedy show; to know how the context and presupposition support the understanding of hidden meaning (implicature) in comics' utterance; to know how the comic used a concept of implicature in order to send their idea that identified as critique in stand up comedy show; the last is to whom the critique was made for. Those are the objectives of this study. Then to elaborate the answer about the question above, I will use some theories as known as pragmatic, such as implicature and some additional theory to support the research such as presupposition and context.

Pragmatic is the study of speaker meaning, contextual of meaning, how more get communicated than is said, and the expression of relative pronoun. (Yule, 2003:5). Jenny Thomas explained the concept of pragmatic by delivering an example. If some one said "It's hot in here", semantically this utterance mean to give information that the weather is hot. But in different occasion, it can give a different meaning such as "please open the window or turning on the air conditioner". There is a hidden meaning when the speaker uttered it. Then why the speaker does not say directly that he want someone to open the window or turn on

the AC. Those are some issues of pragmatic (as one of the area in linguistic). Moreover Jenny Thomas defined that “pragmatic is meaning in interaction”. Providing a meaning in utterance is a dynamic process, it involves the negotiation meaning between speaker and hearer, the utterance context that consist of physical, social, and linguistic context and the meaning potencial of the utterance. (Thomas, 1995: 22)

Implicature is sub discipline of pragmatic, conversational implicature is about the conveying message more than he said. (Yule, 2003:40) another definition come from Jenny Thomas, he said that “Implicature is conveying an additional level of meaning, beyond the semantic meaning of the word uttered.” (Thomas, 1996:57). Such as the example before, the utterance “It’s hot in here”, it contains of implicature. The utterance has hidden meaning. When the speaker produced the utterance “It’s hot in here”, he wants to tell “please open the window! because the weather is so hot”. He forces someone to open the window. The second level of meaning is the concept of implicature.

Talking implicature, we can not stay away from the concept of context and presupposition. When we make a meaning, we have to involve both of the elements. Context is understood as shared knowledge or schemata (Widdowson. 2007: 25). Context is the concept of here and now, and the concept of shared knowledge where everyone has a schemata when they are talking to their speaking partner. It helps them to understand the message of the speaker. Thomas (1995: 22) said there are three kinds of context, those are physical, social, and linguistic. Involving the context in interpreting the utterance can help us to understand the meaning of an utterance. Later, presupposition happens when someone want to produce an utterance. “The presupposition is something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance” that definition of presupposition comes from Yule (2003 :25). In producing the utterance, speakers will normally have the presupposition related to the utterance that they will produce. Understanding of the utterance that contains of implicature or hidden level of meaning, the listener has to make the interpretation of the utterance. Where the listener has to stimulate their understanding related to the knowledge of utterance and context and make inference of it in order to understand the speaker’s message (Carthy, 2000). Then those all of them were used in analyzing the comic’ critique, based on brian (2003) critique is how we assess something or somebody in detail.

RESEARCH METHOD

Qualitative design is used in this research to describe how critique can be delivered through stand up comedy show in the form of implicature. The data was conducted from stand up comedy show “compas TV”. There are five Video that were used as the data. The data was gathered from the internet. In this research, I used observation method to analyze the data in order to know what is the context and presupposition behind the utterance. Then it was continued by taking a note as the technique of gathering the data. (Creswell, 2009)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This discussion explored how comic give a critique to government through stand up comedy. There are five data that are used in this paper. The data was delivered by 5 person, they are muslim, dzahwin, abdur, akbar, and arie.

1. First data is about the stand up comedy performance of muslim. He is a comic from Madura. The video was taken on march 13th 2014. On his show, he said that *Suramadu jembatan terpanjang terpanjang di dunia, proses pembuatannya. Saya dengar rencananya dibangun itu 1991 tapi baru selesai 2008, memang jembatan penuh misteri.* (he bridge of suramadu is the longest bridge in the world, I mean the building process of it. I heard that it was planned to be built on 1991, but it has just finished on 2008. It is a mysterious bridge).
2. The second data is taken from Zahwin’s stand up comedy show. On his stand comedy show he acted as 3 persons that all of them are doing a conversation. But in a previous he said that *di pasar seorang anggota DPR ketemu seorang preman, tapi tenang gak akan dipalak, gila masak preman pasar malak preman Negara* (in market, a member of DPR met a civilian, but the civilian would not rob him, it is crazy because how a little civilian rob a country civilian). Later he acted as butcher, civilian and a member of DPR. First, the conversation happened between a civilian and a butcher in a traditional market. The civilian suddenly asked some money from the butcher roughly; because the butcher was afraid then he directly gave the money to the civilian. The next action, Zahwin acted as a civilian and a member of DPR. The civilian wanted to ask some money from this second person, but after knowing that he is a member of DPR directly the civilian rejected his action. Because of the member

of DPR' curiosity about the civilian's rejection reason, then he asked to the civilian why he rejected the action, then the civilian said *Maaf pak ya bukan apa-apa pak, saya ini preman biasa, malak duit halal pak. Tapi kalau saya malak bapak nanti dosanya dobel* (I am sorry sir, I am just a little civilian, I rob a rightful money, but when I rob your money, then I will get a double sin).

3. The second data was taken from Abdur. He is one of the comic contestant in stand up comedy season 4. This is a part of his utterance in stand up comedy show *pendidikan kita itu menekankan pada pembelajaran kontekstual, berarti pembelajaran banyak yang diambil dari kehidupan kita, tapi masih banyak pembelajaran sehari-hari yang tidak kontekstual, ambil contoh pelajaran matematika ada soal seperti ini, ada menara tingginya 60 meter jika seorang pengamat dengan puncak menara membentuk sudut 60 derajat. Hitunglah jarak pengamat dengan menara? Kalau soal ini diberikan pada kami di timur kami bingung. Bukan bingung hitungnya. Tapi menara ini seperti apa, seperti apa? Tempat saya itu tidak ada menara. Kenapa tidak diganti dengan tiang kapal kah, pohon kelapa kah atau tiang listrik tapi percuma listrik juga belum ada* (Our education emphasize on the contextual learning, it means we take a lot of learning based on our life. But commonly our daily learning are not contextual. For example, on math lesson there is a question like this, there is a tower, the height is 60 meter. If the observer and the top of the tower create a corner with 60 of degree, please measure the distance between the observer and the tower? If this question gives to us in east (orang timur) we will confused. Wait, we are not confused in how to measure it, but we don't know how the tower looks like? In our place, there is no tower. Why it is not changed into ships' mast, coconut tree, or electricity mast, but it will be useless, in my place there is no electricity).
4. The fourth data is from Akbar's utterance. He said that *kejahatan sangat dekat dengan kemiskinan, kemiskinan banyak karena ternyata kemiskinan dipelihara oleh Negara, pasal 34 menyatakan fakir miskin dan anak terlantar dipelihara oleh Negara, namanya dipelihara, ayam 1 dipelihara ya jadi 2, 2 dipelihara jadi 3 dan kalau fakir miskin dipelihara ya tambah banyak sekarang. Kemudian Banyak kejahatan karena aparat gak tegas dalam menerapkan hukum contohnya dalam pelanggaran lalu lintas yang diterapkan pasal apa kalau pelanggaran lalu lintas pasal 25 sama pasal 50 ribu* (a crime is so near to the poverty, there are a lot of poverty because in this country poverty is kept by the government. In the 34 section

(pasal 34) stated that needy and waif are kept by the government, it is kept so if you keep one chicken then it will be two chickens, then if you keep two chicken it will be three chicken, so if you keep a needy the mount of needy will be larger time by time. Then there are a lot of crimes because the police cannot be just a strict with the applying of law. For example, on the violation of traffic, the police use the rule in the section 25 or 50.000 (pasal 25 atau 50 ribu)).

5. The last data is the video of arie's stand up comedy show. He said that "*Kalau di Indonesia timur apa yang mau dikuasai. Tambang, emas sudah dikuasai oleh Negara asing semua. Jangankan penjahat masyarakat sekitar aja sudah tidak kebagian*" (What do criminal want to dominate in the east of Indonesia. All mine (tambang) and gold have been dominated by the foreinger. The local people get nothing of it more over the criminal).

Critiques for government's attitude

Comic in their stand up comedy utterance produced some critic to the government. Here Muslim and dzahwin concerned in criticizing about government's attitude. The data above would be explained more with the three theories about pragmatic that included context, presupposition, and implicature. First the data above muslim stand up comedy show. The interpretation of muslim utterance involved the context of physical and epistemic. The physical context is the material objects surrounding the communication event and any other features of the natural world that influence communication. The speaker is muslim and he comes from madura. He is as one of Madura society who had a big hope since 1992 to the finishing of the suramadu bridge construction. The show was watched by a lot of people via television. The speaker is one of the contestants of stand up comedy show, then the audience is all the person in Indonesia who watch this show directly in the Balai kartini hall room or who watch in their home via television. The genre of this monologue is humor. The producing of the utterance is to make a joke or audience's laughing.

The epistemic context is both hearer and speaker have a schemata (shared knowledge). Both speaker (comic) and hearer (audience) has a shared knowledge about the utterance that would be produced by Muslim. There are about 3 terms of shared knowledge. Those are (1) it is about the building process of suramadu bridge finally finished on 2008, the government need almost 20 years to finish it, (2) the responsibility of the building process of suramadu bridge lied on Government, responsibility of the building process means

government who plan the concept of the bridge, construct the bridge and control all the cost of the building process. Government have a right to control everything so the length or shorten of building process depend on the government. (3) both of speaker and hearer do not know the real reason that lied behind the late of the suramadu building process.

While the speaker produced his utterance, in the first instance he presupposed or assumed about something. Then his assumption would be the case prior to make an utterance. There are some assumption that lied under Muslim's utterance. Those are (1) the suramadu bridge is exist (2) Suramadu bridge connects both of java and Madura island. (3) Suramadu bridge can give a lot of advantages, (4) Madura people have waited the finishing of the bridge construction as fast as possible. Those are some speaker assumptions that encouraged him to produce his utterance.

Implicature is a study of intended meaning of person utterance. By using implicature theory we want to analyze more about an utterance. The utterance that would be discussed contains a second level of meaning. First data is the utterance that was produced by Muslim- a stand up comedy contestant. In the context of utterance above explained that Muslim come from Madura so what he said is truly from his heart. What he told to the audience is based on his experience, he told his opinion as one of Madura society. Then both of the speakers and audience have the same background knowledge about the politic rules or the government right on the building process of the bridge. Then there are some speaker pre assumption that make him produce those utterances. As one of Madura society he hoped the building of the bridge can give a lot of benefit to the Madura people. Then he is very dejected to the late of the building process of the bridge.

The first utterance is "*jembatan Suramadu adalah jembatan terpanjang di dunia, proses pembuatannya* (the bridge of suramadu is the longest bridge in the world, I means the building process of it). By uttering it, Muslim wanted to say that Government never did everything well, whereas the plan of the bridge building since 1991 but it had just finished on 2008. Government needed almost 20 years to finish it. Moreover Muslim thought that actually Government could do the building process of the bridge in short time but because of there are a lot of official government who corrupted or do dishonest so it obstructed the building process of the bridge. Then Muslim also said "*Jembatan ini sangat misterius-* the bridge is so mysterious". Semantically the meaning of mysterious is strange, not known or

not understood but Muslim want tell the message beyond the semantic meaning, by saying mysterious bridge he did not just want to tell that the shape of bridge is strange, not known or not understood but the building process of the bridge itself that is strange, not known. There is a hidden reason that lay behind the late of the building process. Moreover Muslim wanted to tell that government could not responsible of the building process of the bridge because may be so many official government involved in corrupting the fund of the bridge building. That makes one of the reasons for the late of the building process.

In the second data, there are 2 contexts that support while the utterances are produced. Those are physical context and epistemic context. First is physical context, there are some points on physical context: (1) The speaker is Zahwin; (2) He is a university student; (3) Zahwin is one of contestant of stand up comedy Kompas TV season 4; (4) These utterances are produced in Stand comedy show that was held in Balai Kartini hall room. (5) The genre of this monologue is humor. Here, Zahwin acted as three persons who did a dialogue. They are as civilian, butcher and DPR member.

Second, Epistemic context, Zahwin and audience have same background knowledge. Here I will explain more some background knowledge that belongs to Zahwin and the audience. It consist: (1) civilian is a curly people, because they take other persons' thing roughly, without getting any permission from the owner; (2) robbing other person things is sin; (3) in this country, there are a lot of DPR member who corrupt, most of the society do not believe with them; (4) market civilian (preman pasar) just give a trouble to one or two persons, the person who are robbed by the market civilian, then it just described that he only got a little sin from his crime; (5) the corruption that was done by the DPR member can give a big effect to Indonesia society, not only one or two person but it is more that 10.000.000 indonesian. It impedes the developing of the infrastructure of the country, then the corruptors will get a big sin of their crime; (6) Money that belongs to Seller is rightful (halal). Then, zahwin's presupposition before producing these utterances are (1) the conversation does not really happen, Zahwin just do the act; (2) the civilian is a bad person; (3) the corruption is bad activity.

The context and presupposition on this utterance can support the analyzing of second level of meaning (implicature). The context above told that Zahwin is also one of stand up comedy contestant, he acted as the civilian, butcher and DPR member. This story is about a civilian who is brave to rob a butcher but he is not brave to rob the DPR member. Zahwin is

also a student university. Commonly a university student is brave to tell their opinion to the public. Zahwin said “*di pasar seorang anggota DPR ketemu seorang preman, tapi tenang gak akan dipalak, gila masak preman pasar malak preman Negara* (In the market, the DPR member meets a civilian, but it is ok, the DPR member will not be robbed, it will be a crazy thing if a market civilian are brave to rob a country civilian (corruptor)). By uttering this, Zahwin wanted to said that the member of DPR did a lot of crime (corruption), then both speaker and hearer had a shared knowledge that both of their activities are crime, but civilian do less crime than a DPR member (corruptor). Moreover Zahwin also uttered “Maaf pak ya bukan apa-apa pak, saya ini preman biasa, malak duit halal pak. Tapi kalau saya malak bapak nanti dosanya dobel” (Zahwin utterance has a meaning more than he said. Corruption is a big crime, it is worse than civilian. It is a satire to the corruptor (they are labeled as DPR member) that both corruptor and civilian are very bad. But the corruptor is worse than civilian because it is caused many problems for a lot of people.

Both of Zahwin and Muslim utterance in stand up comedy show were discussed about government who liked to corrupt. Truly, governments are people who were trusted by Indonesia society, they should have a good attitude. Then the fact said the opposite of it. There are a lot of government who had corrupted, so it give a lot of disadvantage to Indonesia. Government of Indonesia have a bad attitude. Then the utterance that were delivered by Zahwin and Muslim have an aim to give a critique for government’s attitude.

Critiques for government’s policy

Government policy in controlling the rule and regulation must be done well. Because here government has a big power to control everything, the populace of the country will be prosperous if the government can do the policy that they have made responsibly. The next data are about Abdur, Akbar, and Arie stand up comedy. In their utterance they also criticized the government.

The first data was produced by Abdur. First, physical context, it tells some information; (1) Abdur is stand up comedy contestant; (2) he is from NTT, the topic is about people in the east of Indonesia; (3) he is also a university student. (4) The genre of this monologue is humor. Second, epistemic context, it tells about the shared knowledge both

abdur and the audience. It is about (1) the audience understand the concept of contextual learning; (2) the audience know about the math lesson about the topic “the distance and the corner”. Then the assumption of a speaker or pre supposition that force the producing of the utterance is, (1) Indonesia applied contextual learning in the education system; (2) government distributed the same books to all students in Indonesia from sabang to merauke; and (3) there is not electricity in some place in NTT.

The applying of the contextual learning can not balance, such as between java and NTT. Both of the students on those areas got the same book (with the same content). When we go back to the concept of contextual learning actually all the contents of the book have to related to the area or it must be situational. Different areas have a different content. It is fine if the title and lesson are the same but the used of vocabulary must be contextual. On his utterance, Abdur said “*Hitunglah jarak pengamat dengan menara? Kalau soal ini diberikan pada kami di timur kami bingung. Bukan bingung hitungnya. Tapi menara ini seperti apa, seperti apa?*”, those are some questions on students’ math book in NTT, actually they can answer the question but they are difficult to imagine how the tower look likes. When the government really applied the contextual learning in all areas of Indonesia, the question on Abdur utterance must be “*hitunglah jarak pengamat dengan pohon kelapa*”. Because most of students who live in the outlying district do not have tower in their daily life. Then we go to the conclusion that government are not serious in the developing of Indonesia education.

In the following utterance Abdur also said that “*tapi percuma listrik juga belum ada*”. This utterance also has the second level of meaning. It is about the plan of government that want to do the developing infrastructure in the outlying district, but it is just a plan. Because there is a lot of area in Indonesia that never felt the government job in the developing of infrastructure in Indonesia, it proved that there is a lot of the outlying district that do not have the electricity. The developing of infrastructure of Indonesia is not balance. Government did not work seriously to develop the infrastructure in the outlying district of Indonesia.

The second data was produced by Akbar. He is from Surabaya. He is a worker. The utterance were produced in stand up comedy compass TV that was held in Balai kartini hall room. Those are the information about physical context of Akbar’s utterance. Then the epistemic context is about the background knowledge that belongs to audience and Akbar. (1) audience understand the concept of poverty and crime; (2) there are a lot of needy in Indonesia; (3) the audience know that there is a rule that control poverty and crime in

Indonesia. Then the assumption speaker (pre supposition) behind his utterance is (1) the poverty and crime is exist; (2) 34 section (pasal 34) related to government responsibility to the needy and waif is exist.

In the akbar's utterance contains of some implicature. By saying "*Kalau fakir miskin dipelihara ya banyak*", he wanted to say that if the government are not serious with poverty problem so the mount of the needy larger day by day. The word "*dipelihara* - keeping" has interpreted with the opposite meaning from the semantic meaning of the word itself. Keeping means we take care of their need. But this word in Akbar's utterance were interpreted into the meaning "do not care". Here Akbar want to say that government can not responsible the policy that they have been made. Whereas Government should take care to the prosperity of poverty, so the amounts of poverty reduce day by day, but the fact do not support it. By day poverty are larger in this country. Akbar in his stand up comedy criticized about this problem, government policy.

The third data is form Arie. Physical context gives some information about: (1) the speaker of the utterance is Arie; (2) he is a student university; he is from Papua; the genre of the video is comedy; and this utterance are produced in stand up comedy compas tv show that was held in Balai Kartini hall room. The second context is epistemic context. It tells us that (1) Papua is an area of Indonesia that was rich of mine and gold; (2) a foreign company was built in Papua and it dominated all mine and gold of Papua; and (3) a lot of Papua society that can not get benefit of mine of gold in their area. Then the presupposition of the utterance is the foreigner company in Papua are exist; and papua is famous with a mine field of gold.

This utterance are produced by Arie. He is from Papua. He can felt the effect of the dominant of foreigner to their area "papua". By saying "*Kalau di Indonesia timur apa yang mau dikuasai. Tambang, emas sudah dikuasai oleh Negara asing semua. Jangankan penjahat masyarakat sekitar aja sudah tidak kebagian*", Arie wants to say more than he said. It is about Arie hopes that the government do not only care the amount of investment that was given by the foreigner company to Indonesia, but the government also care to the condition of papua society. Papua has the biggest mine field of gold. But the papua society can not get the benefit of it. Because all the mine and gold have been dominated by the foreigner. It is like, we have money in our hand but we just able to see it and can not use it.

Both of Akbar and Arie stand up comedy want to criticize the government policy. it goes to that conclusion because both of them try to give comment, assess, measure the government policy. Akbar criticized about the applying of the education policy and the balance of infrastructure building, then Arie criticized about the government policy related to foreigner investation.

Critism enforcer's attitude

The information of context in akbar utterance has some points. Those are the police/enforcer likes to take the money from the helmsmen or driver without the legal instruction from their chief. (2) 25 section and 50.000 section (pasal 25 and 50 ribu) is the wrong section of the traffic violation., but the right section of traffic violation and the procedure of punishment of the traffic violation are arranged in *UU lalu lintas* no 22 in 2009 and *UU lalu lintas* no 28 in 1997.

On his stand up comedy, Akbar said "*kalau pelanggaran lalu lintas yaitu pasal 25 sama pasal 50 ribu*". It implied that the law enforcer like to take money from the citizen. It goes to that conclusion because the shared knowledge between speaker and listener are the police like to take money from the helmsmen or driver without the legal instruction from the chief. Then I also can say that the law enforcer like to do deceitfulness. They like to take the money from the helmsmen or driver without the legal instruction from the chief by looking the mistake that was done by the rider of driver. The procedure in giving a punishment has been written down in *UU lalu lintas* no 22 in 2009 and no 28 in 1997. It tells us clearly what is the procedure in giving punishment to some one who do the traffic violation. But most of them do not follow the rule. They just want to look for the driver mistake, ask some money and take the money for their selves. As enforcer that was trust by the society, they should keep their attitude. But the proven showed that they always do a bad thing that makes society do not trust them.

CONCLUSION

Those utterance produced by the comic is to give a critique. Those three point, context; presupposition and impicature explore more how language can be used in giving critique. The coordination of words into the sentence can deliver a hidden message from the speaker to the listener. And the listener or audience can interpret the utterance by connecting

the information or knowledge about context and presupposition of the speaker then finally understanding the implicature of the utterance that was produced by the comics. In brief we can say that all the critiques above were delivered to the government. On their stand up comedy comic criticized government policy, government attitude and enforcer attitude. In order that government and enforcer can understand their mistake and want to revise it, so Indonesian can be prosperous.

References

- Brian, Paul. 2003. *Common Error in English Use*. Britport: William James & Company
- Carthy, Michael Mc. 2000. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press
- Creswell, John W. 1994. *Research design : Qualitative and quantitative approach*. California: sage publication, Inc
- Dienta, Yuniar. 2013. "Ya as Discourse Marker: Indonesian Stand – Up Comedy Strategy in Producing Laughter". In *International Journal of Applied Linguistic and English Literature*. Volume 2. No. 6. ISSN 2200-3452
- Thomas, Jenny. 1996. *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. New York : Adison Wesley Longman Publishing
- Waiyan, Hang. 2011. "Conversational implicature in English listening comprehensive". in *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. Vol. 2. No. 5. ISSN 1798-4763
- Widdowson, H. G. 2007. *Discourse analysis*. New York: oxford university press.
- Yule, George. 2003. *Pragmatic: Oxford introduction to language study*. New York : Oxford university press.