

CHAPTER II

THEORY AND METHOD

2.1 Theoretical Frameworks

2.1.1. Humor

Experts have proposed various definitions of humor from diverse perspectives. Galiñanes (2000) states that humor is a form of verbal communication that requires a narrative structure. Humor arises through situations where someone automatically accepts an assumption as true before realizing that the assumption is actually false (Hurley et al., 2011, p. 176). Other research suggests that humor can be created by someone who has the capability to see a thought, idea, or situation from various different perspectives (Kolb, E. J, 2013).

2.1.2 General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH)

General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH) is an extension of Victor Raskin's Semantic Script Theory of Humor (SSTH) in 1985. The SSTH theory has contributed to linguistic studies in the scope of semantic aspects by analyzing jokes from a script-based approach. On the other hand, the theory GTVH spans "at large" various linguistic fields including narrative, textual linguistics, and pragmatics (Attardo, 1994). The theory GTVH extends the SSTH framework by employing six analytical parameters called knowledge resources (KR), which are a set of knowledge indicators that must be used in creating jokes. These six knowledge resources are script opposition (SO), logical mechanisms (LM), situations (SI),

targets (TA), narrative strategies (NS), and language (LA). Although GTVH proposes six knowledge resources, this study focuses primarily on script opposition and logical mechanism as the main analytical parameters. This decision is grounded in the nature of the data, as the remaining four parameters, situation, target, narrative strategy, and language, were not found to show distinctive features that contribute significantly to the creation of humor in the dialogues of Grown Ups (2010).

2.1.2.1 Script Opposition (SO)

Script opposition refers to a joke involving two distinct and opposing scripts. The punchline serves as a trigger to make the listener backtrack and realize that there is an interpretation other than the assumed one (Raskin & Attardo, 1991). Script opposition (SO) is the most abstract parameter among the six existing KR categories because it forms the core of the whole theoretical framework of verbal humor (Attardo, 1994). Humor texts must present a script opposition, although the context or situation may vary depending on the time and place in which the humor was created (Attardo, 1994). This means humor can be seen more clearly through an analysis of script opposition.

The example of script opposition:

- Walt: We're standing up for our beliefs. And also missing geometry. Win-win! (Nabila, et. al, 2022)

Script opposition: Normal vs. Abnormal

- Mr. Iglesias: Yeah, the way he killed Dracula with that ax handle. Oh! Very presidential. Mikey: You know, in the-in the Lincoln movie I watched, he said, [Imitating Lincoln] “Until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword.” (Nabila, et. al, 2022)

Script opposition: Actual vs. non-actual

- Marisol: In this class, we aren’t given our grades. We earn them. Lorenzo: No matter how much we offer to pay Mr. Iglesias. (Nabila, et. al, 2022)

Script opposition: Possible vs. impossible

2.1.2.2 Logical Mechanism (LM)

The logical mechanism is a parameter explaining the context in the way two script are put together in a joke (Attardo, 1994). Attardo (2001) argues the LM parameter employs unnatural logic and ignores the actual logic, this logic feels valid and can be enjoyed within the joke. The logical mechanism is widely open to the context, Attardo (2001) provides a list of 27 known LMs, including false analogy, referential ambiguity, garden-path, inferring consequences, exaggeration, parallelism, ignoring the obvious, faulty reasoning, cratylism and etc.

The example of logical mechanism:

- “My meal style is different from kids in the village, they usually. I use table manner which the tools should be complete such spoon, fork, and blade. [Audience laugh]” (Mulyadi, et. al, 2021)

Logical mechanism: False analogy

- Immigration Officer: Paperwork.

Tourist 1: Friendship.

Tourist 2: Friendship.

Immigration Officer: Germany, huh?

Tourist 1: Yes.

Tourist 1: Yes.

Immigration Officer: You're a Nazi?

Tourist 1: No, no. No Nazi.

Tourist 2: We are communists, you know? Free communists.

Tourist 1: Yes? Free. Free.

Immigration Officer: Communists? [...]

Tourist 1: I hate those darn commies.

Tourist 2: A little unwise, huh? [...]

Tourist 1: Welcome to America. (Zhuhai, 2023)

Logical mechanism: Faulty reasoning

- Saying goodbye in Britain takes at least 20 minutes. First, you say, 'Right, I should be going,' and then proceed to stand by the door discussing the fact that you should be going. Then there's the 'one last thing' conversation. And finally, you say, 'Goodbye,' but just stand there anyway, because no one actually wants to be the first to leave." (Ahmad, et. Al, 2024)

Logical mechanism: Exaggeration

2.1.2.3 Target (TA)

The target is a parameter refers to the person who is the object of the humor; this person is identified in the data as having a certain stereotype associated in a social group (Attardo, 1994). The researcher adds that not all humor is an attack on a specific person, in the sense that some jokes are not aggressive or offensive to any particular person.

The example of target:

- Robber: Fans: Bro, can you please give me a mark? (his idol slapped him)

Fans: Whoa.. finally I got my idol's mark!! (Ramadhani, 2017)

Target: Fans

2.1.2.4 Situation (SI)

This parameter indicates each joke has a context or situation that serves as its background like participants, instruments, or objects to help the audience understand and feel the humor (Attardo, 1994). The researcher also added several jokes may depend on the situation to get the humor's details, while others can be understood regardless of the situational details.

The example of situation:

- Student: Sir, the ink markers is dried out, do you have the refill?

Teacher: I don't have any. Why do you ask me about that? (Ramadhani, 2017)

Situation: During class, a student asks the gloomy teacher for some ink markers

2.1.2.5 Narrative Strategy (NS)

Narrative strategy refers to the form used to deliver jokes. Every joke has a specific delivery format, which can take the form of dialogue, a riddle, or an aside in conversation (Attardo, 1994, p. 224). He also stated this parameter is another term for genre theory, whose categories can be determined through inductive or deductive approaches.

The example of narrative strategy:

- Since I love to show off, my girlfriend got angry. She cried but I remained silent. (She asks), “Why do you remain silent while I am crying?”, (He replies), “This to make everybody knows if I have girlfriend”. [Audience laugh] (Mulyadi, et. al, 2021)

Narrative strategy: Dialogue

- Walt: We’re standing up for our beliefs. And also missing geometry. Win-win! (Nabila, et. al, 2022)

Narrative strategy: Monologue

- Mr. Tony: I had another bad year at the track. Mr. Iglesias: Oh, big surprise! Do you know who doesn't have a bad year at the track? The track (Nabila, et. al, 2022)

Narrative strategy: Question and Answer

2.1.2.6 Language (LA)

The “language” parameter refers to how humor is expressed verbally through language. Language is used to determine the appropriate word order and the placement of the text to make it a joke (Attardo, 1994). He also mentions that jokes can be conveyed through variations in style while keeping the same meaning, without changing the form of the humor. The selection of words in a punchline is considered important, as it creates a double meaning that can bring two script opposition in the joke.

The example of language:

- Set up: Mr. Tony: I had another bad year at the track.

Punch line: Mr. Iglesias: Oh, big surprise! *Do you know who doesn't have a bad year at the track? The track* (Nabila, et. al, 2022)

2.1.3 Social Factors Affecting Language Communication

In sociolinguistics, social factors are elements that can explain variations in language use (Holmes, 2022, p. 10). He adds that not all of these factors are always applicable in every situation. It depends on the context, as only some of them have an influence. In a social environment, people can choose different language styles, word choices, or ways of speaking to adapt. By understanding social factors, it will be known the use of utterances can reflect social relationships and the purpose of communication. These social factors are used to identify how humor arises through

the use of language in specific social contexts. Holmes (2022) divides social factors into four categories: participant, setting, topic, and function.

2.1.3.1 Participant

Participants refer to speakers and listeners in a dialogue (Holmes, 2022). Wahyuni & Rusyan (2026) add that social identities and roles such as doctors, coaches, teachers, and students influence the way speech is delivered. These differences in status are reflected in the language style, tone, expressions, and level of politeness used by the characters in their interactions. For example, when students speak to their teachers, they tend to use polite language in a soft tone. On the other hand, when someone speaks to a close friend, they are more open in expressing themselves.

2.1.3.2 Setting

The setting refers to the social context or location where the interaction takes place (Holmes, 2022). Settings like the workplace, school, home, or religious places of prayer are factors that can determine the type of language considered appropriate. In certain contexts, the level of formality also influences the language style used in interactions. For example, when someone is in the workplace, they tend to use a formal language style. Likewise, when the setting is home, the language style used is more casual.

2.1.3.3 Topic

Topic is the matter discussed in a conversation (Holmes, 2022). Wahyuni & Rusyan (2026) adds that topics related to relationships, daily activities, or personal

experiences often provide speakers opportunities to express their opinions, feelings, and humor more comfortably. For example, when someone talks about their daily routine, they tend to speak freely and express themselves openly. Another example, when students discuss academic matters, they tend to adjust their vocabulary to make their speech more structured and understandable.

2.1.3.4 Function

Function refers to the purpose or reason why someone uses language in a context (Holmes, 2022). He divides language functions as two types: referential and affective function. The referential function refers to language used to convey information, while the affective function is used to express feelings and social solidarity. The purpose of this interaction is one of the fundamental reasons behind the variation in people's speech patterns.

The example of referential function:

- Three men have been following you for the last half mile their motives highly unsavory. (Arista & Murni, 2014)

The example of affective function:

- Regina: So how do you like North Shore?
Cady: It's good. I think i'm joining the Mathletes.

Regina: No, you cannot do that. That is social suicide. Damn, you are so lucky you have us to guide you.

(Cady doesn't answer and they continue their shopping) (Wahyuni & Rusyan, 2026)

2.2 Research Method

2.2.1. Types of Research

This study used a qualitative descriptive approach. Qualitative research is effectively used in studies to find culturally specific information about the values, opinions, behaviors, and social context of specific social groups (Mack, 2005). Based on this definition, the researcher employs this approach to identify the mechanism and context behind the use of humor in each dialogue, as well as the social factors that influence it. This study focuses on understanding the utterances made and how linguistic elements and the context play a role in creating humor.

2.2.2 Data and Data Sources

The data for this study consists of dialogues that contain criteria for humorous utterances, such as laughter, smiles, or humorous responses from the conversation partner, which will be analysed. These criteria are clearly reflected in the recipient's responses, which reveal distinct linguistic inconsistencies within the dialogue. This data is systematically analysed to uncover the linguistic mechanisms and social factors that contribute to humour in the film. The data source for this study is the dialogue between characters in the American comedy film *Grown Ups* (2010), currently available on various streaming platforms. To ensure the accuracy of the data obtained from the film, this study uses the dialogue transcript as a means of verification. The transcripts are useful for verifying each utterance textually, thereby minimizing misinterpretations of specific terms that arise in the conversation.

2.2.3 Population and Sample

In conducting research, the researcher must identify the population and the sample to be selected. The population refers to the larger group of individuals that is the primary focus of the research. Meanwhile, the sample is a portion of the population selected to represent the entire group (Cresswell, 2019). The population and sample in this study include all utterances containing verbal humor that provoke reactions such as laughter, smiles, or humorous responses from the conversation partner. The 22 utterances identified were selected based on the criterion that they contained visible humorous reactions from the addressee and demonstrated clear linguistic incongruity in the dialogue. These data are considered representative as they cover a variety of social contexts and character interactions throughout the film. Therefore, this study employs total sampling by examining every humorous utterance that generates laughter in the dialogue of the film *Grown Ups* (2010). This technique was chosen because analyzing all available data ensures a more comprehensive and accurate representation of the humor present in the film. Total sampling is a sampling technique taken from the total population, whereby the total population becomes the sample Sugiyono (2020), cited in Lufiah, et. al, (2021). Consequently, the researcher will use all the data collected for analysis in this study, applying the script opposition and logical mechanism of GTVH theory and the theory of social factors.

2.2.4 Method of Collecting Data

The data for this study was collected from humorous dialogues in the *Grown Ups* (2010) movie. First, the researcher watched *Grown Ups* several times to

understand the plot, characters, and dialogue. Second, the researcher noted down selected scenes and transcribed them into written format to understand the details of the conversations. Third, the researcher noted and checked important points in the scenes, such as how the listener reacted when the speaker made a joke, the turn-taking patterns indicated by the characters, and the social context of the dialogue. The researcher also considered the presence of linguistic incongruity and script opposition within the dialogue as defined by Attardo and Raskin (1991), ensuring a more objective and theoretically grounded identification of humorous data. Fourth, the researcher identified the categories of script opposition and logical mechanism, the categories are based on the most prominent and salient incongruities present in each humorous exchange, as Attardo and Raskin (1991) do not prescribe a fixed set of script oppositions that must be applied. The researcher found seven categories of script opposition used to create humor in 22 data, including six data of serious vs. unserious, two data of compliment vs. insult, seven data of expected vs. unexpected, four data of normal vs. abnormal, one datum of possible vs. impossible, one datum of actual vs. nonactual, and one datum of obscene vs. non-obscene. Meanwhile, logical mechanism classification is based on the list of 27 logical mechanisms proposed by Attardo (2001) that best fit the data. Fifth, the analysis continues with the other four GTVH parameters, including target, situation, narrative strategies, and language, following the prior examination of script opposition and logical mechanism (Attardo, 1994) and four social factors (Holmes, 2022). The researcher conducted this analysis repeatedly to ensure the

collected data was accurate, allowing the identification of GTVH constructs and the examination of their social factors.

2.2.5 Method of Analyzing Data

The data collected in the form of dialogues contains verbal humor and receives laughter, smiles, or humorous responses from the conversation partner which reveal distinct linguistic inconsistencies within the dialogue; it was then analyzed using the General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH) framework and its social factors through the following steps:

1. Analyzing symbols using conversation analysis in dialogues containing humor

Symbol used to note the conversations (Liddicoat, 2022):

wo:rd : The number of colons indicates how long the sound is sustained.

(.) : A short pause.

(,) : A comma indicates a slight rise in tone, but is also used when the intonation pattern sounds unfinished.

(?) : A question mark with rising intonation.

(¿) : An inverted question mark is used for an intonation that rising more than slightly (,) but not higher than a question mark.

↓word : Sharp drop in pitch.

↑word : Strong rise in pitch.

°words° : Softer speech or whispering.

>words< : Sounds faster than the surrounding speech.

whord : Breathy sounds..

#words# : Hoarse voice.

hah, hih, heh : A burst of laughter, with vocal sounds indicating laughter.

wor(h)ds : Laughing while speaking.

£ : A smiling voice, words spoken with a smile.

>hhuh< : A sharp inhalation or exhalation.

[word : Start of simultaneous conversation.

word] : End of simultaneous conversation.

=word : Seamless, no visible gap between the two turns when speaking.

((word)) : Comments and descriptions from the transcriber.

2. Analyzing humorous dialogues using the knowledge sources of the General Theory of Verbal Humor (GTVH) by focusing on the script opposition and logical mechanisms parameters as the main analytical parameters of GTVH, as the remaining four parameters were not found to be analytically significant in this data.

3. After the analysis process, each data point is examined to determine the meaning and mechanisms of humor used in each utterance.

4. Identifying the social factors that influence the formation of humor.

5. The analysis results are summarized to identify the patterns of humor in the film