

Pragma-dialectical Analysis of Humour in Interviews: Morgan and Youssef's as a Case Study

Assistant Professor Dr. Maha Bakir Mohammed

University of Tikrit

College of Arts

Department of English

bakir.maha@tu.edu.iq

Abstract :

Humour is a common strategy used in argumentative discussion. The ideal model of analysing a critical discussion (argumentation) is the pragma-dialectical approach. The notion of dialectic, also dialectics, points out a discourse in which two participants are taking turns; the proponent who makes a move and the respondent who makes another move responding to a prior one (Walton: 2006: 41). Argumentation is a term that refers to a verbal, social, and rational move needed to convince others of a standpoint by putting forward utterances for the sake of justifying or rejecting the opposing utterances. (Eemeren and Houtlosser, 2000:1). The current study aims at (1) sketching a pragmatic structure of humour in terms of argumentation by the means of applying a pragma-dialectical method. Of analysis, (2) identifying the highly used illocutionary acts in setting a contradictory argumentation; (3) Pinpointing the type of presupposition that is highly used in a humourous argumentation, and (4) exploring the humorous strategy that is the most commonly used in this term. To achieve the aforementioned objectives, the study hypothesises the following, (1) the pragmatic structure of humour as far as argumentation is concerned, is drawn by the means of employing illocutionary acts, as well as presupposition, (2) Expositives are the most frequent illocutionary act used in argumentative discourse, (3) factive presupposition is the highly used type in the sense of argumentation and (4) satire is the most common strategy of humour in a critical/argumentative discourse. Finally, the study has concluded the following remarks: (1) It is proved that humour can be successfully employed for the purpose of rejecting or

showing disagreement and avoiding going deep in a pointless discussion; (2) The study explicates that the expositive acts of informing, reporting, and disclaiming are frequently used in argumentative discourse in opposition to exercitive acts; (3) Explains that the antagonist tends to make a factive presupposition in order to prove the truth of his utterance, and (4) the study seeks its validation in terms of the frequencies and percentages that proves satire to be the most common type of humour used in argumentative discourse.

Key Words: (Humour, pragma-dialectics, argumentation, speech acts, satire, parody.

Introduction).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Pragma-dialectic is an approach to examine and analyse an argumentative discourse. It has gained ground among the most recent multidisciplinary approaches.

In pragma-dialectics, argumentation aims at resolving a difference of standpoints at issue. Argumentation involves the participants and their different disputes. These participants are a protagonist and an antagonist. The former expresses a standpoint and the latter expresses doubt to this standpoint. In another words, protagonist defends a standpoint by putting forward argumentation while antagonist refutes the arguer's standpoint or advances a contradictory standpoint.

Humour investigated in different fields. It has been examined as a social phenomenon, rhetorical device, and a pragmatic issue. In pragmatics, humour is a violation of communication principle (Grice's Maxims) expressed by pragmatic principles (speech acts).

The genre investigated in the current study is Morgan's Show (uncensored) since it is assigned to present two contradictory points of view that finally shows the superiority of one standpoint over the other.

In this term, the following questions have been raised to be answered through the study:

1. Is it possible to employ humour in an argumentation to convince the other party with the speaker's point of view?
2. Which speech acts are more used setting or arguing a standpoint?
3. What types of presupposition are more frequently used in setting or arguing a point of view with a sense of humour?
4. Finally, which rhetorical strategy of humour has a superiority to the others in a critical argumentative discussion?

1.2 Aims of the Study

The study aims at:

1. Investigating the role of humour by the antagonist in argumentation.
2. Identifying the highly used illocutionary act in setting a contradictory argumentation.
3. Pinpointing the type of presupposition that is highly used in a humorous argumentative discussion.
4. Exploring the humorous rhetorical strategy that is the most frequently used in this term.

1.3 Hypotheses of the Study

The study hypothesizes that:

1. Humour is successfully used in responding to an argument.
2. Expositives are the most frequent illocutionary act used in an argumentative discourse.
3. Factives presupposition is the highly used type when an antagonist responds an argument with a sense of humour.

- 4. Satire is a highly registered humorous strategy in a critical/argumentative discussion.

1.4 Procedures of the Study

Certain procedures are followed in this study that are:

- 1. Presenting the literature related to humour and pragma–dialectic.
- 2. Collecting data from YouTube, transforming them (two interviews) into scripts, then analysing them by means of an eclectic model.
- 3. Analysing the data in question both qualitatively and quantitatively.
- 4. Discussing the findings of the analysis.
- 5. Drawing some concluding remarks.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The study is limited to investigating the role of humour in an argumentative discourse to turn the argument for the favor of the antagonist who is Bassem

Youssef. The genre is Morgan's TV Show (Uncensored) and the protagonist is the British Interviewer Piers Morgan. Four extracts are taken from two interviews of Morgan's show.

2. Theoretical Framework

This section views the literature of pragmatics and argumentation that meet to form the levels of the pragma–dialectic approach of analyzing any critical/argumentative discourse. It explicates the four stages of the approach in addition to the main pragmatic strategies that heavily construct the pragmatic structure of humour. Humour is also tackled in this chapter in terms of its definitions and various strategies (types).

2.1 Argumentation

Argumentation is essential to all human practices. In society as a whole, as well as in people's private and professional life, there is not only a constant flow of viewpoints, but also a strong desire to resolve (often implicit) disagreements regarding them. Argumentative speech is commonly used to resolve differences in a reasonable and successful manner, regardless of whether the viewpoint is evaluative, prescriptive (inciting), or descriptive Van Eemeren et al., (1996).

Argumentation is a set of verbal acts used to settle a disagreement. It is a verbal and social activity of reason carried out by a speaker or writer with the goal of increasing (or decreasing) the acceptability of a controversial viewpoint for a listener or reader; the constellation of propositions used in this endeavour is intended to justify (or refute) the standpoint in against a rational judge (Van Eemeren et al., 1996).

2.2 Pragma-Dialectic

Over the past two decades, scholars have focused on the pragmatic dialectical approach to argument criticism. Pragma-dialectics builds on prior research in languages, pragmatics, and logic.

It began in the Netherlands in the early 1980s where Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984, 1992, 2004) established the pragmatic-dialectical technique, which analyses and criticises argument, rhetoric, and dialectic using a problemsolving framework.

Unlike strictly pragmatic methods (which focus on the study of argument as an object) and simply communicative approaches (which emphasise argument as a process), pragma-dialectics is intended to investigate the complete argumentation as a discourse activity. Thus, the pragma-dialectical theory regards argumentation as a sophisticated speech act that occurs as part of natural language activities and serves certain communicative purposes.

Pragma-dialectics proposes an ideal model of a critical conversation, complete with established discussion phases, critical discussion rules, and analytical procedures. These have been used to a variety of practical areas (Van Eemeren et al., 1996).

The word dialectic comes from the original Greek word ‘dialekticos’ which means ‘conversation or dialogue’ or, more precisely, ‘two parties that employ words in order to engage in communicative interaction.

The term dialectic covers two meanings that are important in the field of argumentation, namely contradiction and the Aristotelian art of argument Loghin (2014).

Dialectic is a method of argumentation used to resolve disagreements. The dialectical approach is a discussion between two or more persons who have opposing viewpoints on a subject and want to establish the truth using reasoned arguments. The terms dialectics and dispute are not identical. Debaters frequently demonstrate emotional commitment, which can hamper rational judgement.

Debates are won by persuading the opponent, proving one’s own argument true, or refuting the opponent’s argument. Debates do not always need quickly determining a clear winner or loser. Dialectics is not the same as rhetoric, a method or art of discourse that tries to convince, inform, or motivate an audience (Corbett, 1991).

2.3 The Pragma-Dialectical Approach to Argumentation:

Argumentation in pragma-dialectics is evaluated through a communicative lens inspired by pragmatic insights from speech act theory and discourse analysis, as well as a crucial perspective inspired by dialectical ideas from critical rationalism and formal dialectical techniques. Pragma-dialectics distinguishes itself through the combination of pragmatic and dialectical insights (van Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2006).

In pragma-dialectics, argumentation is seen as a means of settling a disagreement by critically examining the acceptability of the opposing viewpoints. Thus, the study of

argumentation has a descriptive dimension that pertains the manner in which argumentation is conducted in communicative practice, and it additionally has a normative dimension that pertains to the expectations of appropriateness that are employed when argumentation is characterised for its quality and potential flaws that are identified (van Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2006).

The pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation seeks to integrate dialectics (the study of critical exchanges) and pragmatics (the study of language use in daily life communication). Pragma dialectics thus blends a dialectical perspective of arguments the reasonableness with a pragmatic comprehension of the verbal acts employed in argumentative discourse (van Eemeren & Houtlosser 2006).

Stages of the pragma-dialectical approach in an argument:

The process of settling a conflict of opinion can be divided into four dialectical stages that participants in an arguing exchange of views must go through. These stages correspond to the phases of a critical conversation, which are:

The confrontation stage: In which one participant in the discussion presents a viewpoint while another doubts or contradicts it. At this point, a disagreement arises.

1. The opening stage: When participants decide to resolve a disagreement, the roles of protagonist (the one who supports the viewpoint) and antagonist (the one who opposes it) are given. In actuality, this step is frequently left to the imagination. Thus, this step produces a consensus on rules, such as how evidence should be presented and which sources of data should be used.

2. The argumentation stage: The protagonist defends her or his position by presenting arguments to overcome the antagonist's objections or doubts (application of logical principles in accordance with the agreed-upon rules).

3. The concluding stage: This demonstrates the extent to which the disagreement has been resolved. If the protagonist withdraws, it will be resolved in favour of the antagonist; but, if the antagonist abandons her/his convictions or misgivings, it will be resolved in favour of the protagonist (van Eemeren et al. 1996).

2.4 Humour

Riichie (2018) defines humour in linguistics as the study of how language can generate and communicate humour. Humour is a multifaceted phenomenon with cognitive, emotional, social, and cultural components. Linguists are primarily concerned in the verbal mechanisms that generate humour, which include incongruity, ambiguity, wordplay, irony, sarcasm, and metaphor. Linguists also study how humour is utilised in many situations, including conversation, discourse, literature, media, and advertising (Attardo, 2014).

Humor is defined as “the ability to smile and laugh, and to make others do so. humor takes many forms ranging from the casual level of the joke told to friends to the sophistication of a Shakespearean comedy” (Walker, 1998, p. 3). While Martin and Lefcourt (1984) defined humour as “with which a person smiles, laughs, and otherwise displays happiness or laughter in different situations.”

Humour can be achieved in many form such as; joking, satire, and irony.

1. Joking: As stated in (Gruner, 1996), a joke is a form of verbal humour in which it is normally taken as an oral conversation and published collections. It is a form of humour that uses words in certain structures for the sake of making people laugh. Dynel (2009: 1284–1285) states that the perfect definition is provided by Sherzer (1985: 216) as he defines a joke as “a discourse unit consisting of two parts, the set up and the punch line”.

2. Satire: Quinn as cited in (Gordon, 1999) claims that "satire is a type of humor that aims to ridicule folly in a society, an institution, or an individual. It uses laughter as a weapon against any target that the satirist considers silly, stupid, or vicious".

3. Irony: According to Linda Hutcheon (2003), irony refers to the unspoken, unheard, and unseen. According to Cutler (1974, p.117), ironic utterances transmit meanings that are "opposite," "converse," or "reverse" of their literal meaning. According to her, the speaker uses a specific intonation pattern to convey irony to their audience.

2.5 Pragmatics

Leech (1983) points that the pragmatics is a study of meaning and a way that relates a speech with any provided situations along with an aspect to make a speech in a situation and further it paves a path to determine a core principle that whether it deals with semantic or the pragmatic phenomenon.

According to Crystal (1987), pragmatics examines various factors that influence the decision to speak and its impact on the way people interact. Pragmatic factors affect grammatical formation, such as sound patterns and meaning implied through specified processes for communication.

Pragmatics encompasses both sentence meaning and the speaker's concealed meaning. Pragmatics studies the unspoken aspects of communication. The speakers' goal determines what they wish to express to the listener in different settings. Pragmatics allows listeners and readers to analyse intended meanings and explore their own assumptions through behaviour and actions when communicating with an audience by the virtue of references, presupposition, speech acts, politeness and conversational principle.

2.5.1 Speech Acts:

According to Yule (1996), language is a means of communication. Acts of people with others may depend on their words. For so, each individual has the ability to act with utterance only and may change things by the power of words. Accordingly each interaction that include an utterance, speaker and a hearer accompanied with various types of acts is called a speech acts.

Austin (2020) argues that each utterance of words is able to perform an action. Speech acts theory where first introduced by L. J. Austin throughout a series of lectures that are published after his death in 1962, Austin (2020) assumes that the words have the power of performing things only by saying them. The utterance is divided into two main aspects: “constative” and “performative”

Austin discusses constative sentences as having a truth value (can be true or false), performatives were successful or not, or like Austin wrote, happy or unhappy (2020: p. 18).

According to Austin, performative is the term that “indicates that the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action, it is not normally thought of as just saying something” (2020: p. 6)

The Austin’s typology of speech acts falls into: ‘Locutionary’, ‘Illocutionary’, and ‘Perlocutionary’ (Austin, 2020). Locutionary acts have meaning, such as providing information, asking questions, stating something, or even announcing. Locutionary acts are the utterances humans make to communicate their needs and wants and to persuade others to their viewpoint.

“The illocutionary act refers to the type of speech act that is being performed, this is, the function that the speaker intends to fulfill. The perlocutionary part, on the other hand, is the effect that an utterance could have on the hearer or addressee” (Huang, 2014, p. 128)

Illocutionary acts are also subdivided into five classes:

- a) Verdictives are those capable of truth value, for instance; Estimate, date, assess, describe, value.
- b) Exercitives relate to decisions of action, requesting, and objecting. For instance; appoint, demote, veto, command, warn, pardon.
- c) Commissives when the speaker commits to a certain course of action. Such as; Promise, guarantee, vow, pledge oneself, contract, covenant.
- d) Behabitives are reactions to other people's behavior, to express an attitude toward someone else's behavior. Represented by some verbs such as; Thank, apologize, deplore, congratulate, criticise, bless, curse, protest.
- e) Expositives which are to be used to expound views and arguments. They are also used to informing, reporting, and disclaiming. For example; Revise, understand, report, affirm, inform, deduce, conjecture, deny cited in (Austin, 2020: p. 150)

The perlocutionary acts are the effects of illocutionary acts. Huang (2014) states that The perlocutionary part is the effect that an utterance could have on the hearer or addressee (Huang, 2014, p. 128).

2.5.2 Conversational Implication:

One of the renowned English philosophers, Grice (1988) has emphasized his concern more on the work of normal behavior recorded of human beings within their conversation. His notion was to introduce the "conversational implicatures" "within which the implications to the speaker have been presumed during their conversations. According to Grice, in a sequence to reduce the intended meaning there must be certain maxims in conversation.

2.5.2.1 Grice's Maxims:

Grice's Maxims are a set of conversational rules that individuals follow to convey their intended meaning effectively while maintaining social harmony and politeness. These maxims are introduced by philosopher Grice (1989) in his influential work "Studies in the Way of Words 1989"

The four maxims are:

- a) Maxim of Quality: The speakers should only say what they believe to be true and have evidence for.
- b) Maxim of Quantity: Speakers should provide enough information to convey their intended meaning without being too vague or too detailed.
- c) Maxim of Relation: Speakers should only say things that are relevant to the conversation at hand.
- d) Maxim of Manner: Speakers should communicate clearly, avoid ambiguity, be brief, and avoid unnecessary complexity.

These maxims are essential for effective communication as well as it helps to lessen the misunderstandings between speakers.

2.5.2.2 Flouting of Grice's Maxims:

Grundy (1995) argues that flouting is a term was introduced by Grice describing the process in which conversational implicature is created. A flout occurs when a speaker chooses with the intention to generate an implicature, in other words, the speaker is not trying to mislead, deceive or being uncooperative but encouraging the listener to search for deeper meaning beyond the utterance.

- a) Flouting Quantity Maxim: when the speaker fails to fully engage in a conversation in case of being more informative or less he/she flouts the maxim of quality (Manurung, 2009: 151).
- b) Flouting Quality: when the speaker says something that he/she does not believe in or have no evidence for (Grice, 1975).
- c) Flouting Relation Maxim: it takes a place when the speaker says something not relevant during the conversation. Sometimes, it happens because the speaker wants to hide something or deliver information to others circumstantially (Kurniati and Hanidar, 2018: 142).
- d) Flouting Manner Maxim: when the speaker delivers an ambiguous word, not being brief, orderly, and, using an obscure language, whether the speaker intends to make it or not (Marlisa, R., & Hidayat, 132:2020).

2.5.3 Presupposition:

The term presupposition according to Huang (2007) refers to an assumption or statement whose truth is assumed in uttering a sentence. Presupposition has a close relationship with speakers more than with sentences. Grundy (2008) debates presupposition as background knowledge that is necessary for the utterance to be appropriate to say and it is accommodated by the addressee.

Presupposition refers to a relationship between two propositions. as cited in (Zare, Abbaspour, & Nia, 2012), presuppositions are established in referring phrases and temporal clauses and remain constant, regardless of their negated counterparts, and determine sentence accuracy. sentence is only true if its presupposition is true.

Yule (1996) points out that presupposition is described as constancy in the face of denial. A presupposition remains constant despite the negation of the statement. Presupposition is classified by Yule (1996) based on the functions of linguistic items which trigger presuppositions.

1. Existential presupposition can be shown by possessive constructions (e.g., 'my house' indicates 'I have a house') and definite noun phrases, such as "the manager of the company," "the cat," and "the boy with black jeans,".
2. Factive presupposition refers to the information that are given by verbs like 'know', 'realise', and 'regret'. Factive presupposition can also be seen as term of judgment by accusing, blaming, or criticising as means of judging others. Criticizing someone publicly is an unforgivable offence. Public criticism offends the receivers as well as the observers. It is unlikable to see another person publicly hung by someone too cowardly to address the issue one to one (Paris, 2004: 455). For instance: She didn't realise he was ill>> he was ill
3. Lexical presupposition contents certain forms that are treated as sources, the use of on form with its asserted meaning is conventionally interpreted with the presupposition that another (non-asserted) meaning is understood. For example: you made the same mistake again >> you made this mistake before
4. Structural presupposition points to the assumption that accompanied with a certain structure. The listener perceive that the information is true rather than just an assumption by the speaker. For example: When did he leave?>> He left.
5. Non-factive presupposition refers to something that isn't true (e.g. I imagined I fly>> I don't fly.
6. Counterfactual presupposition is the assumption that is counter to the facts, e.g. If you were a teacher, you would build a generation>> you aren't a teacher.
7. Relative and adverbial presupposition relative and adverbial clauses are also found to presuppose information. For example: He stopped where the crime happened>> there was a crime (relative). It started when the president commanded>> the president commanded (adverbial).

3.Practical Framework: Data Description and Analysis

This section tackles the description of the collected data, data analysis in addition to the discussion of the results. The data have been analysed qualitatively and quantitatively.

3.1 Data Collection and Description

In a compelling and thought-provoking exchange, Bassem Youssef, renowned Egyptian satirist and television host (the antagonist), engaged in a dynamic dialogue with Piers Morgan, a prominent British journalist and media personality (the protagonist). The interview, characterized by its depth and intensity, delved into multifaceted topics ranging from political satire to media ethics, offering a nuanced exploration of the intersection between humor, journalism, and societal critique. Youssef's sharp wit and astute analysis were met with Morgan's incisive questioning and occasional skepticism, resulting in a riveting exchange that illuminated the complexities of contemporary media landscapes and the role of satire in shaping public discourse. Through their interaction, both Youssef and Morgan demonstrated a commitment to probing inquiry and intellectual engagement, enriching the discourse with diverse perspectives and insightful commentary. Four samples of the two interviews have been selected two for each, for qualitative analysis, variable pragmatic discussed (speech acts, flouting Grice's maxims, types of presupposition) are included, qualitative analysis includes the frequency of using each type of (speech acts, flouting Grice's maxims, and type of humour, and presupposition).

3.2 Model of Analysis

The model adopted in this study to analyse the data in question is an eclectic one. That falls into four stages of argumentation (critical discussion) to find a pragmialectical structure of humour applying many pragmatic phenomena that are: speech acts (Austin's), Grice's Maxims and presupposition. The first and fourth stages employ

locutionary and perlocutionary acts respectively. The second stage (opening stage) consists of illocutionary acts of (expositives, and exercitives).

While the third stage delves into Grice's Maxims as well as presupposition (factive and non-factive) types. The last level of this model focuses on the main types of humour specifically: satire, joking, and irony.

3.3 Data Analysis

Analysis of Extract (1):

As far as the first stage is concerned, the locutionary act used by the protagonist

(Morgan) to set a standpoint is "If you were Israel and that had happened to you, what would you think would be the appropriate way to respond?". Concerning the second stage, he argues using an expositive act of informing that Israel has responded to what had happened there (the attack of Hamas). Meanwhile, the antagonist (Youssef) disagrees with the protagonist standpoint in terms of satire when he says "*I would do exactly like Israel did, kill as many people as possible since, the world is letting me do it*" at this point he flouts the maxim of quality. The other pragmatic level of this stage concerns presupposition of factive and non-factive types. Here, the antagonist forwards a factive presupposition in terms of 'judgment' by blaming the world for letting Israel kill the innocent people of Gaza. He also sets a non-factive presupposition when he mentions the verb

'imagine' in "let's imagine a world without Hamas". The last level of this stage, that concerns the humour strategies, is achieved when the antagonist uses irony in his argument "Hamas is the source of evil, let's imagine a world without Hamas, and let's name this world". In the last stage, the protagonist says "I know that your saying has validity". At this point, the argument is resolved for the favor of the antagonist. The perlocutionary effect of the antagonist's cogent argument has been manifested.

Analysis of Extract (2):

As far as the first stage is concerned, the protagonist sets a locutionary act in form of a question “What is your reaction to what happened on October the seventh?”. The antagonist in his turn also use a locutionary act of describing his reaction

“Oh, it was terrible.”. He keeps describing his reaction with a sense of humour: “Uh, you know, it’s just like those Palestinians, they’re very dramatic. Ah, Israel killing us. Uh, but they never die.”

At this point, the second stage starts when the protagonist says: “.... There’s a dark humour there...” while the antagonist objects saying “No, it’s not dark humor.”

Here, the difference of opinion appears. The antagonist, who has a vast role at this stage, shows his stand point with the means of humour. The antagonist, the user of humour, sets an expositive act that seems to be of informing form: “it just like, it’s, it’s, it’s very repetitive. We are used to that. We used to them being bond every time and moving from one place to the other. Uh, you know, it’s just like those Palestinians, they’re very dramatic. Ah, Israel killing us. Uh, but they never die. I mean, they always come back. You know, they, they’re very difficult to kill, very difficult people to kill.”, but he, in facts, sets an expositive act of deducing when he sums up that Palestinians are brave people and no one can get rid of them easily.

With regard of the third stage, the pragmatic structure of humour, drawn in this study, has been successfully manifested. This stage overlaps with the previous one at the level of utilising illocutionary acts. As it is mentioned previously, the antagonist uses an expositive act of deducing. Regarding the second level of this stage, the antagonist flouts the maxim of quality when he uses humour. He says what he believes to be false “they’re very dramatic.”. At the third level of the same stage, the antagonist makes a factive presupposition using the verb ‘know’:

“So we don’t know actually what is the, uh, how is the, how are they’re doing.”. He presupposes that something horrible happens in Gaza but Israel does not want us to know. Humour used in this extract is of a satire type. In addition to the one mentioned previously, the antagonist inserts another one when he says “Ben Shapiro is one of the smartest people who ever walked this earth. He’s very, very smart.” While he means exactly the reverse that can be proved by his final stance: “So, God forbid, I don’t wanna be labeled as a terrorist sympathizer. So I agree with Ben Shapiro. I think we should kill as many sons of Palestinians as possible.” These lines carry the last conclusion that comes at the fourth stage. It is supposed to reflect the antagonist’s withdraw, but they are not. The perlocutionary effect of these lines is to conclude that everyone who upholds a stand point against Israel is regarded as a terrorist sympathizer.

Analysis of Extract (3):

Regarding first stage, the protagonist uses a locutionary act to set a standpoint saying “why does the Arab world wants to constantly attack Israel without actually offering any place for Palestinians?”. Forwarding to the second stage, the protagonist uses an expositive act of informing that “Queen Rania accused the west of a glaring double standard.” But in a sense of arguing “And to many in our region, it makes the western world complicit.” At this point the antagonist disagrees with this standpoint saying on behalf of Israel “Why don’t they just go to Sinai? What would happen?”, the antagonist does an illocutionary exercitive act of requesting in saying “Why don’t they take them and give them Florida?” (referring to America).

The difference of the two points of view has been shown in the previous stage by the virtue of the illocutionary acts. This difference is intended to be resolved in the third stage. Concerning the first level if illocutionary acts, the protagonist argues Queen Rania’s accusation using an expositive act. In his turn, the antagonist flouts the maxim

of quality by giving a solution that he believes to be unworkable “*America has 50 states. Why don’t they give them Florida? I mean they, we seem to complain about Florida the whole time.*” Moving to the other pragmatic level which is the use of presupposition, here, the antagonist sets a nonfactual presupposition “Imagine this now, and because Israel officially has been talking openly about this, it’s like, why don’t they just go in Sinai? This clue ‘imagine’ presupposes the next phrase to be false as he intends to say that this solution is invalid. The humour used in this extract is of a ridicule satire type since the antagonist suggests to get rid of both Israel and the American state of

Florida in a comical way “*America has 50 states. Why don’t they give them Florida? I mean they, we seem to complain about Florida the whole time.*”

As far as the fourth level is concerned, the protagonist moving to the next question shows that the standpoint resolved for the favor of the protagonist.

Analysis of Extract (4):

The first stage is regarded as usual with locutionary act set by the protagonist to convey his argument to the antagonist that Israel has suffered from a terror attack “Any country that suffered the kind of terror attack that Israel suffered with the kind of death toll that occurred that day.”. The protagonist shifts to the second stage to pave the way of argumentation using an expositive act of reporting using facts and numbers “1500 plus people, grandmothers, kids, young women being raped, kidnapped, beheaded. It’s been reported and so on. Well, you can raise an eyebrow. I meant they found, they found a young woman’s skull.” At this point, the protagonist shows his disagreement by the virtue of an exercitive act of objecting. His objection comes in form of a question “So where are those beheaded babies who beheaded?”

Forwarding to the second stage, the antagonist sets an expositive act of disclaiming to the claim addressed by the protagonist earlier “Well, apparently journalists are being

shown utterly". The former disclaims saying "I'm not a journalist. But as a journalist, wouldn't you take anything that an authority would say with a grain of thought? Yes. Especially if this authority has a long history of lying.". concerning the second level of this stage, the antagonist flouts the maxim of quality when he says a joke ridiculing the Israeli government's justification for killing innocent people (Palestinians): "...this is a manual of avocado, of course.". As far as the third level is concerned, the antagonist sets a factive presupposition with his humorous expression of "I didn't know that they have life coaches". It means that they really have life coaches or people who supply them with fake reports, videos, and justifications. Humour of joking is used by the antagonist.

For resolving the difference of the argumentation put forward by both protagonist and antagonist, the former withdraws saying "So lemme respond. I do think the Israeli government has lied all the time. Right? I do think they've lied. I'm not gonna dispute that. I do think they've been caught lying. I do think they've said things that turned out not to be true. I also think that two weeks ago a hospital was bombed.". Consequently, the perlocutionary effect on the protagonist's standpoint shows the validity of the antagonist's argumentative discussion.

The Findings

For the purpose of answering the questions raised at the beginning of the study and verifying or refuting its hypotheses, the study, through both qualitative and quantitative analyses finds out the following:

- 1) Humour plays an important role in directing an argumentative discussion.

Youssef's (the antagonist) moves are full of humour, since he, by the virtue of humour, tries to convey intended messages. He uses irony, especially satire to reject and dispute the opposing move. He also tries to end some fruitless discussions by the means of humour, for example in extract (2), he says "*God forbid, I don't want to be*

labeled as a terrorist sympathiser, so I agree with Ben Shapiro". Here, he shows his entire disagreement with Ben Shapiro in form of agreement. Moreover, humour is used by Youssef as a playful strategy to get rid of the burden of dead end discussion, that produce no positive results, he never withdraws.

2) The study points out that investigating humour from a pragmatic perspective enriches the study and analysis of argumentative discourse throughout applying the various levels of the eclectic model to the data in question.

3) As it is revealed in table (1), the expositives are used 8 times out of 10 appearances of the illocutionary acts. It is found that within the argumentative discourse, the expositive acts of informing, reporting, and disclaiming are used. Meanwhile, the exercitive acts, that are humbly used, are of requesting and objecting forms. That is to says, the former is used to expound views and arguments more than the latter. That is to say, the former is used to expound views and arguments more than the latter.

Table (1) the frequencies and percentages of speech acts

Speech acts	Frequency	Percentage
Expositives	8	88.8 %
Exercitives	2	11.1 %

4) In accordance with table (2), factive presupposition is recorded 3 times to 1 for non-factive presupposition because the former presupposes the truth of its complement clauses unlike the latter that presupposes the falsity of what comes

after. Making a non-factive presupposition by the antagonist serves the aim of strengthening his assumption. In the data in question,

Table (2) frequencies and percentages of presupposition

Presuppositions	Frequency	Percentage
Factive	3	75 %
Non-Factive	1	25 %

5) Youssef uses the clue “imagine” to presuppose the falsity of his following assumption. See extract (3), when Youssef argues the invalidity of the opposing standpoint, he presupposes the falsity of what comes forward which is not his own argument but a repetition of his respondent’s view.

6) According to table (3), it is viewed that the humourous strategy of satire is used 3 times to 1 for each irony and satire. That is to say, Youssef uses the strategy of Satire to shows his disagreement with a less sense of criticism to the protagonist’s point of view.

Table (3) the frequencies and percentages of humour

Types of Humour	Frequency	Percentage
Satire	3	60 %

Joking	1	20 %
Irony	1	20 %

4. Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussion of collected data analysis in the previous chapter, the study draws the following concluding remarks:

- 1) The first hypothesis of this study that reads “Humour is successfully used in responding to an argument.” is verified. It is proved that humour can be successfully employed for the purpose of rejecting or showing disagreement and avoiding going deep in a pointless discussion.
- 2) The validation of the second hypothesis that says “Expositives are the most frequent illocutionary act used in an argumentative discussion.” is achieved. The study explicates that the expositive acts of informing, reporting, and disclaiming are frequently used in argumentative discourse in opposition to exercitive acts.
- 3) The justification of the third hypothesis of the study which says “Factives presupposition is the highly used type when an antagonist responds an argument with a sense of humour.” explains that the antagonist tends to make a factive presupposition in order to prove the truth of his utterance.
- 4) With regard to the fourth hypothesis, the study seeks its validation in terms of the frequencies and percentages that prove satire to be the most common type of humour used in argumentative discourse. This indicates that the fourth hypothesis which reads “Satire is a highly registered humorous strategy in a critical/argumentative discussion.” is fulfilled.

References:

Attardo, S. (2014). Humor in language. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of humor studies* (Vol. 1, pp. 378–381). SAGE Publications.

Austin, J. L. (2020). *How to Do Things with Words* (International Kindle Paperwhite). Barakaldo Books.

Corbett, E. P. J. & R. J. Connors (1999) *classical rhetoric for the modern student*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, David. (1985). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cutler, A. (1974). On saying what you mean without meaning what you say. In: M.W. Lagaly, R. Fox, & A. Bruck. (eds.). *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Department of Linguistics. Chicago: University of Chicago. pp. 117–127.

Dynel, M. (2009). *Humorous garden-paths: A pragmatic-cognitive study*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Grice, P. 1975. *Logic and Conversation. The semantics-pragmatics boundary in philosophy*. Ontario: Broadview Press.

Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.

Grundy, Peter. *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold, (1995).

Gruner, Charles R. (1996). “Wit and Humour in Mass Communication.” *Humor and Laughter: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Eds. Antony J. Chapman and Hugh C. Foot. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics (Second)*. Oxford University Press.

Hutcheon, L. (2003, September) *Irony's Edge*. Routledge.

Kurniati, M., & Hanidar, S. (2018). The Flouting of the Gricean Maxims In the Movies *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*. Lexicon.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Loghin, D. (2014) *Argumentation and Cognition: Can Pragma–Dialectics Interplay with Pragma–Semantics? Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines 1* (1).

Manurung, W. L. (2009). Flouting maxims in Hitam Putih talk show. *Suar Betang*.

Marlisa, R., & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). The analysis of flouting maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) talk show. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*.

Martin, R. A., & Lefcourt, H. M. (1984). The situational humor response questionnaire: Quantitative measure of sense of humor. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 145–155.

Paris, R. (2004). *Criticizing a Project Team Member's Performance: Five Guidelines for Delivering Constructive Criticism*. London: Heatherleieh Press.

Ritchie, G. (2018). *Humor in language*. Oxford University Press.

Sherzer, J. (1985). Puns and jokes. *Handbook of discourse analysis Discourse and dialogue*. (ed) Teun A. Van Dijk. London: Academic Press (213–221).

Van Eemeren, F.H. & Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech acts in argumentative Discussions: A theoretical model for the analysis of discussions directed towards solving conflicts of opinion*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Floris Publications.

Van Eemeren, F.H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, communication, And fallacies: A pragma–dialectical perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Van Eemeren, F. H. & Houtlosser, P. (2000). Rhetorical analysis within a pragmialectical framework: The case of RJ Reynolds. *Argumentation*, 14(3), 293–305.

Van Eemeren, F.H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, N. A. (1998). *What's So Funny?: Humor in American Culture*. Wilmington: Rowman.

Yule. G. (1996) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: university Press.

Appendix

Extract (1)

Piers Morgan: If you were Israel and that had happened to you, what would you think would be the appropriate way for the country to respond?

Bassem Youssef: I would do exactly like Israel did, kill as many people as possible since the, the, the word is letting me do it. I mean, I, I can do it because I can. Hamas is the source of evil, let's imagine a world without Hamas, and let's name this word. The West Bank.....

Piers Morgan: I know; I know that what you're saying has validity.

Extract (2)

Piers Morgan: What is your reaction to what happened on October the seventh?

Bassem Youssef: Oh, it was terrible. Of course. I mean, we kind of get our news kind of also secondhand because, you know, my, my wife's family, they live in Gaza. They actually have, uh, cousins and uncles there. Um, and, uh, their house also was bombed. We haven't been able to communicate with them for the past three days. Communication are lost. So we don't know actually what is the, uh, how is the, how are they're doing. But, you know, we used to that. I mean, it's, it just like, it's, it's very

repetitive. We are used to that. We used to them being bond every time and moving from one place to the other. Uh, you know, it's just like those Palestinians, they're very dramatic. Ah, Israel killing us. Uh, but they never die. I mean, they always come back. You know, they, they're very difficult to kill, very difficult people to kill. I know, because I'm married to one. I tried many times, couldn't kill her.

Piers Morgan: <laugh>. I mean, there's a dark humor there, and I understand why, because

Bassem Youssef: No, it's not dark humor. I really, I try to get to her every time, but she uses our kids as human shields. I can never take her out <laugh>

.....Would be serious. Yeah. I will be serious. I was watching your interview with Ben Shapiro, and I'll tell you one thing. Yeah. I think that Ben Shapiro is one of the smartest people who ever walked this earth. He's very, very smart. I follow him and I believe everything he said. And when he came in on your show, his solution was, and I quote, his solution was that the solution for this is for Israel to annex Gaza and to kill as many son of as possible to make sure that this will never happen again. And anyone, anyone who called for a ceasefire will be a terrorist sympathizer. So, God forbid, I don't wanna be labeled as a terrorist sympathizer. So I agree with Ben Shapiro. I think we should kill as many son of as possible.

Extract (3)

Piers Morgan: Yeah, I just said that what he was saying. Yeah. I mean, I was gonna ask you about Queen Rania and let's ask him about since you've raised it. Yeah. Because Queen Rania accused the west of a glaring double standard. She said, this is the first time in modern history there's such human suffering. And the world is not even calling for a ceasefire. So the silence is deafening. And to many in our region, it makes

the western world complicit. Uh, now, other people said, well, okay, if you feel that strongly, why aren't you taking in any Palestinians? Why is Egypt not taking Palestinians? Why does the Arab world want to constantly attack Israel without actually offering any place to go for the Palestinians? And what do you say to that?

Bassem Youssef: That is exactly what Israel wants. And that is exactly what actually starts Third War iii. This is the worst solution. These are Palestinian, these are their lands. And then suddenly take them. Why? So they've been basically kicked around from their homes and now another country should take them. You see what would happen? Imagine this now, and because Israel officially has been talking openly about this, it's like, why don't they just go in Sinai? Why? They go, you know, what would happen? Those people are gonna be pushed in Sinai. And with any population, 2 million people, they're living refugee camp. What do you think will happen? Unrest, uh, chaos. And then after a few years, the Western media will come with their cameras like, oh, look at those Arabs. Oh, they're killing each other. Oh, Israel is good that they got rid of them. And then they will go to the West Bank. Bassem Youssef: And suddenly those 3.35 million people pushing to Jordan this, the whole idea, why does Jordan take them? Why does Egypt take him? The same question.

Europe has 44 countries. Why don't they take Israel? America has 50 states. Why don't they give them Florida? I mean they, we seem to complain about Florida the whole time. Why don't they just like give Israel the whole idea was like, oh, you are Arabs, you're all the same. No, no, no, because what would happen then? So Israel will move into Jordan.

It's like, oh, Saudi, why don't you take the Jordanian? So

Piers Morgan: Let,

Bassem Youssef: This is not a solution. I hear this is not a solution. Piers Morgan: I hear you. I'm not taking your position outta the way. Yeah. Let me ask you...

Extract (4)

Piers Morgan: Any country that suffered the kind of terror attack that Israel suffered with the kind of death toll that occurred that day. 1500 plus people, grandmothers, kids, young women being raped, kidnapped, beheaded. It's been reported and so on. Well, you can raise an eyebrow. I meant they found, they found a young woman's skull. Right? Somehow.

Bassem Youssef: About what?

Piers Morgan: a report saying 40 babies have been beheaded and 40 babies have been reported, have been killed, including some.

Bassem Youssef: So where are those beheaded babies who beheaded?

Piers Morgan: Well, apparently journalists are being shown utterly

Bassem Youssef: Horrific, quitting. Okay, this is, this comes to a very important question about credibility. Again, I'm not condemn what happened in October, but in, I'm not a journalist. But as a journalist, wouldn't you take anything that an authority would say with a grain of thought? Yes. Especially if this authority has a long history of lying. And I'm just gonna give a few example. 1996, they bombed Khan. It's a refugee camp.

They killed one of oh six people. And despite that, they knew it's a refugee camp. They said, oh, maybe it's a one time off. 2006, they won again. 2014, they killed two teenagers at Checkpoint. They denied as usual, but CNN was there. So they said, we have to say 2018, they killed a medic, a Palestinian medic. And the doctor, they fabricated a video showing that it's someone else, that he was a human shield. And then they, I would say, can I just like finish that?

Bassem Youssef: Yeah. But I do wanna respond. And, and then 2010, they killed. Ahmed denied it, then said, it's okay, it's us 2021. They bombed the media office in Haas. It's not us, but no, I'm sorry. And then 11th, May, 2022. Sinabler, a reporter, your colleague, she's Palestinian American citizen. She was shot in the head and they provided forensic evidence and even a doctor video that it was not them, it was Islamic

jihad. How can I expect to believe this regime, especially if the president of Israel comes down with this ridiculous, ridiculous thing. Have you seen him there? There, no. He said, okay, this was reported by Sky News and it was the funniest thing I've saw in so many. This was a Colin Powell moment, but like the cheap edition, Mr. Uh, ok said, like Isaac Ok is like, we have found evidence on one of the, uh, um, terrorist, a manual to create chemical bombs. And then he showed this and he showed this. I, I just wanna say, why would a foot shoulder go in into meal with like a manual to chemical bombing? It's like, is that BYOB? Bring your own beer a bomb. It's, it's crazy. And, and what, what he like have like local ingredients to make up. And then this is like, this is a manual of avocado, of course. Convenient certain card. And let me read to you in Arabic, because this is funny. I'm not sure the man, but which basic say.

Bassem Youssef: This is basically like a catalogue for self-improvement for you.

Bassem Youssef: I didn't know that They have life coaches. So this, and you know what, it's kind new set that we cannot confirm or any of this, but we will show it anyway. So lemme respond, lemme respond. So this is like a, lemme respond. This is a lying government,

Piers Morgan: So lemme respond. I do think the Israeli government has lied all the time. Right? I do think they've lied. I'm not gonna dispute that. I do think they've been caught lying. I do think they've said things that turned out not to be true. I also think that two weeks ago a hospital was bombed.