INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIETY, CULTURE & LANGUAGE

Investigating Humor on FYP Talk Show through Multimodal-Pragmatic Analysis: No Humor, No Life?

Ni Wayan Kasni[1*], I Wayan Budiarta[1]
[1]*Universitas Warmadewa, Indonesia*

Abstract Humor is important in human interactions, and its form and reception depend on the producer's awareness of the audience's culture. This study adopts a qualitative, multimodal-pragmatic approach, analyzing two For Your Pagi (FYP) talk show video clips through detailed multimodal transcription and pragmatic coding of humor strategies and speech acts. A total of 31 instances of humor were identified. The analysis focuses on three variables: 1) speech acts such as irony, teasing, and satire; 2) multimodal cues such as gesture, prosody, facial expression, and camera movement; and 3) their role in constructing identity and engaging audiences. The findings reveal that assertive and expressive speech acts were dominant, with irony, teasing, and parody serving as key strategies in identity negotiation and cultural commentary. Multimodal cues, such as facial expressions, gestures, and prosody, worked synergistically with verbal strategies to produce humor that both entertains and reinforces socio-cultural bonds. Overall, humor functions as a medium for delivering social critique, framing identity, and indirectly fostering interpersonal closeness.

Keywords: *Humor analysis, Implicature meaning, Language function, Multimodal, Talk show*

[*]**Corresponding Author:**
Ni Wayan Kasni
wayankasni@gmail.com

Received: April 2025
Revised: July 2025
Accepted: August 2025
Published: September 2025

© 2025 Kasni and Budiarta. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

No humor, no life is a phrase that highlights the significance of humor in communication. Humor can be understood as a set of phenomena related to the creation, perception, or experience of something absurd or funny—an idea, situation, or event that deviates from the norm (Attardo & Raskin, 2017). Individuals within a community often have distinct ways of expressing and interpreting humor, depending on its purpose and the situational context. Humor is typically accompanied by laughter, an emotional response triggered by verbal and non-verbal actions from humorous individuals or groups (Agra, 2022). However, humor in communication is not merely a tool to elicit laughter; it also functions as a communication strategy. The use of humorous language often carries multiple layers of meaning, such as metaphor, satire, or critique (see Caroline et al.,

https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2025.2067875.4155

2024; Kamandanu et al., 2024; Swari & Ayomi, 2024), which calls for deeper examination in academic research.

In contemporary contexts, humor is not only embedded in everyday conversations but also widely disseminated across social media platforms such as TikTok, Facebook, and Instagram (Bernad-Mechó & Girón-García, 2023; Budiarta et al., 2025; Hakokõngäs et al., 2020; Hidayat et al., 2018). Most television channels likewise feature programs designed to entertain and bring joy to audiences (Messerli, 2017; Messerli & Locher, 2021a; Mulyadi et al., 2021). One genre that frequently provokes laughter is the talk show. Talk shows present a particular gradation of discursive characteristics related to institutionalization, incorporating informal conversational features at one end of the speech continuum and transitioning toward more formal institutional characteristics (Ilie, 2006). Depending on the topic, participants' backgrounds, and viewpoints, and the nature of the audience, talk show interactions often blend spontaneous and intentional speech, non-institutional and institutional roles, free-flowing and host-regulated exchanges, as well as interlocutor-oriented, message-driven, and multi-audience communication—all shaped by the host (Ilie, 2001).

Although humor in memes, interviews, and online communication has been widely studied, less attention has been paid to how humor is constructed in talk shows. This gap is important because talk shows occupy a hybrid space: they are simultaneously institutional and entertainment-oriented, combining spontaneity, performance, and multimodal interaction in ways that differ from memes or social media humor. Investigating humor in talk shows, therefore, offers unique insights into how humor operates in real-time, face-to-face interaction while still mediated for mass audiences. Thus, humorous communication in talk shows functions as a strategy to attract public attention; in other words, talk shows risk failing to engage viewers without humor. Against this backdrop, the present study investigates how humorous language is employed in talk shows, with a specific focus on the Indonesian program *For Your Pagi (FYP)*, to uncover explicit and implicit meanings as well as the multimodal strategies used to evoke laughter.

One of the talk shows selected for analysis is FYP, a morning program broadcast on Trans7 in Indonesia. Hosted by Raffi Ahmad and Irfan Hakim, the show primarily targets a female audience, particularly mothers. The program typically presents celebrity and non-celebrity news from multiple perspectives, distinguished by the unique styles of its presenters. Observations of FYP reveal a notably distinctive communication style among speakers. The language used often appears casual yet carries hidden meanings. For example, a presenter might say, "Saya kenal dia 'I know him' (accompanied by a smile)," a remark that immediately triggers laughter from the audience. The humorous communication employed is also highly varied. In one instance, a guest once said to a presenter, "Kayaknya dulu kamu hitam deh 'You used to be dark-skinned, didn't you?"—a seemingly ordinary comment that evokes multiple interpretations. On the surface, it might be taken literally, but it also functions as a form of satire, which, in context, becomes humorous (see Bakomitrou, 2024; Fägersten, 2017; Holmes, 2006; Piata, 2016).

These examples demonstrate why the FYP talk show is a valuable case: it illustrates how humor is co-constructed by hosts, guests, and audiences in a mediated space, blending casual remarks, satire, and multimodal cues such as gesture and prosody. Unlike memes or scripted media, FYP provides spontaneous yet regulated interactions, making it a rich site for studying humor pragmatics and multimodality in Indonesian television. To this end, the present study adopts a multimodal-pragmatic framework to examine how verbal, visual, and gestural elements combine to produce humor on FYP. The analysis focuses on three variables: (1) speech acts such as irony, teasing, and satire; (2) multimodal cues such as gesture, prosody, facial expression, and camera movement; and (3) their role in constructing identity and engaging audiences.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Theories of Humor

Numerous theories of humor have been proposed, even though Attardo and Raskin (2017) and Schaefer and Lynch (2017) asserted that there is no single theory that provides a comprehensive scheme for

understanding humor. The existing general theories of humor are relief theory, incongruity theory, and superiority theory (Krikmann, 2006; Larkin-Galiñanes, 2017; Wilkins & Eisenbraun, 2009). Firstly, the relief theory posits that the creation of humor is for relieving tension. Concerning this, Schaefer and Lynch (2017) explained that relief humor has two properties: "a healing quality that allows built-up tension and energy to be released…[and] an act of disguised aggression and sanctioned resistance." Secondly, the superiority theory states that humor is created by someone who feels superior to and laughs (together) at those who are misfortune or refuse to comply with the rules (Lintott, 2016). This theory focuses on the psychological effects of humor on the expected audience. Thirdly, the incongruity theory states that humor is generated due to the incongruities of expectation and experience. This theory focuses on the cognitive-linguistic aspect of humor in which perceivers feel that someone has done or said something violating normal rules. Related to the above theory, Tianli and Chen (2024) reveal that humor is a kind of cognitive psychological activity, and it is diverse among individuals. In their research, they also found that both language talk show hosts use a variety of rhetorical strategies to produce humorous discourse. Likewise, Harida (2018) states that verbal humor tends to exploit linguistic aspects such as words, phrases, and sentences to trigger laughter.

2.2. Types and Function of Humor

The literature identifies various types of humor. Some classify them into seven humor types: comparison, personification, exaggeration, surprise, sarcasm, silliness, and pun (Catanescu & Tom, 2001). Firstly, the comparison type refers to humor that happens because of combining two or more objects to generate a humorous situation. Secondly, personification type, which is by attributing human traits to animals or other inanimate things. Thirdly, exaggeration happens when something is overstated to generate humor, such as by exaggerating foolishness. Fourthly, sarcasm occurs when one uses sarcastic remarks to respond to a situation. Fifthly, silliness happens when a joker shows funny faces when responding to absurd situations. Sixthly, the surprise type is the humor that arises from unpredictable situations.

Meyer (2000) highlights four functions of humor: (1) Identification: Humor builds support by identifying communicators with their audiences, enhancing speaker credibility, and building group cohesiveness. When communicators try to release tension through humor and make their audiences feel superior in the sense that they are brought up to a more equal relationship with the speaker, (2) Clarification, it means that sometimes the communicators try to encapsulate their views into a memorable phrase or short anecdotes, resulting in the clarification of issues or positions. (3) Enforcement, with humor, the speakers try to enforce norms delicately by levelling criticism while maintaining some degree of identification with the audience, and (4) Differentiation, the speakers sometimes try to differentiate and contrast themselves with their opponents, their views with the opponents' views, and so on. Humor is invoked to make both alliances and distinctions.

As stated in the previous research, humor is co-constructed and negotiated through interaction (Sheikhan, 2024); it not only serves to entertain but also acts as a subtle form of social critique. In addition, Usman and Fauzan (2020) investigate the humorous communicative interactions during the Wartimes in Aceh. It tried to observe the types and styles of humor within the memories of Aceh society. The study shows that many types of humor and styles occurred unintentionally due to speaker's mistranslation and code-mixing from Acehnese to Indonesian during unexpected interactions. Likewise, Nabila et al. (2022) found that situational comedy showed sarcasm as the most frequently used category of verbal humor.

2.3. Multimodal Analysis

Multimodal analysis is an interdisciplinary approach that examines how meaning is constructed through multiple modes of communication, verbal language, visuals, gestures, sound, and spatial arrangements, within a unified interaction (Jurado & Ruiz-Madrid, 2015). Each mode has its semiotic structure and may convey meaning autonomously or in combination with others (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2001). Thus, multimodal analysis extends beyond language as a sign system to consider how non-verbal elements contribute to overall meaning. This makes multimodal analysis highly relevant for examining audiovisual media such as talk shows, where meaning is conveyed through spoken language and

complex cross-modal interactions. Additionally, Yanda and Ramadhanti (2018) describe multimodal discourse analysis as a field within discourse studies that analyzes texts in conjunction with images, colors, symbols, and other semiotic resources.

From a linguistic perspective, the multimodal approach has become increasingly important in capturing communication as it occurs in real-world contexts, where multiple channels of meaning operate simultaneously. Norris (2004) argues that multimodal interaction analysis enables researchers to examine how gestures, intonation, facial expressions, and even physical objects in the interaction space actively shape meaning. Similarly, Jewitt (2009) emphasizes the significance of inter-modal cohesion and how relationships between modes produce richer social narratives than single-mode communication. Baldry and Thibault (2006) also describe multimodal texts as semiotic constructions that require critical interpretation of how each element contributes to a cohesive structure. The central function of multimodal analysis in linguistic contexts is therefore to capture the dynamics of communication holistically and understand how meaning is generated through verbal utterances, visual cues, and accompanying social actions (Xie, 2025). Forceville (2006) further explains that multimodal pragmatics makes it possible to explore implicit meanings, such as visual metaphors, multimodal irony, or humorous effects arising from the combination of facial expressions and speech structures. As such, multimodal analysis provides a powerful tool for interpreting contemporary communication, especially in media that integrate multiple channels, such as talk shows, vlogs, advertisements, and social media. One of the multimodal analysis studies conducted by Liang (2021) found that multimodal conversation analysis revealed how participants' indices of game activities were reframed, converting the verbal instructions that were heavily enforced into directive trajectories that were made in a lighthearted way.

2.4. Pragmatic Analysis

Pragmatic analysis focuses on how language functions as action in social contexts. One of its central concerns is speech acts, actions performed through language, such as commanding, advising, promising, or requesting. Searle (1979) explains that every utterance contains three dimensions: the locutionary act (literal meaning), the illocutionary act (speaker's intention), and the perlocutionary act (effect on the listener). This framework helps researchers identify the social and communicative functions of speech in various contexts. On the other hand, Thomas (1995) highlights the concept of pragmatic failure, which occurs when pragmatic meanings are misinterpreted due to cultural or contextual differences, potentially leading to communication breakdowns. Mey (2001) expands this perspective by introducing the concept of participatory pragmatics, which explores how individuals use language to access and shape social reality. Overall, pragmatic analysis uncovers how meaning, power, humor, critique, and persuasion are constructed through speech within particular social settings (Levinson, 2001). In this way, pragmatics not only involves the structure of language but also the underlying social and psychological dynamics that inform its use.

2.5. Speech Act Theory and Humor

Speech act theory (Searle, 1979) emphasizes that every utterance conveys not only linguistic meaning but also a specific action, such as stating, requesting, promising, or criticizing. In the context of humor, speech acts are crucial because speakers often exploit illocutionary intent that diverges from literal meaning. For instance, a directive may be delivered ironically or hyperbolically, thus producing a humorous effect through the incongruity between the intent and the form of the utterance. Despite the fact that humor is entertaining, it can also make the audience feel insulted, offended, or even hurt (if the humor is excessive). This is because a person's reaction to humor depends on their individual understanding and specific situational constraints (Sinkeviciute, 2019). Even an utterance intended to be humorous may be perceived as insulting or hateful if the audience or a particular social group does not accept the humor being presented or delivered (Bell, 2015). Humor can be understood and accepted by a group of people if it aligns with the cultural values and norms of those who are the target of humor (Nissenbaum & Freud, 2021). It can also be stated that humor is more likely to be accepted if the humorous expressions are related to language use and cultural background, and if they represent the community's identity (Cao et al., 2023; De Pablos, 2021). Additionally, Meyer (2000) adds that humor serves as a communication strategy that enables social cohesion, relaxation, and even social criticism through language play and the manipulation of pragmatic contexts. Humor strategies can thus be

understood as variations of speech acts that emphasize indirect, implicit, or ambiguous aspects, thereby producing laughter and reducing the potential for conflict. In this study, a multimodal-pragmatic analysis highlights how verbal, visual, and gestural elements combine to reinforce humorous speech acts. For example, an illocutionary statement can be emphasized through facial expressions or gestures, which strengthens its humorous function as satire, criticism, or entertainment.

3. Methodology

3.1. Materials

Two videos served as the primary data (See Table 1), obtained from video recordings of publicly available episodes of the talk show FYP on the program's official YouTube channel (Trans7 Official), which were then transcribed. The transcription focused on the speakers' utterances in the talk show program, as well as non-verbal elements such as facial expressions, gestures, vocal intonation, audience responses, and other relevant visual cues for multimodal analysis.

As noted, this research investigates multimodal humor in two FYP clips. FYP is a talk show hosted by a main host and a co-host, first aired on July 18, 2022, on Trans7 and continues to be broadcast today (CNN Indonesia, 2022; Gaganantara, 2022), with episodes regularly uploaded to the program's official YouTube channel. The language used in the show is Indonesian. The uniqueness of this talk show lies not only in its relaxed, friendly communication style (often using everyday language between the hosts and guests) but also in the distinctive use of humor throughout the discussions, which makes it an appropriate corpus for examining humor mechanisms. Much of the humor involves implicit meanings, so analysis attends to how these meanings are co-constructed across verbal, prosodic, gestural, and visual modes.

The two focal clips were purposefully selected as typical cases. A short subset was double-coded and reconciled through discussion. Given the small data set, the purpose was analytic (theory-building) rather than statistical generalization, and we acknowledge associated limitations. Episodes with technical issues (e.g., obstructed audio/visual cues) or atypical formats were excluded from full analysis.

The study analyzes publicly accessible broadcast material; no interaction with human subjects occurred, and no private data were collected. Only credited public figures are discussed, and identifiable images of incidental audience members are not reproduced. Materials were accessed through platform links and timecodes, without unauthorized downloading. Each clip is cited in accordance with scientific guidelines (uploader/channel, date, title, URL, and analyzed timecode).

Table 1
List of Data Sources

No	FYP Video Title	Video Source (YouTube)	Duration	Views	Release Date
1	Klarifikasi Mischa Chandrawinata Soal Kedekatannya Dengan Cut Syifa |FYP|Part 1	https://youtu.be/Apvv9WJZMZM?feature=shared	10:26 minutes	581,245 views	Oct 24, 2024
2	Bongkar Kedekatan Mischa Chandrawinata Dengan Artis-Artis Cantik |FYP| Part 2	https://youtu.be/mUhMzyYbUio?feature=shared	9:48 minutes	246,742 views	Oct 24, 2024

3.2. Procedures

This research adopts a qualitative approach using a multimodal-pragmatic method. Analytic generalization is employed, aiming to contribute to the theoretical understanding of multimodal humor rather than to statistically generalize across all episodes. The two analyzed clips yielded 31 humor segments, 15 from Part 1 and 16 from Part 2. These were coded for pragmatic strategies, speech acts, and multimodal elements observed in conversational events (such as smiles, gestures, prosody, facial expressions, gaze, laughter).

The analysis followed a three-step coding process. First, all humor-related sequences were identified in the transcripts and video recordings. Second, these sequences were coded according to predefined humor strategies (e.g., teasing, irony, exaggeration), adapted from Attardo (1994) and Meyer (2000). Third, coding was refined iteratively to account for multimodal features such as gesture, facial expression, and prosody.

A *humor event* was defined as the minimal stretch of interaction in which a humorous intent is signaled and recognized, anchored by a trigger (e.g., punchline, ironic turn, reaction shot), and bounded either by uptake (laughter, smile, voice, topic shift) or a brief 2–3 second window when cues were short. Each video was segmented into event-level rows (start–end timecodes), and coders assigned one or more humor strategies (multi-label allowed) using an event codebook. Operational definitions were as follows: a) Irony/Sarcasm: propositional content contrasts with literal form, resolved by contextual knowledge; b) Wordplay/Pun: phonological or lexical ambiguity exploited for comic effect; c) Teasing/Mock impoliteness: playful face-threat with mitigating cues (smile, prosody, affiliative uptake); d) Hyperbole/Understatement: scalar extremity/minimization oriented to stance; e) Visual gag/Embodied cue: camera framing, reaction shots, facial/gestural cues that independently produce humor; f) Timing/Editing: cutaways, pause, or overlap that create incongruity/resolution. Event-level metadata included speaker(s), audience response (laugh/smiles/cheers), and salient multimodal cues (prosody, gesture, camera).

Speech acts were analyzed using Searle's taxonomy (assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, declarations) with attention to illocutionary point, preparatory conditions, and uptake. Primary coding prioritized function in context (sequencing, recipient uptake, activity type), with form and prosody, and kinesics as secondary cues. Speech acts were coded alongside humor strategies at the event level (same time row) to preserve the alignment of form, function, and multimodal evidence. This enabled us to trace patterns such as 'teasing (humor strategy) realized as an expressive (speech act), accompanied by smile, voice, and recipient laughter.'

4. Results

The multimodal transcription of humorous segments in the FYP talk show demonstrates that humor is constructed not only through verbal means but also through the interplay of speech, gesture, audio cues, and proxemic movement (see Appendix 1 and 2). Across 31 humor instances, verbal wordplay and self-deprecating comments frequently triggered visual reinforcement (facial expressions, pointing, blushing) and were co-constructed with audience laughter and chanting.

4.1. Multimodal Elements Constructed in the Humor of the FYP Talk Show

An analysis of 31 humorous segments of FYP, fifteen of which were in Video Part 1, shows that both verbal and visual modalities are fully present, while the audio modality appears in only 14 of the 15 segments (see Appendix 1 for details). This confirms that humor in Part 1 is primarily constructed through a combination of verbal utterances and visual reinforcement. For example, the phrase *"Spesial, spesial terus… spesial pake telor"* (0:03) relies not only on wordplay but is also enhanced by smiles and hand gestures that signal humorous intent.

Theoretically, this pattern demonstrates the dominance of multimodal interplay between language (verbal) and gesture (visual), consistent with the framework of Kress and van Leeuwen (2001), where meaning is generated not by a single mode but by the integration of several modes. However, the limited audio participation of the audience makes the humor in Part 1 relatively performative and individual, originating more from the speaker's initiative than from shared resonance. In other words, audience laughter serves as validation, but is not a primary element in the co-construction of humor.

In contrast, the sixteen segments in Video Part 2 demonstrate the full engagement of all three primary modalities: verbal, visual, and audio. For example, in the segment *"Saya akan buat partai dari mantan-mantan"* [I'll start a political party made up of all my exes] (9:01), where the parodic verbal is reinforced by confused looks (visual) and immediately met with collective laughter from the audience (audio). The simultaneous presence of these three modalities indicates that the humor in Part 2 is co-constructed in

the sense of Norris (2004), where humorous meaning emerges not from individual utterances alone but from multifaceted social interactions.

From a distributional perspective, the audience's full involvement at the audio level represents a shift in role, from a supportive background (as in Part 1) to an active agent in the production of humor. Baldry and Thibault (2006) describe this as a multimodal ensemble, where multiple modalities work simultaneously to create a unified meaning that cannot be reduced to a single mode.

4.2. The Pragmatic Strategies Employed in Delivering Humor on the FYP Talk Show

The multimodal-pragmatic analysis of the FYP shows that humor is shaped through various pragmatic strategies that not only entertain but also strengthen social, romantic, and emotional relationships (see Appendix 2). At least four major strategies were identified.

Table 4
Pragmatic Strategies and Types of Speech Acts Most Frequently Found in FYP Videos

Category	Most Frequent Subtypes (with counts)	Highest Frequency	Dominant Role in Humor
Pragmatic Strategies	Teasing (11), Irony (6), Hyperbole (6), Wordplay/Parody (5)	Teasing (11)	Building intimacy through playful provocation
Speech Acts	Assertive/Representative (16), Expressive (8), Directive (8), Commissive (1)	Assertive (16)	Making humorous statements, character assessments, and identity claims in a humorous manner

From Table 4, teasing emerges as the most dominant pragmatic strategy, appearing across nearly all segments. Teasing functions as a relational device that sustains social bonding by provoking, ridiculing, or playfully embarrassing others without causing serious offense. In this talk show, teasing operates as a safe form of *benign violation*, where temporary discomfort is transformed into laughter. Teasing generates humor primarily through assertive speech acts (making exaggerated statements) or interrogative/directive forms (asking questions that highlight personal flaws), which produce comic incongruity and reinforce solidarity between hosts and guests.

Irony appears as many as 6 of the overall humor strategies, particularly in describing paradoxical twin relationships, identity confusion, or romantic contradictions. It challenges the audience to recognize the gap between literal utterances and the intended meaning. Irony is generally realized through assertives that deliberately state the opposite of reality, creating humorous cognitive distance. For instance, when Marcell claims that he only gets along with his twin when they are apart, the ironic reversal of family norms generates laughter.

Hyperbolic expressions also include as many as 6 of the data, often exaggerating emotions, physical appearances, or relational experiences. Statements such as "my face looked like a boiled crab" or "I will establish a political party of my exes" distort reality beyond plausibility, yet remain intelligible to the audience. Hyperbole is realized through expressives that amplify emotions disproportionately. The comic effect arises from the mismatch between exaggerated descriptions and the shared awareness of the actual circumstances.

Wordplay and phonological parody appear as many as 5 times in the humorous instances. Examples include exploiting a lisp (cadel) or playing with the similarity of the twins' names (Mischa vs. Marcell). Such strategies rely on linguistic awareness from the audience, who recognize the incongruity at the level of form rather than content. Wordplay typically surfaces in assertive or expressive acts, where sound manipulation alters meaning. The humor arises from linguistic creativity that transforms ordinary phonological features into comic resources.

Speech act analysis further shows that assertives dominate humorous interactions. These utterances present statements of fact or opinion that are deliberately twisted, exaggerated, or framed ironically, creating laughter when the audience detects the incongruity between what is said and what is plausible.

Expressives and directives occur less often but still form substantial portions of the data. Expressives draw humor from the overdramatization of emotions, such as embarrassment or affection, especially when presented in socially inappropriate contexts. Directives, on the other hand, generate humor by placing the target in socially awkward or exaggerated situations, often through rhetorical questions or teasing commands. Meanwhile, commissives appear only once, but their rarity makes them especially striking as a humorous device. By promising something absurd or impossible, commissives highlight the gap between the serious force of a commitment and the implausibility of its content. Taken together, these patterns demonstrate that humor in the talk show is not evenly distributed across speech act types but instead shaped by how each illocutionary force interacts with incongruity, exaggeration, and social expectations to elicit laughter.

Overall, humor in the talk show is systematically constructed through the interplay of pragmatic strategies and speech acts. Teasing, irony, hyperbole, and wordplay are the primary strategies, while assertives and expressives dominate the speech act distribution. The correlation is evident: teasing often manifests as assertives or directives; irony is embedded in assertives; hyperbole thrives in expressives; and wordplay is anchored in assertives or expressives. This pattern underscores the social function of humor: to negotiate intimacy, manage face, and entertain through linguistic creativity. In short, humor in the talk show emerges not merely from content, but from how speakers strategically select speech acts to reshape meaning and elicit laughter.

5. Discussion

This study aims to analyze the role of multimodal elements in humor formation and the pragmatic strategies employed to create humor. The results reveal that humor in the FYP talk show is co-constructed through assertive and expressive speech acts supported by multimodal cues. For instance, in *"Spesial, spesial terus… spesial pake telor"* [Special, always special… special with egg], humor arises from wordplay and cultural metaphor, but its comic force is reinforced through the host's playful intonation, smiling, and hand gestures, which the camera captures in close-up while the audience chuckles. This confirms Sheikhan's (2024) view that humor is collaboratively negotiated and resonates with Landert's (2021) study of improvised fiction, where spontaneous co-creation distinguishes humorous discourse from scripted forms. Yet, unlike theatrical improvisation, FYP's humor depends heavily on audience participation and multimodal orchestration, demonstrating how entertainment media embed humor in a layered, interactive environment.

For example, in *"Mischa cadel… Gua cadel…"* [Mischa lisps… I lisp], where the host mocks a co-host's lisp and then extends the joke by parodying his own speech. On the surface, this is an assertive act that risks being a face-threatening act (FTA), echoing Priana et al.'s (2024) observation that humor often exploits indirect insults and violations of politeness. However, following Goffman's (1967) and Brown and Levinson's (1987) frameworks, this utterance is mitigated by face-saving strategies: the self-deprecation, exaggerated pronunciation, and the audience's laughter collectively transform potential offense into affiliative bonding. Similar to Dynel's (2020) analysis of disparaging humor on Reddit, where ridicule fosters group solidarity, the talk show data demonstrate that humor can simultaneously threaten and preserve face. The difference lies in multimodality: smiling, mimicry, and shared laughter function as redressive cues that prevent teasing from escalating into a genuine insult.

Another example is "*Kirain on the way ke hati dia?"* [Thought you were on the way to her heart?], the host deploys an ironic romantic metaphor directed at a co-host, a directive speech act framed as playful flirtation. Such teasing aligns with Holmes' (2006) and Hay's (2000) findings that humor in the workplace and public discourse serves relational purposes by softening critique and strengthening rapport. However, unlike written or online humor (Chen et al., 2025; Messerli & Locher, 2021b), the FYP segment relies on visual reinforcement such as a mischievous glance, audience laughter, and a slightly provocative tone, which reframes flirtation as comedic rather than inappropriate. This divergence highlights that talk show humor is not merely linguistic but fundamentally multimodal, echoing Alviar et al.'s (2023) concept of "pragmatic modes," where speech, gaze, and gesture jointly create interactional meaning.

Thus, the complexity of humor as a social discourse demonstrates that humor in this talk show is not merely a tool for entertainment but also serves as a medium for constructing identity, expressing critique, celebrating vulnerability, and fostering social connections. This aligns with Lynch (2002), who asserts that humor knows no boundaries and can permeate all aspects of life. These implications reinforce the role of humor as a discursive practice that reflects socio-cultural dynamics. Moreover, multimodality as a key aspect of humor construction reveals that verbal elements cannot stand alone. Understanding humor heavily depends on the synchronization of facial expressions, gestures, intonation, and contextual cues (Xie, 2025). This reinforces the importance of a multimodal approach as a vital method in contemporary pragmatic analysis (Forceville, 2006). In this analysis, many instances of humor also subtly touch on issues of sexuality, gender stereotypes, and intimate relationships, while remaining within the boundaries of politeness. This indicates an evolution in public communication norms, particularly in entertainment media.

Overall, this study shows that humor in the FYP talk show is constructed through pragmatic strategies and mutually reinforcing multimodal elements. Strategies such as ambiguity, euphemism, irony, teasing, parody, and hyperbolic narrative are consistently employed to create humorous effects that entertain while reflecting relational and socio-cultural dynamics. In this context, assertive and expressive speech acts emerge as the dominant forms of conveying humorous meaning. Another significant finding confirms that humor is a complex social communication tool whose interpretation relies heavily on multimodal contextualization—namely, the integration of verbal utterances, facial expressions, body gestures, and vocal tone. Humor functions not only as a tension reliever or mere entertainment but also as a medium for delivering social critique, framing identity, and fostering interpersonal closeness in subtle ways. Based on these insights, the researchers recommend that future studies explore humor and audience responses in greater depth. This could involve analyzing real audience reactions through social media comments and direct expressions of laughter. Such an approach would provide a more holistic understanding of how diverse audience groups process, interpret, and socially evaluate humor. Future research could also adopt a more systematic multimodal approach, integrating visual and acoustic analysis tools to measure the contribution of facial expressions, gestures, and prosody to humor construction.

Disclosure Statement

The authors claim no conflict of interest.

Funding

This work was funded by the Directorate Research and Community Service, Universitas Warmadewa.

Acknowledgments

The author also extends heartfelt thanks to the rector of Universitas Warmadewa for the financial support provided for this research.

References

Agra, S. de S. (2022). John L. Austin’s laugth or its humour’s seriousness. *Anales Del Seminario de Historia de La Filosofia*, *39*(1), 169–179. https://doi.org/10.5209/ashf.77604

Alviar, C., Kello, C. T., & Dale, R. (2023). Multimodal coordination and pragmatic modes in conversation. *Language Sciences*, *97*, Article 101524. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2022.101524

Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic theories of humor (Humor research)*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Attardo, S., & Raskin, V. (2017). Linguistics and humor theory. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and humor* (1st ed., p. 15). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315731162

Bakomitrou, E. (2024). *When laughter takes flight: Analyzing Ryanair’s humorous strategy on Instagram: A multimodal discourse analysis of Ryanair’s memes*. Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Baldry, A., & Thibault, P. J. (2006). *Multimodal transcription and text analysis: A multimedia toolkit and coursebook*. Equinox Publishing.

Bell, N. (2015). *We are not amused: Failed humor in interaction.* De Gruyter Mouton.

Bernad-Mechó, E., & Girón-García, C. (2023). A multimodal analysis of humour as an engagement strategy in YouTube research dissemination videos. *European Journal of Humour Research*, *11*(1), 46–66. https://doi.org/10.7592/EJHR.2023.11.1.760

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Budiarta, I. W., Rajistha, I. G. N. A., Jayantini, I. G. A. S. R., & Kasni, N. W. (2025). General politeness and impoliteness in mobile gaming communication. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, *13*(1), 132–146. https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2024.2040802.3691

Cao, Y., Hou, Y., Dong, Z., & Ji, L. J. (2023). The impact of culture and social distance on humor appreciation, sharing, and production. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *14*(2), 207–217. https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211065938

Caroline, Y. P., Zahrani, T., & Sinaga, A. N. (2024). Analysis of language functions in live broadcasting online seller on TikTok. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature*, *3*(1), 39–51. https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.3.1.2024.39-51

Catanescu, C., & Tom, G. (2001). Types of humor in television and magazine advertising. *Review of Business*, *22*(1), 92-95.

Chen, Y., Gong, Q., & Dovchin, S. (2025). Black humour as official slogan: The CDA from Chinese anti-epidemic discourse. *Language and Communication*, *100*, 166–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2024.12.002

CNN Indonesia. (2022, July 17). *Raffi Ahmad dan Irfan Hakim Bakal Duet di Acara FYP Trans7* [Raffi Ahmad and Irfan Hakim will be a duet at the FYP Trans7 event]. https://www.cnnindonesia.com/hiburan/20220717221005-248-822648/raffi-ahmad-dan-irfan-hakim-bakal-duet-di-acara-fyp-trans7

De Pablos, M. E. J. (2021). El humor como estrategia de subversión feminista en "The Portable Virgin" de Ann Enright [Humour as a subversive feminist strategy in "The Portable Virgin" by Ann Enright. *Cadernos Pagu*, *62*, e216201. https://doi.org/10.1590/18094449202100620001

Dynel, M. (2020). Vigilante disparaging humour at r/IncelTears: Humour as critique of incel ideology. *Language and Communication*, *74*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2020.05.001

Fägersten, K. B. (2017). English-language swearing as humor in Swedish comic strips. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *121*, 175–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.014

Forceville, C. (2006). Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research. In G. Kristiansen, M. Achard, R. Dirven, & F. R. de M. Ibàñez (Eds.), *Cognitive linguistics: Current applications and future perspectives* (pp. 379–402). Mouton de Gruyter.

Gaganantara, D. D. (2022). *Program talkshow FYP for your Pagi Tayang Perdana, simak jadwal trans 7 hari ini senin 18 Juli 2022*. Portaljepara.Com.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face interaction.* Aldine.

Hakokõngäs, E., Halmesvaara, O., & Sakki, I. (2020). Persuasion through bitter humor: Multimodal discourse analysis of rhetoric in internet memes of two far-right groups in Finland. *Social Media and Society*, *6*(2), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120921575

Harida, R. (2018). Analysis of humor making techniques in the WIT comedy program (Waktu Indonesia Timur). *International Journal of Education, Information Technology*, *1*(2), 78–85. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2527540

Hay, J. (2000). Functions of humor in the conversations of men and women. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(6), 709–742. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00069-7

Hidayat, D. N., A, A., & A, A. (2018). A multimodal discourse analysis of the interpersonal meaning of a television advertisement in Indonesia. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *5*(2), 119–126. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v5i2.11188

Holmes, J. (2006). Sharing a laugh: Pragmatic aspects of humor and gender in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *38*(1), 26–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.06.007

Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *33*(2), 209–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00133-2

Ilie, C. (2006). Talk shows. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language & linguistics* (pp. 489–494). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00357-6

Jewitt, C. (2009). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis*. Routledge.

Jurado, J. V., & Ruiz-Madrid, M. N. (2015). A multimodal approach to product presentations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *173*, 252–258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.061

Kamandanu, I. K. R. J., Ayu, I., & Puspani, M. (2024). Analyzing conceptual metaphors through Michael Bublés 'Call me irresponsible' album. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature, 3*(3), 113–121. https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.3.3.2024.113-121

Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold Publishers.

Krikmann, A. (2006). Contemporary linguistic theories of humour. *Folklore: Electronic Journal of Folklore*, *33*, 27–58. https://doi.org/10.7592/fejf2006.33.kriku

Landert, D. (2021). The spontaneous co-creation of comedy: Humour in improvised theatrical fiction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *173*, 68–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.12.007

Larkin-Galiñanes, C. (2017). An overview of humor theory. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and humor* (pp. 5-21). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315731162

Levinson, S. C. (2001). Pragmatics: Linguistic. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (pp. 11948–11954). Pergamon. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/03008-4

Liang, M. Y. (2021). Pragmatic socialization through gameplay directives: Multimodal conversation analysis of avatar-embodied interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *171*, 36–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.09.028

Lintott, S. (2016). Superiority in humor theory. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, *74*(4), 347–358. https://doi.org/10.1111/jaac.12321

Lynch, O. H. (2002). Humorous communication: Finding a place for humor in communication research. *Communication Theory*, *12*(4), 423–445. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/12.4.423

Messerli, T. C. (2017). Sitcom humour as ventriloquism. *Lingua*, *197*, 16–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.05.006

Messerli, T. C., & Locher, M. A. (2021a). Humour support and emotive stance in comments on Korean TV drama. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *178*, 408–425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.03.001

Messerli, T. C., & Locher, M. A. (2021b). Humour support and emotive stance in comments on Korean TV drama. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *178*, 408–425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.03.001

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publisher, Inc.

Meyer, J. C. (2000). Humor as a double-edged sword: Four functions of humor in communication. *Communication Theory*, *10*(3), 310–331. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2000.tb00194.x

Mulyadi, M., Yusuf, M., & Siregar, R. K. (2021). Verbal humor in selected Indonesian stand up comedian's discourse: Semantic analysis using GVTH. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *8*(1), Article 1943927. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2021.1943927

Nabila, K. B., Ena, O. T., & Bram, B. (2022). Investigating verbal humor in selected Mr. Iglesias sitcom shows episodes. *English Franca: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, *6*(2), 393–410. https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v6i2.5458

Nissenbaum, A., & Freud, D. (2021). Which person walks into a bar? A typology of globally spread humor on Twitter. *International Journal of Communication*, *15*, 5208–5228

Norris, S. (2004). *Analyzing multimodal interaction: A methodological framework*. Routledge.

Piata, A. (2016). When metaphor becomes a joke: Metaphor journeys from political ads to internet memes. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *106*, 39–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.10.003

Priana, R. Y. S., Karlinah, S., Hidayat, D. R., & Sjuchro, D. W. (2024). Humor as a representation of community identity: An analysis of Sundanese verbal humor. *The European Journal of Humour Research*, *12*(4), 197–214. https://doi.org/10.7592/EJHR.2024.12.4.894

Schaefer, Z. A., & Lynch, O. H. (2017). Humor. In C. R. Scott, L. Lewis, J. R. Barker, J. Keyton, T. Kuhn, & P. K. Turner (Eds.), *The International encyclopedia of organizational communication* (pp. 1–9). John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc099

Searle, J. R. (1979). Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts. Cambridge University Press.

Sheikhan, A. (2024). Responses to conversational humour: An analytical framework. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *224*, 57–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.03.002

Sinkeviciute, V. (2019). Juggling identities in interviews: The metapragmatics of 'doing humour.' *Journal of Pragmatics*, *152*, 216–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.08.005

Swari, N. M. F. P., & Ayomi, P. N. (2024). Metafunctions analysis of Instagram meme in @9Gag post. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature*, *3*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.3.1.2024.1-11

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.

Tianli, Z., & Chen, S. (2024). Rhetorical strategies in Chinese and English talk show humor: A comparative analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*, e1380702. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1380702

Usman, J., & Fauzan. (2020). Analyzing the humorous communicative interactions during the wartimes in Aceh. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *7*(2), 607–621. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16890

Wilkins, J., & Eisenbraun, A. J. (2009). Humor theories and the physiological benefits of laughter. *Holistic Nursing Practice*, *23*(6), 349–354. https://doi.org/10.1097/HNP.0b013e3181bf37ad

Xie, F. (2025). From words to multimodalities: Compliment perceptions across lingua cultures. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *239*, 94–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2025.02.006

Yanda, D. P., & Ramadhanti, D. (2018). Analisis wacana multimodal dalam novel Bidadari Bermata Bening karya Habiburrahman El-Shirazy [A multimodal discourse analysis on Bidadari Bermata Bening novel by Habiburrahman El-Shirazy]. *Jurnal Gramatika*, *4*(2), 214–226. https://doi.org/10.22202/jg.2018.v4i2.2597

Appendix 1

Table 2

The Results of the Humor Utterance and Multimodal Element Analysis Obtained from Video Part 1 and 2

No	Time Code	Humor Segment	Context of Conversation	Multimodal Element		
				Verbal (Speech/ Dialogue)	Visual (Camera, Gesture, Facial Expression, Setting)	Audio (Laughter, Background, Silence, Music)
Video Part 1						
1	0:03	*Spesial, spesial terus… spesial pake telor* [Special, always special… special with egg]	The host welcomes the guest star	Wordplay; repetition; food metaphor	Smile; playful hand gesture; close-up shot	Audience chuckles; no background music
2	0:46–0:53	*Mischa cadel… Gua cadel...* [Mischa lisps… I lisp…]	The host explains that Mischa has a lisp	Lisped pronunciation; self-parody	Shy smile; self-pointing; facial mimic of "cadel"	Laughter from the audience
3	1:12	*Kakak lu si Marcel, parah ceweknya banyak bro?* [Your brother Marcel—he's got too many girls, huh?]	Raffi, the host of FYP, describes Marcell's character to his younger brother, Mischa	Provocative tone; high pitch	Quick pointing; smirk	Laughter from peers
4	2:55	*Kirain on the way ke hati dia?* [Thought you were on the way to her heart?]	The host attempts to tease the guest star with words	Flirtatious, ironic tone	Mischievous glance; pointing at Mischa	Audience laughter; teasing background voices
5	3:50	Gue bilang, ah gue bukan Mischa. Gue Marchell [I said: I'm not Mischa, I'm Marcell]	Marcell emphasizes that he is not Mischa	Self-correction; verbal slip	Shocked face; nervous hand movement	Audience burst of laughter

6	4:16	*Sayang, udah dulu ya... (semua menyoraki, waaaahhh, eheee, cieee)* [Babe, I'll hang up now…" (everyone teases: waaahhh, eheee, cieee)]	The guest star ends the phone call with his interlocutor	Slip of tongue, intimate register	Blushing; gaze down; embarrassed smile	Audience loud teasing "waaaah, cieee"
7	4:34	*Lu merah banget. Kenapa bahas Cut Syifa langsung begini?* [You're so red. Just mentioning Cut Syifa made you like this?]	Marcell states that Mischa's face turned red	Teasing intonation; direct address	Visible blushing; pointing gesture	Co-hosts laugh; audience noise rises
8	4:50	*Kita jauh saling sayang, deket berantem terus* [We love each other when far apart, but always fight when close]	Marcell mentions that he only gets along with his twin, Mischa, when they are apart	Soft, reflective tone	Light pushing gesture	Audience soft laughter
9	5:10	*Muka gue pasti kayak kepiting rebus kayaknya yah?* [My face probably looked like a boiled crab, huh?]	Mischa says that his face turned red because of his mischievous brother	Self-deprecation; visual metaphor	Touching face; cheeks visibly red	Audience laughter
10	5:38	*Lu telepon subuh-subuh… curhat nangis-nangis* [You called at dawn... crying and venting]	Marcell reveals that Mischa once called at dawn while crying	Dramatic tone; exaggeration	Raised eyebrows; tilted head	Audience laughter
11	6:30	*Kan kakaknya udah nikah, gua gantiin* [His older brother's married, I'll take his place]	Mischa clarifies that he does not have a special relationship with Cut Syifa	Suggestive tone; playful offer	Shy smile; hand-to-chest	Audience giggle
12	6:48	*Cut Syifa umurnya jauh, gua jadi kakak aja* [Cut Syifa is much younger. I'll just be her older brother]	Mischa explains that there is a significant age gap between him and Cut Syifa	Serious tone; moral stance	Hand on chest; steady gaze	Quiet reaction, mild laughter
13	7:49	*Lu kalo jadi kakak-kakakan, akhirnya dipacarin juga* [If you act like a brother, you'll end up dating her too]	Raffi comments that Mischa could still date Cut Syifa even though his status is like that of an older brother	Teasing, ironic	Flirtatious gaze; pointing	Audience chuckle
14	8:41	*Doanya universal aja ya* [Just pray something universal]	Mischa talks about Cut Syifa	Calm, sincere tone	Palms together (prayer gesture); awkward smile	Silence, soft chuckle
15	10:20-10:25	Mau gini-gini, telpon aa Raffi aja. Suhunya dia soalnya [If you want to do something like this, just call Raffi. He's the expert]	Marcell tells Mischa to call Raffi regarding matters with girls	Wise tone; flat delivery	Neutral face; hand gesture	(serious humor)

Video Part 2						
16	0:00	*Dia playboy kaya lu gak?* [Is he a playboy like you?]	Raffi asked whether Mischa is a playboy like his brother	Soft, intimate tone	Faint smile; gaze; pointing	Soft laughter, pause
17	0:01	*Enggak, gue gak. Gue ada lingkaran, lingkaran itu* [I'm part of that circle]	Mischa stated that he is not a playboy	Verbal ambiguity Firm statement	Shoulder tap gesture	Co-host laughter
18	0:23	*Jadi, pas waktu gue mau mulai bandel, gue langsung kayak, Cell, gimana caranya* [So, when I wanted to start being naughty, I was immediately like, Cell, how do I do it]	Mischa said that he once asked Marcell how to become a playboy	Dramatic revelation	Shocked face; confused gestures	Audience gasp + laughter
19	00:33	*Tapi Marcel dulu parah. Dia, eh tapi lu jangan bi* lang-bilang adik gue ya [But Marcel used to be serious. He, eh but don't tell my brother, okay?]	Raffi said that Marcell used to be a playboy	Dramatic revelation, parody	Exaggerated mouth shapes; pointing	Audience laughter
20	2:34	*Lu bakal diserang komunitas cadel* [He lisps." "You'll get attacked by the lisp community]	Mischa scared Marcell by saying he might be attacked by the lisp community	Embarrassed, hushed tone	Awkward smile; head lowered	Audience chuckle after pause
21	3:51	*Gak nginep. Bahaya. Khilaf entar* [Not staying over. Dangerous. Might slip up]	Marcell joked that Mischa could be in danger at his own house.	Joking tone; mock accent	Open-hand gestures; serious gaze	Audience laughter
22	4:14	*Iya, lu gak mau dipanggil Uncle ya?* [Yeah, you don't want to be called Uncle, right?]	Irfan asked Mischa	Denial	Nervous smile; rejecting gesture	Audience tease
23	4:26	*Bule-bule, tapi tinggal gue di Banten, bro* [Foreigners, but I live in Banten, bro]	Marcell emphasized that they are of Western descent but live in Banten	Wordplay; repetition; sarcastic tone	Western-style gestures	Audience chuckle
24	6:07	*Gue sama dia bener-bener temen banget* [I'm really really friends with him]	Mischa explained his relationship status with Aril Tatum	Defensive tone, open-hand gesture,	Hushed gesture; serious gaze	Silence, slight laughter
25	6:43-6:44	Ini judulnya apa sih? Kayaknya di roasting banget sih [What is this? It looks like it's been heavily roasted]	Mischa couldn't stand being teased throughout the conversation	nervous tone Embarrassed, hushed tone	Rejecting hand wave; suppressed smile	Audience tease laughter

26	7:14	*Rantimaria mantan lo ya?* [Ranty Maria's your ex, right?]	The host asked Mischa	Soft, intimate tone	Head lowered; shy look	Audience soft response
27	7:43	Masa semua bukan? Lo deket sama cewek banyak banget [Really? You're close to a lot of girls]	Raffi asked Mischa	Co-host's teasing Exaggerated	Pointing; co-host laugh	Audience laugh loud
28	8:02	*Jessica Mila, ini mantan gue jelas ya* [Jessica Mila clearly my ex	Mischa emphasized his relationship with Mila	Firm statement; intimate tone	Exaggerated falling gesture	Audience laughter
29	8:29	*Udah jatuh banget terus guling* [Fell so hard and then rolled over]	Mischa said that he struggled after a breakup	Dramatic repetition	Grand gesture, mock speech	Audience's loud laughter
30	9:01	*Saya akan buat partai dari mantan-mantan* [I'll start a political party made up of all my exes]	Raffi proudly said that he had many ex-girlfriends	Political parody, serious tone; Flirtatious, ambiguous	Confused look; playful gaze	Audience chuckle
31	9:32	Tipe lo kayak gimana? Kulitnya? [What's your skin type?]	Marcell asked Raffi about his criteria for a girlfriend	Flirtatious tone, confused expression	Pointing; co-host laugh	Co-hosts laugh; audience noise rises

Appendix 2

Table 3

Results of Analysis of FYP Humor Which Is Formed through Various Pragmatic Strategies and Speech Acts

No.	Time Code	Humor Segment	Context of Communication	Pragmatic Strategy	Speech Act
Video Part 1					
1	0:03	*Spesial, spesial terus… spesial pake telor* [Special, always special… special with egg]	The host welcomes the guest star	Wordplay, repetition, food metaphor	Expressive (ice-breaker, playful praise)
2	0:46–0:53	*Mischa cadel… Gua cadel...* [Mischa lisps… I lisp…]	The host explains that Mischa has a lisp	Phonological parody, self-deprecation	Expressive
3	1:12	*Kakak lu si Marcel, parah ceweknya banyak bro?* [Your brother Marcel—he's got too many girls, huh?]	Raffi, the host of FYP, describes Marcell's character to his younger brother, Mischa	Hyperbole, teasing	Assertive
4	2:55	*Kirain on the way ke hati dia?* [Thought you were on the way to her heart?]	The host attempts to tease the guest star with words	Ironic flirtation, ambiguity	Directive (teasing)
5	3:50	Gue bilang, ah gue bukan Mischa. Gue Marchell [I	Marcell emphasizes that he is not Mischa	Identity play, pun on names	Assertive

		said: I'm not Mischa, I'm Marcell]			
6	4:16	*Sayang, udah dulu ya... (semua menyoraki, waaaahhh, eheee, cieee)* [Babe, I'll hang up now…" (everyone teases: waaahhh, eheee, cieee)]	The guest star ends the phone call with his interlocutor	Slip of the tongue (private intimacy in public)	Expressive
7	4:34	*Lu merah banget. Kenapa bahas Cut Syifa langsung begini?* [You're so red. Just mentioning Cut Syifa made you like this?]	Marcell states that Mischa's face turned red	Observation + teasing	Assertive
8	4:50	*Kita jauh saling sayang, deket berantem terus* [We love each other when far apart, but always fight when close]	Marcell mentions that he only gets along with his twin, Mischa, when they are apart	Relational irony (twin paradox)	Assertive
9	5:10	*Muka gue pasti kayak kepiting rebus kayaknya yah?* [My face probably looked like a boiled crab, huh?]	Mischa says that his face turned red because of his mischievous brother	Visual hyperbole, metaphor	Expressive
10	5:38	*Lu telepon subuh-subuh… curhat nangis-nangis* [You called at dawn... crying and venting]	Marcell reveals that Mischa once called at dawn while crying	Retrospective teasing	Assertive
11	6:30	*Kan kakaknya udah nikah, gua gantiin* [His older brother's married, I'll take his place]	Mischa clarifies that he does not have a special relationship with Cut Syifa	Irony, double meaning	Expressive
12	6:48	*Cut Syifa umurnya jauh, gua jadi kakak aja* [Cut Syifa is much younger. I'll just be her older brother]	Mischa explains that there is a significant age gap between him and Cut Syifa	Rationalization, mitigation	Assertive
13	7:49	*Lu kalo jadi kakak-kakakan, akhirnya dipacarin juga* [If you act like a brother, you'll end up dating her too]	Raffi comments that Mischa could still date Cut Syifa even though his status is like that of an older brother	Teasing, ironic social commentary	Assertive

14	8:41	*Doanya universal aja ya* [Just pray something universal]	Mischa talks about Cut Syifa	Ambiguous politeness (avoidance)	Mild Directive
15	10:20-10:25	Mau gini-gini, telpon aa Raffi aja. Suhunya dia soalnya [If you want to do something like this, just call Raffi. He's the expert]	Marcell tells Mischa to call Raffi regarding matters with girls	Authority teasing, playful delegation	Directive
Video Part 2					
16	0:00	*Dia playboy kaya lu gak?* [Is he a playboy like you?]	Raffi asked whether Mischa is a playboy like his brother	Ambiguity, identity provocation	Assertive
17	0:01	*Enggak, gue gak. Gue ada lingkaran, lingkaran itu* [I'm part of that circle]	Mischa stated that he is not a playboy	Metaphorical ambiguity	Assertive
18	0:23	*Jadi, pas waktu gue mau mulai bandel, gue langsung kayak, Cell, gimana caranya* [So, when I wanted to start being naughty, I was immediately like, Cell, how do I do it]	Mischa said that he once asked Marcell how to become a playboy	Self-deprecation, narrative	Representative
19	00:33	*Tapi Marcel dulu parah. Dia, eh tapi lu jangan bi*lang-bilang adik gue ya [But Marcel used to be serious. He, eh but don't tell my brother, okay?]	Raffi said that Marcell used to be a playboy	Irony, face-saving	Indirect Directive
20	2:34	*Lu bakal diserang komunitas cadel* [He lisps." "You'll get attacked by the lisp community]	Mischa scared Marcell by saying he might be attacked by the lisp community	Stereotype parody, hyperbolic threat	Directive
21	3:51	*Gak nginep. Bahaya. Khilaf entar* [Not staying over. Dangerous. Might slip up]	Marcell joked that Mischa could be in danger at his own house.	Sexual euphemism, irony	Expressive
22	4:14	*Iya, lu gak mau dipanggil Uncle ya?* [Yeah, you don't want to be called Uncle, right?]	Irfan asked Mischa	Intergenerational teasing	Interrogative/Directive (teasing)

23	4:26	*Bule-bule, tapi tinggal gue di Banten, bro* [Foreigners, but I live in Banten, bro]	Marcell emphasized that they are of Western descent but live in Banten	Identity contrast, self-parody	Assertive
24	6:07	*Gue sama dia bener-bener temen banget* [I'm really really friends with him]	Mischa explained his relationship status with Aril Tatum	Defensive, clarification	Assertive
25	6:43-6:44	Ini judulnya apa sih? Kayaknya di roasting banget sih [What is this? It looks like it's been heavily roasted]	Mischa couldn't stand being teased throughout the conversation	Metacommunication, resistance	Expressive
26	7:14	*Rantimaria mantan lo ya?* [Ranty Maria's your ex, right?]	The host asked Mischa	Teasing interrogation	Interrogative/Assertive
27	7:43	Masa semua bukan? Lo deket sama cewek banyak banget [Really? You're close to a lot of girls]	Raffi asked Mischa	Hyperbolic teasing	Assertive
28	8:02	*Jessica Mila, ini mantan gue jelas ya* [Jessica Mila clearly my ex	Mischa emphasized his relationship with Mila	Identity assertion	Assertive
29	8:29	*Udah jatuh banget terus guling* [Fell so hard and then rolled over]	Mischa said that he struggled after a breakup	Hyperbolic narrative	Expressive
30	9:01	*Saya akan buat partai dari mantan-mantan* [I'll start a political party made up of all my exes]	Raffi proudly said that he had many ex-girlfriends	Absurdity, political hyperbole	Commissive (joking)
31	9:32	Tipe lo kayak gimana? Kulitnya? [What's your skin type?]	Marcell asked Raffi about his criteria for a girlfriend	Direct teasing, light innuendo	Interrogative/Directive