

A Pragmatic Analysis Of Humour Strategies And Functions In Steve Harvey's TV Shows

Hussain Hameed Mayuuf¹, Arshed Sadoun Atei (Corresponding Author)²

Abstract

The majority of the research body's focus has been on the subject of humor. Because humor is so multifaceted and has so many distinct forms, scholars have examined it from a variety of angles. These works looked at humor in connection to a variety of other academic disciplines, including philosophy, linguistics, psychology, and sociology. Scholars and philosophers have always been intrigued by humor as an essential human phenomenon. "Studies conducted from philosophical, psychological, sociological, anthropological, and linguistic perspectives focus on human behavior," claims Dynel (2009). This study looks at this large body of research, giving a thorough rundown of the various facets of humor, its theoretical foundations, and its applications in various situations. It also provides a succinct synopsis of some important theoretical frameworks, including superiority theory, incongruity theory, and relief theory, exploring how these viewpoints aid in understanding why particular stimuli cause laughter or amusement as well as how these theories and their proponents view humor. This chapter provides some insight into the representation of social and cultural differences in humor. Lastly, it looks for gaps in the literature and current thinking to help guide future research areas and this study.

This survey of the literature aims to advance a shared knowledge of the complex and multifaceted nature of humor by delving into a variety of viewpoints and including research from other fields.

1.1 Introduction

One of the phrases that people frequently use in daily conversation is "humour." It is also one of the natural senses that Allah gave us, allowing us to react to funny things by giggling and making analogies, or by makin¹g jokes ourselves and making others laugh as well. Nonetheless, there has been debate over how to define this term in the most current corpus on humor. There are a number of factors contributing to the difficulty of the lack of a widely recognized, clear-cut definition of humor, including a lack of agreement among academics over what humor is.

1.2 Literature Review

One of the reasons for this is that phrases like "humor" and "comic" or "amusement" are very similar. Humour is a comprehensive phrase that encompasses any act or behavior that elicits laughter, amusement, or is perceived as hilarious, according to Attardo, Attardo, Baltes, & Petray (1994). According to Godkewitsch (2017), humor is the process that is sparked by a comical act and results in laughter, which is an indication of enjoyment. In the same spirit,

¹prof of Linguistics University of Babylon, Babylon,

²PhD candidate of Linguistics, University of Babylon, Iraq.

Blistein (1991) defines humor as any humorous deed or anything that makes people laugh. According to Audrieth (1998), humor is any intentional act or behavior that elicits laughter from others. Additionally, he describes humor as the cognitive ability people possess naturally to recognize, communicate, or find amusing inconsistencies.

1.2.1 Humour Theories

Numerous theories of humor have been developed to investigate the origins, consequences, and societal roles of humor. These ideas examine humor and laughing from a variety of angles, including social, psychological, and spiritual. These theories include the following: the incongruity theory (Hutcheson, 1750, as cited in Morreall, 1986; Cicero; Kant, 1790; Schopenhauer, 1883; Beattie, 1776; Morreall, 1983; Veatch, 1998; Goel & Dolan, 2001); the superiority theory (Plato & Aristotle; Hobbes, 1679; Bergson, 1911); and the relief theory (Spencer, 1864; Fraud, 1905; Martin, 2007). An overview of each hypothesis is given below.

1.2.1.1 The Theory of Superiority

Greek philosophers including Plato, Aristotle, and Hobbes all wrote about the superiority theory, sometimes referred to as the disparagement theory. Hobbes (1650) supplied the fundamental premise of this idea in his work "Of Human Nature." Hobbes claims that the superiority theory holds that laughing is an inferior conduct because it results from a person's sense and knowledge of their own superiority over another person's suffering and blunders (Kulka, 2007). This view states that laughter is a reaction to one's sentiments of superiority and frequently entails making fun of or mocking someone or something in response to the perceived misfortunes, failings, or ignorance of others (Hobbes, 1650, as referenced in Larkin-Galiñanes, 2017).

1.2.1.2 The Theory of Incongruity

One of the most well-known and significant theories of humor in philosophy and psychology is the incongruity theory. It is regarded as a foundational work in the field of humor studies as well. Hutcheson created it in response to Hobbes' superiority theory, which holds that ideas of superiority cannot alone elicit laughter. According to this hypothesis, humor arises when expectations and reality don't match. Kulka (2007) asserts that incongruity is the source of humor and that individuals laugh to convey how amused they are by it. The sense of humor can also be influenced by the resolution of incongruity. According to Morreall (1983), humor emerges when people believe that some components of a situation are inconsistent or that expectations have been broken. According to this idea, laughing results from the unexpectedness or surprise that incongruity creates.

1.3 Methodology

1.3.1 Introduction

This socio-pragmatic study aims to pinpoint the kinds of humor that are employed in selected TV shows by Steve Harvey to convey mocking. Additionally, it makes an effort to offer a practical interpretation of the (im)politeness techniques employed to convey ridicule in the examined data. In addition, it looks at the rhetorical strategies that are employed in the selected data to convey both humor and ridicule. It also investigates the kinds of maxims that are broken in Steve Harvey's TV shows that have to do with humor and mockery as well as the various implicatures. In order to achieve these goals, the data under consideration will be examined from two angles: a pragmatic perspective and a sociolinguistic perspective, as will be discussed in chapters two and three.

The purpose of this chapter is to give a quick overview of the methods and processes used to gather and analyze the data. Its primary focus is on outlining the processes involved in gathering, classifying, identifying, and analyzing data. This chapter is divided into a number of sections and subsections, including research ethics, the method for gathering data, the history of Steve Harvey and the two TV shows that were used in the study, and a summary.

1.3.2 Procedure

In this section, the method used to gather the data is described, the speech acts that involve humor and mockery are identified, and the data is analyzed. The following subsections are included in it.

1.3.2.1 Process

This part focuses on defining the speech acts that involve humor and ridicule, outlining the method used to collect the data, and analyzing the results. The following subsections are included in it.

1.3. Data Collection

The study's data include excerpts from two of Steve Harvey's television programs, Ask Steve and Family Feud. The next subsection provides a brief discussion of these TV series. Every TV show is examined in just two episodes, from which the jokes and ridicule are taken. The data in the appendix provide specifics on these episodes. We have chosen these data and TV programs based on the pragmatic and sociolinguistic information that they provide. There are several humorous and mocking instances in both these TV series and the statements chosen for data analysis.

"Steve Harvey's FIRST CAR GIVEAWAY on Family Feud!" and "Harvey Boys vs. Girls (Full Episode) | Celebrity Family Feud" are the two-Family Feud episodes. These episodes are chosen at random from a single TV show's data set. The data has been fully transcribed and is then compared, utterance by utterance, with the YouTube video footage. Similarly, this TV show's second episode is transcription. The next section discusses humor and mocking speech acts, which are based on the transcription and YouTube recordings of the episodes. Then, one episode from Season 1 of Steve Harvey's television program "Ask Steve" are chosen, including "I'm not going to help you,"

The data set is typical of the humor in Steve Harvey's shows because these episodes from two distinct TV shows were chosen. You may watch these episodes on YouTube. You can click the following links for any reference:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Korl8ahsNF4&ab_channel=FamilyFeud

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t7KedM2NLto&ab_channel=FamilyFeud

Introduction - Team Darling faces off against Team Kerkhoff.

0:01

Joey Fatone: THIS IS JOEY FATONE

0:02

FROM UNIVERSAL ORLANDO RESORT

0:04

IN SUNNY FLORIDA.

0:05

IT'S TIME TO PLAY "FAMILY FEUD."

0:08

AND NOW HERE'S THE STAR OF OUR

0:09

SHOW, GIVE IT UP FOR STEVE

0:11

HARVEY.

0:28

Steve: HOW Y'ALL DOING?

0:29

GOOD, GOOD, GOOD.

0:30

WELCOME TO THE SHOW, EVERYBODY.

0:32

I'M YOUR MAN STEVE HARVEY.

0:33

WELCOME TO THE "FEUD."

0:34

WE GOT 2 GREAT

0:35

FAMILIES HERE READY TO BATTLE IT

0:37

OUT FOR A SHOT AT WINNING A

0:38

LOT OF CASH AND A

0:40

BRAND-NEW CAR.

0:41

[CHEERING AND APPLAUSE]

Round #1 - Name something that makes a kiss great. "If I give away a car, I'm gonna get naked!"

0:45

IF YOU'RE READY TO

0:46

PLAY "FEUD," LET'S GET IT ON.

0:48

GIVE ME STACEY, GIVE ME TRICIA.

0:50

LET'S GO.

0:51

[CHEERING AND APPLAUSE]

0:57

Steve: WHOO-HOO!

0:58

I'M GIVING AWAY A CAR,

0:59

I'M GONNA GET NAKED.

1:00

[CHEERING AND APPLAUSE]

1:01

YEAH. I'M TAKING MY CLOTHES OFF.

1:04

>> IF I WIN A CAR, I MIGHT DO

1:06

THE SAME THING.

1:07

Steve: IF YOU WIN IN A CAR,

1:08

YOU MIGHT DO THE SAME THING?

1:09

WELL, DIRK MIGHT NOT REALLY

1:10

WANT THAT TO HAPPEN, BUT--

1:12

JUST KNOW THAT THE HOST

1:14

WILL BE CHEERING FOR YOU.

1:15

>> ALL RIGHT, ALL RIGHT.

1:16

ALL RIGHT, LET'S GO.

1:17

NAME SOMETHING THAT MAKES A

1:19

KISS GREAT.

1:21

STACEY?

1:23

>> THE TONGUE.

1:24

[CHEERING AND APPLAUSE]

1:29

Steve: THE TONGUE!

1:32

[CHEERING AND APPLAUSE]

1:35

THERE'S ONE ANSWER THAT

1.4 Discussion

Speech Acts in Searle's View:

The speech acts in the aforementioned utterances are representative speech acts that convey Steve's assessment and conclusion regarding the nature of a wife's connection with her

husband. In these statements, Harvey shows his surprise at this peculiar situation and keeps asking the wife if she and her husband talk about it or if he is aware of it. Steve did not find her claim convincing. Because of this, he makes fun of the wife by stating, "the guy that is standing next to you," implying that even though she is moaning about him, he is still standing close to her. The host spoke as though he heard a riddle because he did not believe her. Harvey makes fun of her for failing to see that her spouse is treating her with true love. Then, calling the scenario a damn problem, he told her that her problem was that he married a lady who did not deserve this kind of love. He tells her that the husband's love is nothing new to her and that he picked her to be his wife, which further bolsters his assessment of their connection. Nonetheless, the wife persistently seeks Steve's assistance in soothing her husband.

In this passage, Steve Harvey transgresses the cooperative principles by using sarcastic language. When Harvey says, "He thank you fine, that's the damn problem he married a woman he's in love with," he is breaking the relationship rule. He further transgresses the manners norm by characterizing "love" as a difficult deed. The adage "how he got you?" is also broken by Steve, who asks the wife how he got her although he knows that their marriage was founded on love.

Examining this passage through the lens of Leech's decorum principle, Steve Harvey transgresses certain social norms, like civility, by refusing to engage with her husband in order to help her relax. He argues that most women would like to feel this kind of affection in this situation. Steve begs her to let go of this emotion. He also talks harshly to the wife, which is a violation of the second maxim of approval. Steve wants to convey the idea that her spouse is not worthy of his wife's actions. In this way, breaking the rules of etiquette invites ridicule and humor. Harvey also transgresses the principle of compassion, which calls for demonstrating care and encouragement, which made the audience and the two interlocutors in this play laugh aloud.

In terms of the sociolinguistic approach to humor in this passage, the audience has laughed at the remarks made by Steve Harvey in particular because of the hilarious ways in which the woman acts toward her husband. Harvey's sardonic reply refers to her situation as a "damn problem." It is not normal in society or culture for a wife to view her husband's love for her as troublesome. Steve utilizes his remarks to try to convince the wife by using his social, economic, and prestigious power, according to Weber's power dimension, but all of his efforts were in vain because the wife was not persuaded and the audience and other participants kept laughing.

1.5 Conclusion

This study examines this substantial corpus of work, providing a comprehensive overview of the diverse aspects of humor, its theoretical underpinnings, and its uses in a range of contexts. Additionally, it offers a brief overview of several significant theoretical frameworks, such as relief theory, incongruity theory, and superiority theory, examining how these perspectives contribute to our understanding of why specific stimuli elicit laughter or amusement as well as how these theories and their proponents perceive humor. This chapter sheds some light on how humor portrays socioeconomic and cultural disparities. Finally, in order to inform both this study and future research fields, it searches for gaps in the literature and current thought.

This literature review attempts to promote a common understanding of the intricate and diverse aspects of comedy by exploring multiple points of view and including studies from other disciplines.

It can be noticed that Harvey's usage related with humour is something distinguished that affects a lot of people, Harvey mostly breaches the maxims of quality, quantity and manner. Violating the maxims results humour. Power is something crucial that enables Steve to have the main role in solving the audiences' problems. The host violates the principles of politeness which directly leads to laughter and humour. Breaching courtesy and modesty is the most affective issue in his Tv show. Normally, people think Harvey will support them with their case though they are wrong. The last think to mention is that whenever there is violating of maxims, there will be laughter.

References

- Attardo, S., Attardo, D. H., Baltes, P., & Petray, M. J. (1994). The linear organization of jokes: analysis of two thousand texts.
- Audrieth, L.A., (1998). The Art of Using Humour in Public Speaking. Retrieved June, 2015, from <http://www.squaresail.com/onhumour.html>.
- Blistein, E.M. 1991. —Humourl. In Encyclopedia Americana. New York: Grolier International, Inc. pp:562.
- Cambridge English Dictionary. (Latest Edition).
- Dynel, M. (2009). 'Beyond a joke: Types of conversational humour'. Language and Linguistics Compass 3, pp. 1284-1299.
- Godkewitsch, M. (2017). Physiological and verbal indices of arousal in rated humour. In Humour and Laughter (pp. 117-138). Routledge.
- Hobbes, T. (1650) Human nature. In English Works. Vol. 4. London: Bohn, 1840.
- Kulka, T. (2007). The incongruity of incongruity theories of humour. Organon F, 14(3), 320-333.
- Martin, R.A. (2007). The psychology of humour: An integrative approach. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Morreall, J. (1983). Taking Laughter Seriously. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Morreall, J. (1986). The philosophy of laughter and humour. New York: State University of New York Press
- Spencer, H. (1864). The physiology of laughter. In H. Spencer (Ed.), Essays: Scientific, political and speculative (Vol. 2, pp. 452–466). New York: D. Appleton.