Journal of Innovative and Creativity
Journal Homepage: https://joecy.org/index.php/joecy
e-mail: journaljoecy@gmail.com

Faculty of Education
University of Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai
ISSN 2775-771X (Online)
ISSN 2962-570X (Printed)
6 (1) 2026, Page: 11866-11880

Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Non-Observance in Medical Crisis Communication: Raditya Dika Podcast

Diyan Adeyanti[1], Rega Kurniawan[2], Cecep Agus[3]
[1, 2, 3]Institute Prima Bangsa
Corresponding Author: Diyan Adeyanti, diyanadynti@gmail.com

Published: February, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study explores how conversational meaning is created through the deliberate non-observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle in a humor-based Indonesian podcast. The purpose of this research is to understand not only how speakers flout conversational maxims, but also why they do so and how these choices help convey humor, engage listeners, and make complex information easier to understand. The study uses a qualitative descriptive method with a pragmatic approach, drawing data from an episode of the Raditya Dika Podcast titled Cerita dari Ruang IGD, featuring Dr. Gia Pratama, which discusses a real medical emergency case. The analysis identifies instances where speakers intentionally break the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner to create meaning beyond the literal words. The findings reveal 15 instances of maxim flouting, with Quality occurring most often, followed by Manner, Quantity, and Relation. These strategies are used to dramatize events, express professional awe, manage emotional tension, and translate complicated medical experiences into stories that are engaging and accessible. Overall, the study shows that deliberately flouting conversational maxims allows speakers to balance humor with sensitive content, making the podcast both informative and entertaining. This highlights the role of pragmatic choices in digital discourse and suggests that humor can be an effective tool for presenting serious topics in ways that are clear, relatable, and engaging for listeners.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Maxim, Non-Observance, Podcast, Communication

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi bagaimana makna percakapan terbentuk melalui pelanggaran sengaja terhadap Prinsip Kooperatif Grice dalam podcast humor Indonesia. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk memahami tidak hanya bagaimana pembicara melanggar maksim percakapan, tetapi juga mengapa mereka melakukannya dan bagaimana pilihan-pilihan ini membantu menyampaikan humor, melibatkan pendengar, dan membuat informasi kompleks lebih mudah dipahami. Studi ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif dengan pendekatan pragmatik, mengambil data dari episode podcast Raditya Dika berjudul "Cerita dari Ruang IGD" yang menampilkan Dr. Gia Pratama, yang membahas kasus darurat medis nyata. Analisis mengidentifikasi contoh-contoh di mana pembicara secara sengaja melanggar maksim Kuantitas, Kualitas, Hubungan, dan Cara untuk menciptakan makna di luar kata-kata literal. Temuan menunjukkan 15 contoh pelanggaran maksim, dengan Kualitas terjadi paling sering, diikuti oleh Cara, Kuantitas, dan Hubungan. Strategi ini digunakan untuk mendramatisasi peristiwa, mengekspresikan kekaguman profesional, mengelola ketegangan emosional, dan menerjemahkan pengalaman medis yang rumit menjadi cerita yang menarik dan mudah diakses. Secara keseluruhan, studi ini menunjukkan bahwa melanggar prinsip percakapan secara sengaja memungkinkan pembicara untuk menyeimbangkan humor dengan konten sensitif, menjadikan podcast ini informatif dan menghibur. Hal ini menyoroti peran pilihan pragmatik dalam diskursus digital dan menyarankan bahwa humor dapat menjadi alat yang efektif untuk menyajikan topik serius dengan cara yang jelas, relevan, dan menarik bagi pendengar.

Kata kunci: Pragmatika, Prinsip, Pelanggaran, Podcast, Komunikasi

© The Author(s). 2021 Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Atibution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

INTRODUCTION

Communication is an essential aspect of human interaction, as it enables individuals to convey thoughts, emotions, and information to one another. Through communication, people establish social relationships and create mutual understanding in both formal and informal contexts. Language plays a central role in this process because it functions as the primary medium for expressing intentions and interpreting messages. In a communication people deliver the meaning,

such as sharing stories, ideas, experiences, and knowledge incapsulated in words and sentences (Wardana, Surbakti, Anayati, & Mayasari, 2020). Therefore, communication needs more than knowing a language and how to encode thoughts into messages and transmit them to the second party, who normally through decoding messages to thoughts comprehends what the speaker intended to say (Hassan, 2022). When this process fails, miscommunication and misunderstanding may occur due to difficulties in conveying or interpreting intended meaning (Gunatika, Candra, & Utami, 2021; Salam, 2020).

Pragmatics, on the other hand, is the study of meaning in context (Tamrin, Muarifuddin, & Arman, 2022), This branch of study concerned what speakers implies and listeners infers based on factors such as situational context, the individuals' mental states, the preceding dialogue, and other elements (Zahra & Suyudi, 2023). The speech that comes before the sentence being translated is the linguistic context, and the knowledge of the external environment is the situational context (Ishaq & Putra, 2023).

In digital communication, the intentional manipulation of conversational maxims has become increasingly prominent. Online content creators, influencers, and public figures frequently employ humor, exaggeration, ambiguity, and indirectness to engage audiences, mitigate face-threatening topics, or present themselves in relatable ways. This tendency is particularly evident in podcast discourse, whose appeal lies in its diverse range of topics, from true crime and comedy to educational content and in-depth interviews (Zelianti, Degaf, Baswarudin, & Guktomo, 2024). Humor is a universal and complex phenomenon that permeates various forms in human interactions (Hamdi & Fissah, 2024). It is also considered one of the most powerful forms of communication, yet one of the most difficult to define because it frequently contains implicit meaning embedded in pauses, exaggeration, and indirect expressions (Nisa, Rustono, Yuniawan, & Pristiwati, 2025). In order to make a good communication, human must follow cooperative principles (Firda, Hidayat, Alek, & Nurhalimah, 2021), conversational settings such as podcasts involving a conversation between the host and a guest discussing a certain topic, this conversation can non observance the maxims of the principle of cooperation in conveying messages and providing information to listeners (Simbolon, 2024). In some cases, humor-based podcasts, in particular, often rely heavily on strategies of non-observance maxims to balance entertainment with information delivery.

This phenomenon can be observed in an episode of the Raditya Dika Podcast featuring dr. Gia Pratama, which discusses a widely publicized case of total uterine prolapse during childbirth assisted by a midwife. As a serious medical issue, the topic would typically require careful explanation and professional clarity; however, in this episode, it is presented in a humorous and conversational manner that reflects Raditya Dika's comedic persona. In this context, humor functions as a deliberate communicative strategy in which speakers may exaggerate information, avoid direct truth, or manipulate relevance to attract attention, maintain politeness, or entertain listeners (Sidabutar et al., 2023). Understanding how humor interacts with emotional responses is essential for improving the communication of complex scientific issues, particularly when audiences encounter humorous yet emotionally charged content (Yeo & McKasy, 2021). While humor can enhance engagement, it also carries the risk of trivializing serious issues or causing misinterpretation. This combination of humor and medical discourse creates a linguistic setting in which the non-observance of conversational maxims plays a key role in shaping meaning. Despite extensive studies on Grice's maxims in scripted media, unscripted humor-based podcasts that address sensitive medical topics in the Indonesian context remain underexplored. Therefore, this study examines the manipulation of conversational maxims in the Raditya Dika Podcast as a form of digital interaction that integrates humor with real-world issues.

To ground this analysis theoretically, the study draws on Grice's Cooperative Principle. Grice (1975) famously proposed that conversation operates under a tacit understanding that participants cooperate with one another in order to achieve effective communication. This

cooperative behavior is governed by four conversational maxims: the Maxim of Quantity, which requires speakers to provide sufficient but not excessive information; the Maxim of Quality, which emphasizes truthfulness and the use of reliable evidence; the Maxim of Relation, which requires relevance; and the Maxim of Manner, which promotes clarity, brevity, and orderliness. The participants utter the required information related to the topic of conversation (Oksinia, Jayantini, & Sulatra, 2021), and the maxim of relevance states that each participant's contribution should be expressed as relevant to the subject of the conversation (Purnami & Adiwijaya, 2021). Ideally, these maxims facilitate smooth communication, allowing interlocutors to interpret utterances efficiently and accurately. Here, Grice has thrown light on the speaker meaning or what a speaker implies, implicates, or says beyond the literal meaning and how it directs the hearer to reach the intended meaning (Hassan, 2022).

According to Grice (1975), speakers may deliberately flout conversational maxims to generate implicature and prompt listeners to infer meanings beyond what is explicitly stated, relying on shared background knowledge and contextual understanding to maintain effective communication. This perspective is particularly relevant in humorous discourse, where ambiguity, exaggeration, or irrelevance is intentionally used to achieve specific communicative effects while preserving cooperative interaction (Grice, 1975). Complementing this view, Yule defines pragmatics as the study of meaning as communicated by speakers and interpreted by listeners, emphasizing the central role of context rather than linguistic form alone (Yule, 2010). Yule further argues that speakers often convey meaning implicitly, requiring listeners to infer intended messages based on shared knowledge and situational context, which supports Grice's concept of implicature (Yule, 2010).

However, real-life interactions rarely adhere perfectly to these theoretical expectations, as people may not always observe conversational maxims, which can lead to miscommunication and conflict (Salsabila, 2023). Both offline and online conversations frequently involve intentional or unintentional deviations from these maxims, reflecting the complexity of natural communication. Grice refers to such deviations as non-observance of maxims, which may occur in several forms, including flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending a maxim, and these deviations may occur either consciously or unconsciously and in explicit or implicit ways (Saradifa, 2020). Each form of non-observance contributes uniquely to meaning construction, as speakers often produce utterances containing implicatures that prompt hearers to infer meanings beyond what is explicitly stated (Saradifa, 2020). Such strategies serve various communicative purposes, including hiding the truth, creating jokes, avoiding sensitive topics, preventing offense, saving face, constructing false impressions, persuading others, and entertaining the hearer (Fadillah & Imperiani, 2020).

Previous studies on Raditya Dika's podcast have provided important insights into conversation patterns, particularly through the analysis of interrogative sentences and their function in spoken conversation. In podcast interactions, interrogative sentences are often used to elicit responses and manage the flow of conversation (Sari, Ula, Aulia, Mahmudi, & Mohammed, 2025). While these studies successfully explain how questions regulate and maintain interactions, they mostly focus on structural and syntactic aspects. As a result, the pragmatic process of meaning negotiation, especially how speakers deviate from conversational norms to achieve specific communicative goals, has not received sufficient attention. Moreover, podcast discourse in sensitive or crisis-related medical contexts remains under-explored. Consequently, violations of maxim principles in medical crisis communication on podcasts have not been adequately researched, highlighting the need for pragmatic analysis that goes beyond literal meaning.

Based on these considerations, this study aims to investigate the non-observance of Grice's conversational maxims in the Raditya Dika Podcast episode featuring dr. Gia Pratama as a form of medical crisis communication. The study specifically seeks to identify the types of maxim non-observance that occur and to explain their communicative functions, with particular attention to

how humor is strategically employed to convey sensitive medical information in a digital conversational setting.

METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research design with a pragmatic approach. The qualitative method is used to examine language phenomena in their natural context, particularly focusing on how meaning is constructed beyond literal interpretation. The study is grounded in Grice (1975) Cooperative Principle, which serves as the primary framework for identifying and analyzing non-observance of conversational maxims. Yule (2010) are used as supporting references to provide additional perspectives on implicature, conversational meaning, and pragmatic interpretation. This research specifically investigates instances of non-observance of Grice's maxims in spoken discourse within a humor-based podcast. The pragmatic framework is applied to interpret implicatures arising from conversational interactions between speakers, including social, humorous, and ironic effects.

Data Source

The data source of this study is an episode of the Indonesian podcast Cerita dari Ruang IGD from the Raditya Dika Podcast, featuring dr. Gia Pratama, which was uploaded to YouTube on 6 November 2025. The podcast discusses a real medical emergency case and is publicly accessible, making it suitable for linguistic analysis. The data consist of spoken utterances produced by the host and the guest during the episode.

Research Procedure

The research procedure was carried out through several systematic steps. First, the selected podcast episode was repeatedly listened to in order to gain comprehensive contextual understanding. Second, the audio data were transcribed verbatim to produce an accurate dialogue transcript. Third, the transcript was carefully examined to identify utterances that potentially demonstrate non-observance of Grice's maxims. Fourth, the identified data were classified based on the four conversational maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Finally, each instance was analyzed contextually to determine the type of non-observance and its implied meaning.

Data Analysis Technique

The data were analyzed using a pragmatic discourse analysis technique based on Grice's Cooperative Principle. The analysis followed several stages: (1) identifying utterances that indicate non-observance of conversational maxims; (2) classifying the data according to the types of maxims flouted (Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner); (3) interpreting the contextual background of each utterance; and (4) analyzing the implicatures generated through non-observance. The results were then discussed in relation to the research objectives, particularly focusing on how humor and sensitive medical information are conveyed through pragmatic strategies in digital conversational discourse.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The analysis was conducted on the dialogue transcript of the Indonesian podcast "Cerita dari Ruang IGD" by Raditya Dika, featuring Dr. Gia Pratama, to identify instances of non-observance of Grice's Maxims within authentic communication. The results are classified and examined in accordance with the various categories of Grice's Cooperative Principle (Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner).

Table 1. Analysis of Non-Observance of Conversational Maxims in Podcast

Utterance	Duration	Type non-observence	(*Implicature*)	Context
Dr. Gia: Tunjukin ke aku	00:05:03-	Quantity -	Dr. Gia implied that	The officer came to

kantong kresek warna hitam isinya. Tahu enggak apa, Bang? Aku ambil. Masyaallah ini mah rahim.	00:05:06	Flouting	the situation was highly unexpected, extremely unusual, or unbelievable for a doctor, even though he knew that the contents were from the uterus.	the emergency room carrying a black plastic bag and asked Dr. Gia to look inside.
Raditya Dika: Kok bisa?	00:05:13-00:05:14	Quantity - Flouting	This was a rhetorical question that did not require an immediate technical answer because the doctor had not finished his story, but it showed his extreme disbelief and shock.	Dr. Gia said that the uterus had detached from the patient's body and was in the plastic bag.
Dr. Gia: Nongol di vagina itu apa ya nongol tarik aja yuk yuk brol copot semua itu kayak air terjun Bang Radit asli terus ditutup kan sama si Paraji...	00:06:07-00:06:09	Quality - Flouting	Using the simile of bleeding as a "air terjun." Implies that the amount of bleeding was visually massive and torrential.	Dr. Gia explained that there was heavy bleeding during the incident when the traditional birth attendant (Paraji) removed the placenta.
Dr. Gia: Kayak apa di dalam kan wah itu seru banget asli.	00:06:16-00:06:20	Quality - Flouting	Using the word "seru" inappropriately for a life-threatening case. Implies that for him, "seru" is a complex, challenging, and professionally memorable medical case.	Dr. Gia concluded his experience in handling this extreme medical case.
Raditya Dika: Definisi seru kita agak beda ya sampai rahim lepas dari badan.	00:06:20-00:06:26	Quality - Flouting	Using sarcasm. This implies that the incident was shocking, not exciting, which contrasts with the doctor's view.	Radit commented on Dr. Gia calling the detached uterus case "exciting."
Dr. Gia: Akhirnya panggil bagian bedah. bagian bedah datang, aduh itu ngeliat bagian bedah datang itu rasanya kayak battle of the bastard waktu itu datang itu cavalernya datang itu rasanya gitu tuh. Raditya Dika: Avengers datang. Avengers. Dr. Gia: Avengers datang on your left…	00:08:29-00:08:43	Relation - Flouting	Using an analogy with fictional Avengers characters. This implies that the arrival of the specialist doctor felt like the arrival of a long-awaited savior.	Radit summarized Dr. Gia's feelings when another surgeon arrived to help treat the ruptured intestine.
Dr. Gia: Kita laki-laki enggak	00:09:43-	Quantity -	Providing irrelevant	Dr. Gia explained

punya organ seistima itu.	00:09:45	Flouting	information "laki-laki enggak punya" as a contrast. This implies that this biological difference further strengthens the admiration for the uterus.	how remarkable it is that the uterus can expand and contract without losing its function.
Dr. Gia: Jadi habis lahiran sama Paraji. Bang Radit tahu Paraji enggak sih?	00:05:39-00:05:40	Manner - Flouting	Asking distracting questions "tahu Paraji enggak sih?" before defining it. Implies that Paraji is a local or common term that needs to be confirmed.	Dr. Gia began explaining the cause of the case (handled by a traditional birth attendant).
Dr. Gia: Nongol di vagina itu apa ya nongol tarik aja yuk yuk brol copot semua.	00:06:01-00:06:03	Manner - Flouting	Using informal and unclear exclamations "brol copot semua" and uncertainty "apa ya nongol". Implies that the process occurs very quickly, chaotically, and drastically.	Dr. Gia recounted the moments leading up to the uterus detaching due to being pulled by the traditional birth attendant.
Dr. Gia: Buka kulit, buka otot. Itu rongga perut penuh sama darah.	00:07:05-00:07:08	Quality - Flouting	Using hyperbole "penuh sama darah". Implies that the volume of bleeding in the abdominal cavity is very large and severe, causing great concern.	Dr. Gia explained the surgical process as she began the operation.
Dr. Gia: Saction itu sedot aku tuh sampai buang darah sampai pakai tangan, Bang.	00:07:08-00:07:11	Quality - Flouting	Using hyperbole and extreme descriptions "buang darah sampai pakai tangan". Implies that the situation is so chaotic and urgent that standard procedures cannot be applied.	Dr. Gia continued describing the operation, using her hands to remove the blood.
Dr. Gia: Iya masih wer-wer. Woi, dapat satu klaim. Dapat satu klaim. Dapat satu klaim. 12 klaim aku ar ditutup pendarahannya.	00:07:18-00:07:23	Manner - Flouting	Using onomatopoeia "wer-wer" and excessive repetition "dapat satu klaim..." that is unnecessary in a technical explanation. This implies a fast, repetitive work rhythm and extreme focus.	Dr. Gia explained the process of closing the blood vessels (claim) that continued to bleed.
Dr. Gia: Sekarang bayangin silinder itu enggak ada rahimnya. Jadi aku bisa ngelihat pagina dia	00:07:33-00:07:38	Quality - Flouting	Using very explicit and graphic visual descriptions	Dr. Gia explained the difficulty of reconstructing the

dari dalam, Bang.			"ngelihat vagina dia dari dalam". Implies the uniqueness and extremely severe damage to the patient's anatomy.	vagina after the uterus detached.
Dr. Gia: Makanya aku bilang rahim itu organ yang istimewa banget. Enggak. Kita laki-laki enggak punya organ seistima itu.	00:09:40-00:09:43	Quality - Flouting	Giving an exaggerated assessment "istimewa banget" and making unnecessary comparisons with male organs. Implies a very high regard for the biological wonder of these organs.	Dr. Gia concluded her explanation about the capabilities of the uterus.
Raditya Dika: Berarti dokter yang di gawat darurat ini harus ngerti semuanya dong berarti ya? Dr. Gia: Iya. Jadi kayak kita kayak polisi tidur aja habis ini harus alirin ke mana gitu, ke bedah, ke kandungan, ke THT.	00:10:30-00:10:36	Quality - Flouting	Uses a metaphor that is not literally correct "polisi tidur". Implies that the main role of an emergency room doctor is as an initial assessor and referral guide, not as a specialist who solves all problems.	Raditya Dika asked about the extent of knowledge that an emergency room doctor must possess.

Quantity

The non-observance phenomenon found from this analysis is primarily categorized as Flouting with 3 instances identified, where the speaker either provides too much information (verbose) or too little information (ambiguous) than is required by the current conversation. This is often employed to avoid direct commitment or to emphasize a point through rhetorical questioning.

Data 1.
(00:05:03-00:05:06)

Dr. Gia : Tunjukin ke aku kantong kresek warna hitam isinya. Tahu enggak apa, Bang? Aku ambil. Masyaallah ini mah rahim.

The context of the above utterance occurred when a family member brought a black plastic bag into the Emergency Room (IGD), asking Dr. Gia to identify the contents. Dr. Gia's utterances, particularly the rhetorical question "Tahu enggak apa, Bang?" and the immediate, exclamatory reveal "Masyaallah ini mah rahim", demonstrate a clear non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quantity. This maxim requires the speaker to be as informative as required, but no more. Dr. Gia interrupts his own narrative with a question that he immediately answers, thus providing information that is not strictly necessary for the flow of the story.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quantity because the violation is deliberate and open. The rhetorical pause and question serve not to genuinely ask for an answer, but to build tension and draw the listener (Raditya Dika) into the narrative. This happens because the doctor maximizes the dramatic effect of the situation by creating a pause before delivering the astonishing and unexpected diagnosis. This technique elevates the urgency and shock factor of the event he is recounting to the audience.

The implicature that implies extreme shock and the unbelievable nature of the medical case can be found in Dr. Gia's utterances. The doctor's use of the rhetorical question implicitly tells the listener that the contents of the bag were so unusual and unexpected that they deserved a dramatic reveal, thereby maximizing the dramatization and emotional impact of the storytelling.

Data 2.
(00:05:13-00;05:14)

Raditya Dika : Kok bisa?

The context of the above utterance occurred when Raditya Dika was responding to Dr. Gia's revelation that a uterus (rahim) was brought into the Emergency Room in a black plastic bag, detached from the patient's body. Raditya Dika's utterance, the question "Kok bisa?", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quantity. This maxim requires the speaker's contribution to be as informative as required for the current conversational exchange. While a question demands information, this question is highly contextualized as an expression of shock rather than a genuine request for a simple factual explanation.

The host's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quantity because, rather than seeking a simple medical procedure summary, the question functions rhetorically to express profound disbelief and shock. The violation is deliberate; Raditya Dika, representing the typical layman audience, uses the question to underscore the extraordinary and anomalous nature of the event being described. This serves to maximize the emotional reaction to the story, effectively signaling to Dr. Gia that the narrative is having its intended dramatic effect and prompting him to continue the detailed account.

The implicature arising from this conversational flouting is the expression of overwhelming incredulity and amazement regarding the extreme medical incident. The use of "Kok bisa?" implicitly tells the speaker that the narrated event defies common understanding and is so shocking that it requires immediate acknowledgment before the narrative can proceed, thereby reinforcing the dramatic tension of the story.

Data 3.
(00:09:43-00:09:45)

Dr. Gia : Kita laki-laki enggak punya organ seistima itu.

The context of the above utterance occurred when Dr. Gia was summarizing the capabilities of the uterus, particularly its ability to expand significantly during pregnancy and return to its original size without losing function. Dr. Gia's statement, "Kita laki-laki enggak punya organ seistima itu", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quantity. The inclusion of a comparative element regarding male anatomy is not necessary to define or describe the function and characteristics of the female uterus.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quantity because the violation is deliberate and serves a rhetorical purpose beyond mere information exchange. By introducing the contrasting and arguably irrelevant element of male biology, Dr. Gia draws a sharp comparison that maximizes the sense of awe and uniqueness attributed to the female organ. This strategy elevates the concluding remark from a simple statement of fact into a tribute.

The implicature that arises from this conversational flouting is the expression of profound reverence and admiration for the complex biological feat of the uterus. The comparison implicitly tells the audience that the organ is so biologically superior in its function that it warrants the highest level of respect, effectively delivering a strong closing message of homage and biological appreciation.

Quality

The non-observance phenomenon found from this analysis is dominantly categorized as Flouting with 8 instances identified, where the speaker deliberately violates the principle of truthfulness. This is primarily achieved through the use of figurative language (metafors, hyperbole, personification) and sarcasm. This type of flouting is highly effective in media contexts for dramatization and comedic effect.

Data 1.
(00:06:07-00:06:09)

Dr. Gia : Nongol di vagina itu apa ya nongol tarik aja yuk yuk brol copot semua itu kayak air terjun Bang Radit asli terus ditutup kan sama si Paraji...

The context of the above utterance occurs when Dr. Gia is recounting the moment the uterus avulsed, resulting in massive hemorrhage, immediately after the midwife (Paraji) pulled the umbilical cord. Dr. Gia's descriptive phrase, "itu kayak air terjun Bang Radit asli", demonstrates a clear non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quality. This maxim requires the speaker not to state what they lack adequate evidence for or what they believe to be false. By using the simile waterfall, the doctor is not literally describing the blood flow.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quality because the use of the simile is deliberate, creating an intentional exaggeration (hiperbda) to convey the severity of the bleeding. The flouting serves to maximize the visual and emotional impact of the sudden hemorrhage, overriding the need for a precise medical description. The listener is compelled to look beyond the literal meaning and search for the implied meaning.

The implicature that arises is the expression of extreme severity and volume of bleeding, implicitly telling the listener that the hemorrhage was immediate, copious, and life-threatening. This rhetorical device effectively establishes the critical nature of the emergency and reinforces the doctor's credibility in handling such a shocking event.

Data 2.
(00:06:16-00:06:20)

Dr. Gia : Kayak apa di dalam kan wah itu seru banget asli.

The context for this utterance is Dr. Gia's concluding remark after describing the chaotic and graphic details of the uterine avulsion and the resulting extensive internal damage. Dr. Gia's exclamation, "wah itu seru banget asli", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quality. Given the grave, life-threatening nature of the medical case being discussed, the adjective 'seru' is highly inappropriate and false in a common, non-medical context.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quality because he is deliberately using an adjective that is contrary to the audience's perception of the truth. The flouting is used rhetorically to reframe the trauma; for the medical professional, "seru" implicitly means "complex, challenging, and engaging" rather than entertaining. This reframing maximizes the professional perspective on the intensity of the case.

The implicature that arises is the expression of professional fascination and intellectual challenge. The doctor implicitly communicates that the case was one of the most demanding and memorable experiences of his career, thus highlighting his expertise and the extraordinary nature of the work done in the ER.

Data 3:
(00:06:20-00:06:26)

Raditya Dika : Definisi seru kita agak beda ya sampai rahim lepas dari badan.

The context of this utterance is Raditya Dika's immediate reaction to Dr. Gia classifying the traumatic uterine avulsion as "seru". Raditya Dika's response, "definisi seru kita agak beda ya", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quality. By making this comparative statement, he is using sarcasm, implying that he absolutely does not find the situation "seru," but rather horrifying.

Raditya Dika's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quality because he deliberately states a comparison that contradicts the literal reality of the situation the reality being that the event is horrifying, not "fun". The flouting serves to highlight the vast difference between the life-and-death professional perspective and the layman's perspective, maximizing the humorous and unsettling nature of the contrast.

The implicature derived from this non-observance is the expression of profound shock, disapproval, and general human empathy for the gravity of the situation. The host implicitly tells the doctor that the professional's choice of words minimizes the horror and confirms the audience's shared perception that the event was terrifying.

Data 4.
(00:07:05-00:07:08)

Dr. Gia : Buka kulit, buka otot. Itu rongga perut penuh sama darah.

The context of the above utterance occurs when Dr. Gia is narrating the beginning of the emergency operation and what they immediately found upon opening the patient's abdomen. Dr. Gia's descriptive statement, "Itu rongga perut penuh sama darah", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quality. While there was indeed massive internal bleeding, the phrase "penuh sama darah" is an exaggeration or hyperbole; the cavity would be mostly filled, but not completely to capacity.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quality because he is deliberately using hyperbole to convey the overwhelming volume of internal hemorrhage. The flouting serves to dramatize the critical nature of the patient's condition and the immediate life-saving challenge faced by the surgical team, overriding the need for strictly factual, quantitative data on the blood loss.

The implicature that arises is the expression of extreme urgency and severity. The doctor implicitly communicates that the patient was in severe hypovolemic shock, and the amount of blood loss was so extensive that the team was immediately fighting to control massive, life-threatening internal bleeding.

Data 5.
(00:07:08-00:07:11)

Dr. Gia : Saction itu sedot aku tuh sampai buang darah sampai pakai tangan, Bang.

The context of this utterance is Dr. Gia's narration of the frantic efforts to clear the blood from the patient's abdominal cavity during the emergency surgery, following the massive internal hemorrhage. Dr. Gia's statement, "buang darah sampai pakai tangan", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quality. The inclusion of the detail that blood was removed using hands implies an abandonment of standard medical suction procedure due to the crisis.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quality because it uses a description intended to convey an image of non-standard, improvised action. The flouting serves to maximize the intensity and chaos of the operating room, where time was critical and rules had to be bent to save the patient's life, thus emphasizing the heroism of the medical team.

The implicature that arises is the expression of overwhelming crisis and intense urgency. The doctor implicitly communicates that the volume and speed of the hemorrhage were so severe that the surgical team was forced to resort to the fastest, most direct method available, highlighting the high-stakes environment.

Data 6.
(00:07:33-00:07:38)

Dr. Gia : Sekarang bayangin silinder itu enggak ada rahimnya. Jadi aku bisa ngelihat pagina dia dari dalam, Bang.

The context of the above utterance occurs when Dr. Gia is explaining the anatomical damage left behind after the uterus was completely torn out. Dr. Gia's descriptive statement, "Jadi aku bisa ngelihat pagina dia dari dalam, Bang", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quality. This statement is highly graphic and intentionally shocking to a layperson because of its visual nature.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quality because he is deliberately using a descriptive phrasing that is stark, highly explicit, and intended to shock the listener by vividly visualizing the profound anatomical loss. The flouting serves to maximize the sense of irreparable damage and uniqueness of the injury, overriding the need for a technically neutral description.

The implicature that arises is the expression of profound anatomical damage and the rareness of the injury. The doctor implicitly communicates that the destruction was so complete that the normal boundaries of the body were exposed, underscoring the severity of the medical challenge and the extent of the surgical reconstruction needed.

Data 7.
(00:09:40-00:09:43)

Dr. Gia : Makanya aku bilang rahim itu organ yang istimewa banget. Enggak. Kita laki-laki enggak punya organ seistima itu.

The context for this utterance is Dr. Gia's concluding analysis on the miraculous regenerative and expansive capabilities of the uterus. Dr. Gia's strong evaluation, "rahim itu organ yang istimewa banget", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quality. The term "istimewa banget" is a subjective, value-laden judgment, not a strictly objective medical statement concerning its function.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quality because he deliberately chooses a highly subjective and effusive word ("istimewa") to convey a feeling that transcends clinical reality. The flouting serves to maximize the sense of wonder and biological marvel, functioning as a strong rhetorical closing statement to the audience about the organ's capability.

The implicature that arises is the expression of deep personal and professional awe. The doctor implicitly communicates his immense respect and biological fascination with the uterus's elasticity and resilience, concluding the complex medical narrative with a message of profound appreciation.

Data 8.
(00:10:30-00:10:36)

Raditya Dika : Berarti dokter yang di gawat darurat ini harus ngerti semuanya dong berarti ya?
Dr. Gia : Iya. Jadi kayak kita kayak polisi tidur aja habis ini harus alirin ke mana gitu, ke bedah, ke kandungan, ke THT.

The context of the above utterance is Dr. Gia's direct response to Raditya Dika's question regarding the necessity of a generalist's broad knowledge in the ER. Dr. Gia's comparison, "kayak kita kayak polisi tidur aja", demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Quality. The utterance is an obvious figurative statement; a medical doctor is not literally a speed bump.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Quality because he deliberately employs a metafor (pdisi tidur) that is literally false. The flouting serves to simply and vividly explain a complex professional role (triage) to the general audience, overriding the need for technical accuracy. The metaphor maximizes the clarity of the functional role.

The implicature that arises is the expression of the ER doctor's primary function as triage and gatekeeper. The doctor implicitly communicates that their job is not to solve all specialist problems but to quickly assess, stabilize (slow down), and correctly direct (alirin) the patient to the appropriate specialist department (bedah, kandungan, THT).

Relation

The non-observance phenomenon found from this analysis is primarily categorized as Flouting with 1 instance identified, where the speaker intentionally makes a conversational contribution that is seemingly irrelevant to the topic at hand. This is often used to change the direction of the conversation or to avoid addressing a sensitive subject directly.

Data 1.
(00:08:29-00:08:43)

Dr. Gia : Akhirnya panggil bagian bedah. bagian bedah datang, aduh itu ngeliat bagian bedah datang itu rasanya kayak battle of the bastard waktu itu datang itu cavalernya datang itu rasanya gitu tuh.
Raditya Dika : Avengers datang, Avengers.
Dr. Gia : Avengers datang on your left…

The context of the above utterances occurred during the narration of the emergency surgery when the general surgeon was called in to repair the patient's ruptured intestine. Dr. Gia's comparison, which references a specific fictional battle or epic event "battle of bterd," "cavalernya datang", followed by Raditya Dika's interjection "Avengers datang" and Dr. Gia's agreement, demonstrates a clear non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Relation. This maxim requires the speaker's contribution to be relevant to the immediate purpose of the exchange, which, in this case, is medical reporting.

The speakers' utterances are categorized as flouting the Maxim of Relation because they deliberately use analogies from pop culture and fiction (e.g., Avengers, Game of Thrones-like events) instead of providing a standard description of professional relief or the surgeon's arrival. The flouting is a conscious rhetorical choice to bridge the gap between the specialized medical world and the audience's common knowledge. The use of extreme, non-literal analogy serves to maximize the emotional impact of the moment, overriding the need for strictly factual relevance.

The implicature that arises from this conversational flouting is the expression of immense relief, gratitude, and a sense of 'last-minute rescue'. The implicit meaning conveyed is that the complexity and severity of the patient's condition were so overwhelming that the arrival of the specialist felt akin to a supernatural or heroic intervention, thereby reinforcing the dramatic tension and highlighting the surgeon's critical expertise.

Manner

The non-observance phenomenon found from this analysis is also categorized as Flouting with 3 instances identified, where the speaker intentionally employs ambiguity, obscurity, or uses expressions that are not brief or orderly. This is often utilized to express intense emotion, create humor, or convey meaning that transcends simple literal expression.

Data 1.
(00:05:39-00:05:04)

Dr. Gia : Jadi habis lahiran sama Paraji. Bang Radit tahu Paraji enggak sih?

The context of the above utterance occurred when Dr. Gia was about to explain the cause of the uterine avulsion, immediately identifying the perpetrator as "Paraji." Dr. Gia's question, "Bang Radit tahu Paraji enggak sih?", demonstrates a clear non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Manner. This maxim requires the speaker to avoid obscurity and be orderly. Introducing a term and then immediately pausing to ask for clarification from the listener creates a moment of unnecessary ambiguity and lack of orderliness in the explanation.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Manner because the ambiguity is deliberate and functions as a rhetorical check. The flouting serves to confirm a shared cultural context or ensure the listener's engagement before proceeding with the critical segment of the narrative. This maximizes the conversational flow and avoids explaining an easily definable term, only to provide the definition ("dukun beranak") moments later.

The implicature that arises is the expression of seeking immediate cultural confirmation and prioritizing audience comprehension over strict orderliness. The implicit meaning conveyed is that the term "Paraji" is locally specific, and its role as the root cause of the trauma must be clearly understood before the horrific medical details are recounted.

Data 2.
(00:06:01-00:06:03)
Dr. Gia : Nongol di vagina itu apa ya nongol tarik aja yuk yuk brol copot semua.

The context for this utterance is Dr. Gia's narration of the actual physical act of the uterus descending and detaching due to the midwife's actions. Dr. Gia's phrasing, containing the self-correction "apa ya nongol" and the highly descriptive, informal cluster of words "brol copot semua" and a sound effect followed by 'all detached', demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Manner. This maxim requires the speaker to avoid ambiguity and be brief. The use of sound effects and colloquial, non-standard terms is obscure and lacks precision.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Manner because he deliberately chooses graphic, non-standard language to substitute for a technical medical term like "inversion" or "avulsion." The flouting serves to maximize the vividness, speed, and shocking nature of the catastrophic medical failure, allowing the audience to visualize the event's brutality.

The implicature that arises is the expression of chaos, immediacy, and high physical trauma. The implicit meaning conveyed is that the event was so rapid and disorderly that it defies clinical description, requiring the use of informal, powerful language to capture the moment's visceral intensity.

Data 3.
(00:07:18-00:07:23)

Dr. Gia : Iya masih wer-wer. Woi, dapat satu klaim. Dapat satu klaim. Dapat satu klaim. 12 klaim aku ar ditutup pendarahannya.

The context of the above utterance occurred when Dr. Gia was describing the frantic effort to clamp the bleeding vessels inside the patient's abdomen during the life-saving surgery. Dr. Gia's statement, featuring the sound effect "wer-wer," and the repetition of the phrase "Dapat satu klaim" three times, demonstrates a non-observance of Grice's Maxim of Manner. This maxim demands the speaker avoid obscurity and be brief. The repetition and sound effects are superfluous and overly dramatic.

The doctor's utterance is categorized as flouting the Maxim of Manner because he deliberately sacrifices brevity and technical precision for dramatic effect. The flouting serves to maximize the sense of urgency, speed, and focus required in the operating room. The repetition implicitly tells the listener that the bleeding was so severe and the action so rapid that the surgical team was performing a highly repetitive, high-stakes, life-saving maneuver under extreme pressure.

The implicature that arises is the expression of intense surgical action, immense pressure, and concentration. The implicit meaning is that the surgical team was engaged in a continuous, fast-

paced battle against severe hemorrhage, highlighting the rapid, focused, and overwhelming nature of the emergency procedure.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the qualitative pragmatic analysis of the selected segment from the Raditya Dika Podcast episode, this study confirms the prominent role of non-observance of Grice's Maxims in shaping conversational meaning within a hybrid genre of digital communication that merges humor and sensitive medical reporting. A total of 15 instances of maxim flouting were identified within the discourse focusing on the uterine prolapse case. The distribution of these rhetorical strategies highlights the communicative priorities of the speakers: Maxim of Quality was the most frequently violated maxim, accounting for 8 instances. This dominance was followed by Maxim of Manner (3 instances), Maxim of Quantity (3 instances), and Maxim of Relation (1 instance). The prevalence of flouting over violating indicates that both Dr. Gia and Raditya Dika maintained a fundamentally cooperative stance, strategically manipulating maxims to generate implied meanings (implicature) rather than deceiving the audience.

The strategic manipulation of maxims served crucial communicative functions, particularly in balancing the tension between clinical trauma and audience engagement. The high frequency of Flouting the Maxim of Quality was essential for dramatization using hyperbole like "air terjun" or "penuh sama darah" and rhetorical expression (using sarcasm like "definisi seru kita agak beda") to manage the emotional weight of the topic. Similarly, Flouting the Maxim of Manner e.g., using obscure language like "brol copot semua" or sound effects like "wer-wer" intensified the vividness and chaos of the surgical environment. Ultimately, the systematic non-observance allowed the speakers to successfully transform a sensitive medical crisis into an engaging narrative. This process not only made the complex information digestible for the general audience but also enabled the host to express awe, skepticism, and human empathy, thereby enhancing social bonding with the expert and mitigating the potential severity of the discussion.

REFERENCES

Fadillah, M., & Imperiani, E. D. A. (2020). An analysis of non-observance maxims in customs protection. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *430*, 129–133. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200406.026

Firda, I. N., Hidayat, D. N., Alek, & Nurhalimah. (2021). An analysis of flouting maxim in a talk show program in Indonesia. *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development*, *4*(2), 107–118. https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i2.887

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics* (hal. 41–58). Academic Press.

Gunatika, I. M. Wi. A., Candra, K. D. P., & Utami, N. M. V. (2021). The types of non-observance maxims performed by the main character in knives out movie. *Elysian Journal: English Literature, Linguistics and Translation Studies*, *1*(2), 87–97.

Hamdi, N., & Fissah, R. (2024). *Unveiling humor: A pragmatic analysis of non-observance of gricean maxims in puns in the Tunisian sitcom Choufli Hal*. University of Tebessa.

Hassan, J. S. (2022). A pragmatic study of non-observance maxims in selected political speeches. *Journal of Language Studies*, *5*(2), 38–48.

Ishaq, R. M., & Putra, I. G. A. C. S. (2023). An analysis of maxim relevance by main character in Taxi Driver film. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature*, *2*(2), 86–96. https://doi.org/10. 59011/austronesian.2.2.2023.86-96

Nisa, E. K., Rustono, Yuniawan, T., & Pristiwati, R. (2025). Violation of grice's maxim of cooperation in stand-up comedy humor. *Proceedings of Fine Arts, Literature, Language, and Education*, 1–10.

Oksinia, B. Y., Jayantini, I. G. A. S. R., & Sulatra, I. K. (2021). Verbal humour created by non-observance of cooperative principle in Miranda. Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching, 5(1), 80–89. https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v5i1.3582

Purnami, N. M. A., & Adiwijaya, P. A. (2021). A gender-based analysis of observance and non-observance of conversational maxims in front office staff's speech at restaurants in Ubud District. Journal GEEJ, 8(1), 1–13.

Salam, M. D. H. N. (2020). Non-observance of quality maxim by characters in body of lies movie. UIN Sunan Kalijaga.

Salsabila, T. (2023). Non-observance politeness maxim and implicature on the TV Show Kids Say The Darndest Things. Lilics: Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies, 2(2), 90–103.

Saradifa, A. S. (2020). Non-observance of grice's maxims found in "The Grapevine: Gossip at Work, What Should You Do as a Leader?" Drama series script produced by the Calvin Company. Journal of English Literature, Linguistic, and Education, 1(1), 1–8.

Sari, Z. A., Ula, G. N., Aulia, D., Mahmudi, A. K., & Mohammed, U. Y. Bin. (2025). Analisis kalimat interogatif dalam podcast Raditya Dika episode "Cerita dari Ruang IGD." Narasi: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia, dan Pengajarannya, 3(2), 229–236. https://doi.org/10.30762/narasi.v3i2. 7362

Simbolon, V. (2024). An analysis of non-observance maxims and the implicature in the podcast YouTube channel the Leonardo's "Face to Face with Onadio Leonardo - Vior." JEES: Jorunal of Education and Educational Sciences, 1(1), 26–32.

Tamrin, Muarifuddin, & Arman. (2022). An analysis of non-observance the maxim in knives out movie script. Elite Journal of English Language and Literature, 7(1), 10–20. https://doi.org/10.33772/elite.v5i1.1470

Wardana, M. K., Surbakti, D. A., Anayati, W., & Mayasari. (2020). Non-observance of maxim in "Coco" movie: An analysis of flouting maxim. The 2nd Bogor English Student and Teacher (BEST), 93–96.

Yeo, S. K., & McKasy, M. (2021). Emotion and humor as misinformation antidotes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 118(15). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2002484118

Yule, G. (2010). The study of language (4 ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Zahra, T. N., & Suyudi, I. (2023). The non-observance of maxims in dialogues of Harry Potter and the cursed child book. Journal of Language and Literature, 11(2), 209–218. https://doi.org/10.35760/jll.2023.v11i2.9169

Zelianti, S., Degaf, A., Baswarudin, F., & Guktomo. (2024). Humor in conversation: Flouting maxims in the "Close the Door" podcast. Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research, 5(2), 72. https://doi.org/10.30659/jamr.5.2.72-82