



PAPER – OPEN ACCESS

Applying General Theory of Verbal Humour to the Suburban Community Conversation in ‘Kontrakan Rempong’ YouTube Content

Author : Sisila Fitriany Damanik, dkk.,
DOI : 10.32734/lwsa.v4i2.1194
Electronic ISSN : 2654-7066
Print ISSN : 2654-7058

Volume 4 Issue 2 – 2021 TALENTA Conference Series: Local Wisdom, Social, and Arts (LWSA)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Published under licence by TALENTA Publisher, Universitas Sumatera Utara



Applying General Theory of Verbal Humour to the Suburban Community Conversation in 'Kontrakan Rempong' YouTube Content

Sisila Fitriany Damanik^{a*}, Tiarnita Maria Sarjani Siregar^b

^{a,b}Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Language and Art, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan 20221, Indonesia

SFDamanik@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to demonstrate how structural characteristics of conversational humour are related to the functions served by hilarious utterances and acts. Linguistically speaking, examining humour can provide us with a wealth of information about the society in which we live. Regrettably, not all linguists believe that researching humour is a wise approach. Additionally, this study will examine the suburban community's debate in one of the most popular YouTube videos, Kontrakan Rempong by Warintil official. Pamer provided the funny data (episode 69). The approach employed in this study is Fairclough's CDA model, which evaluates the dimensions of text, specifically the GTVH theory, interpretation, and explanation (social practice). As a result, it is discovered that residents' noticeable behaviors, in particular, become a regular topic of debate among the community's housewives. The theme is primarily concerned with how members of a particular family behave in the community and how women as homemakers identify as community members. The targeted behaviors include being chatty, materialistic, impolite and pompous, having an unconventional view of the world, and gossipmongers who spread tales about another person's debt.

Keywords: conversational humour; suburban community; CDA; GTVH theory

1. Introduction

It is evident that humour plays a significant part in human life. According to Raskin (1985: 1), humour is a phenomenon in which someone laughs when they see (visually) or hear (audially) something amusing in ordinary life, whether it is a scenario, a narrative, or an idea. Additionally, it is considered that humour serves not only as a means of relieving the audience's psychological burden, but also as a medium for social criticism of all sorts of inequality that exist in the community (Damanik & Mulyadi, 2020). It can develop as a result of a particular sort of social imbalances presented through amusing language and evocative imagery that relaxes and tickles the reader or listener. In agreement with Raskin, Attardo (1994: 10) considered that humour is expressed through implicit or explicit laughter. It's something that has the potential to make people chuckle. In other words, humour is capable of eliciting laughter.

According to Archakis and Tsakona (2005), one of the most common social purposes of humour is the formation of solidarity and in-group identity. Their research focuses on the target as the most effective knowledge resource because it is capable of bringing the evaluative dimension of humour to the surface and so distinguishing between what young informants regard to be "proper" and "inappropriate" behavior. In short, humour elicits information about the humourists' shared ideas and values and demonstrates a high degree of effectiveness in assisting participants in constructing their situated sense of social identity. Brock's (2005) analysis of Monty Python's humour has been variably described as crazy, strange, and anarchic.

This is not just because of their stream-of-consciousness style, representation of severe violence, and so forth, but also because the Pythons generate unusual script constellations. While Mizco (2014) proposes a methodology for connecting form and function in conversational humour in his article. When the membership category is referenced in the model's settings, a pair of incompatible starting scripts (i.e. opposition scripts) is activated. The punch or jab-line presents a second opposition script that "resolves" or makes sense in terms of organizational preferences in comparison to the first. When the humour of the conversation is analyzed, it was discovered that these choices have ramifications for coming together or sharing the interlocutor.

The most influential linguistic theories of humour, which have been widely accepted as comprehensive formal accounts of the mechanisms underlying jokes and have served as a starting point for much contemporary linguistic work on humour, are the Script Semantic Theory of Humour (SSTH) and the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH) (GTVH). To begin, those theories were developed in response to jokes, and they have recently been applied to better understand linguistic humour as it appears in various forms of texts (Attardo, 2017).

It is undeniable that studying humour may give us prosperous information about society among us. Unfortunately, there are some researchers who stated that studying humour is not an intelligent concept since it will remove the excitement of the humour itself. As it is stated by W.H. Auden in Lew (1996:6) that investigating humour will kill the humour itself. In accordance with Auden, E.B White in Goebel (2011:1) stated that examining humour is similar to operating a frog; not many are interested in conducting it since once they do, the frog dies immediately. However, Martin (2007:1) argues that even though humour involves a light-hearted and non-serious attitude towards something, it is still worth investigated scientifically, since humour also represents some serious functions in social, emotional, and cognitive matters.

This paper seeks to examine the famous YouTube content called *Kontrakan Rempong* by Warintil official. The Warintil Official YouTube channel is now well known on the video social networking platform. The content series made by six creators from Medan, in which, now has more than 1 million subscribers. Warintil Official YouTube channel tells the story of suburban community who live in *Kontrakan Rempong* (Rempong's rented service), which has now reached more than hundreds of episodes. They raise the stories which are identical to suburban community's daily lives-in this case, Medan women-coupled with funny scenes. It is interesting to be analysed since their conversation not only describe zany, bizarre, and anarchic language but also extreme violence which can make people laugh. By exploring this subject, we will learn how the structural characteristics of conversational humour are related to the functions offered by hilarious words and acts.

In this paper, the GTVH types of humour theories will be used to analyse the conversation of suburban community in *Kontrakan Rempong* YouTube content. At the theoretical and methodological levels, the aims of this study is to contribute the application of Attardo's (1994) GTVH to an appreciation of the social interaction of everyday jokes. More specifically, in this study, the conversation of suburban community in *Kontrakan Rempong* YouTube content will be analysed as well as the target of the humorous extracts.

2. Literature Review

This section provides a summary of the prior literature pertinent to this investigation. Since this study discusses conversational humour in one of the famous comedy contents in YouTube, the micro-level humour analysis approach in conversation also needs to be introduced. The approach, developed based on Conversation Analysis (CA), is used in this study because of its significant theoretical and analytical value for investigating conversational humour in various discourses. Then, it is followed by the explanation of YouTube content and General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH).

2.1. Humour in Conversation

The Conversation Analysis (CA) approach is important to be used in analysing humour in conversation because it provides a theoretical framework for capturing the phenomena associated with the use of humour in conversation and the relationship between humour and conversation (Attardo, 1994: 295). As it is widely recognized, CA is a broad and complex field of research, and this section borrows only a few important insights in CA which are useful in understanding the sequential arrangement of joke-telling. Humour scholars have recognized that the sequential arrangement of jokes (Attardo, 1994; Sacks, 1974), is one of the most useful and informative linguistic approaches in the study of humour in the setting of spontaneous conversation. The sequential arrangement of jokes derives from the CA framework itself.

The sequential arrangement of jokes in conversation is described as having a structure consisting of three parts (three-part structure), namely introduction, delivery of jokes and response (Sacks, 1974). Sacks, (1974: 340-347) describes that the introduction refers to the foreword part of telling a joke. During this stage, the speaker needs to secure the floor of the conversation, to create conducive conditions for the joke, and to direct the listener to the next joke sequence. The foreword may be completed in a minimum of two rounds, namely the speaker's offer or request to tell a joke, and the listener's acceptance of the offer. In the second stage, jokes are carried out. When a joke has been started correctly, the speaker is entitled to at least one turn to tell the joke to the end. Meanwhile, the listener must not enter his turn to speak during the story sequences, because any contribution from the listener at this stage is considered disturbing and out of order. Finally, the response stage refers to the completion of a joke which is usually contains a minimal sequence of responses, such as listener's laughter or overlapping laughter from speaker and listener. Since the listener is not obliged to laugh or does not always immediately or successfully understand the speaker's joke, unexpected conversation problems, such as silence, can occur at this point. However, as Sacks et al (1974) pointed out, when conversational problems occur, listeners are expected to adopt a remedial mechanism that serves to minimize gaps and silences in communication and to ensure smooth communication. It also has to do with the sequence of jokes. When the ending of a speaker's joke is followed by unpredicted silence, whether it is due to the listener's failure to understand or dislike the speaker's joke, the listener has the option of using remedial strategies, such as delayed laughter or evaluative comments on the speaker's performance joke, to demonstrate their involvement and to mark the completion of a joke sequence.

2.2. Youtube Content

The world of technology is expanding at the moment. Technology has also advanced significantly throughout time. There are numerous new developments brought about by technology, one of which is the topic of new media. McQuail (2005) in his book *Communication Theory and Research* states that new media is a telematic media which is a different technological device with different uses. Information can be accessed easily, quickly and anywhere since it is distributed by using computer technology with an internet network. In new media we can access various kinds of information, entertainment and so on.

The advent of new media has made it extremely simple for anyone to obtain wanted information without restriction. Apart from accessing information and enjoyment, information can also be applied to new media or social media. The information might be presented in the form of infographics, photos, or videos. At the moment, the most popular method of disseminating information is through images and videos. YouTube is the most extensively used platform for publishing image and video content.

YouTube is a popular medium for disseminating information in Indonesia. In Indonesia, many people have turned to YouTube as a means of earning a career, specifically by becoming YouTubers. A YouTuber may have a channel dedicated to a variety of various types of material, including vlogs, tutorials, recipes, reviews, pranks, and comedy. Naturally, the content picked by a YouTuber must possess unique features and ingenuity. According to

Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI), content is defined as information that is accessible via media or electronic items. Content can be delivered by a variety of media, either directly or indirectly, including the internet, television, audio CDs, and, more recently, cell phones.

The world of creativity in Indonesia is now growing, one of which is the development of creativity in YouTube content. Munandar (2004) defines creativity as the result of interactions between individuals and their environment, the capacity to create new combinations based on data, information, or elements that already exist or were previously known, i.e., all experiences and knowledge acquired during a person's lifetime. Many YouTube video makers or what is often called YouTubers are busy competing for creativity in creating content that is expected to attract people's attention. Creativity is the main key in content creation, consciously not aware that when a creative content that is liked by many people is made, it is certain that in the future there will be many people who create similar content for a long time. Creative content will usually get more response from the public.

This paper seeks to examine the famous YouTube content called *Kontrakan Rempong* by Warintil official. The Warintil Official YouTube channel is now well known on the video social networking platform. The content series made by six creators from Medan, in which, now has more than 3 million subscribers. Warintil tells the story of *Kontrakan Rempong* (Rempong's rented service), which has now reached more than hundreds of episodes. They raise the stories which are identical to Medan women's daily lives, coupled with funny scenes. From six of the players, there are 8 main characters played in the comedy, they are Nining, Kestel, Bordir, Ishaya, Tatik, Bobo, Mumu, and Rita. Each of them plays different characters, and sometimes, they play more than one characters. Their conversation not only describes zany, bizarre, and anarchic language but also extreme violence which can make people laugh. That is the reason why it is interesting to be analysed.

2.3. General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH)

Attardo (1994: 222) asserts that the General Theory of Verbal Humour (GTVH) may be applied to any type of hilarious writing. It is consistent with Hempelmann and Ruch's (2005) and Masaeli and Heidari-(2016) Shahreza's assertions that the GVTM can serve as a framework for linguistic analysis of humour. Numerous previous studies have used the theory to analyze humour in a variety of contexts, including decoding the language mechanism underlying cyber humour (Pasaribu & Kadarisman, 2016), examining the interaction of language and image in cartoons (Tsakona, 2009), the variation of humorous representations in popular culture texts (Archakis et al., 2014), and Indonesian humorous status in social media by applying the theory. Additionally, as one of the major theories of humour, several studies committed to the GTVH have been conducted, including one by Attardo et al. (2002) on script oppositions and logical mechanisms: modeling incongruities and their resolutions, one by Hempelmann & Ruch (2005) on interdisciplinary humour research, and one by (Attardo, 2001) who introduced another knowledge resource to the theory, dubbed Met.

The GTVH introduces Six Knowledge Resources (KRs) as dimensions or characteristics of humour. Script Opposition (SO), Logical Mechanism (LM), Situation (SI), Target (TA), Narrative Strategy (NS), and Language are the six KRs (LA). All of these KRs are critical factors to consider when comparing and contrasting comedy (Attardo 1994: 227). Attardo (1994) provides additional clarification on each of these KRs. The Script Opposition (SO) KR is concerned with the conflict between two scripts. A script is defined as follows:

a cognitive structure internalized by the speaker that provides information about the structure of a given entity, its parts and components, or how an activity is carried out, a relationship is organized, and so on, in order to cover all possible relations between entities, including their constituents (Attardo, 2001).

Scripts, in their simplest form, are collections of information about something that are organized in a particular way. According to SO, a text is considered amusing when two scripts overlap and are in opposition to one another. The term "Logical Mechanism" refers to the process by which humour scripts are assembled in order to elicit laughter. The Situation (SI) is in charge of the situation in which humour is staged; it is often referred to as the "props" of humour.

The Narrative Strategy (NS) determines the location of the numerous narrative organization or genres, such as a dialogue. Language (LA) is concerned with the precise formulation of humour and the placement of the punch line (see Attardo 1994: 222-226). This hierarchy of KRs is predicated on their relative power. As Attardo (1994: 227) suggests, "parameters determine the parameters below them and are determined by the parameters above them." That is, the values selected in higher KRs will constrain the alternatives accessible in lower KRs.

3. Methods

Because the primary objective of this study is to describe and establish variance within a situation, phenomena, problem, or event without quantifying them (Kumar, 2011), a qualitative method is used to perform this study. In this case, the study aims to analyze the community's conversation within the Kontrakan Rempong YouTube material.

To gain a firm grasp on the hilarious language used by the suburban community characters in the Kontrakan Rempong YouTube material, Fairclough's (2003) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was employed as a research approach. Three stages are involved in this process: description (text), interpretation, and explanation (social practice). To begin, at the description (text) stage, the linguistic aspect of the data was analyzed using the GTVH theory, namely the humours' aim. Second, during the interpretation step, certain clarifications regarding the manner in which the amusing discussion was extracted were included. Finally, the social practice (explanation) was examined by examining the relationship between the substance of humour – particularly its targets – and social interaction. The researchers were able to describe the suburban community's dialogue in Kontrakan Rempong YouTube Content using these steps of analysis.

Pamer provided the funny data (episode 69). The data were extracted from Warintil's official YouTube channel in the form of utterances and screenshots. It is regarded a hilarious item since it was evident from the content's comments that viewers laughed when they saw (visually) or heard (audibly) it. It is consistent with Raskin's (1985) assessment of humour.

The data collecting approach used was observation, transcription, copying, and reading. The data were then analyzed on an analysis worksheet, which included data reduction, data coding, data analysis and interpretation, and finally, data/verification conclusion.

4. Findings and Discussion

As it is stated previously that this study used Fairclough's (2003) three-dimensional model of CDA as a research method in order to grasp a clear understanding of the humorous conversations uttered by the suburban community in the *Kontrakan Rempong* YouTube content. In this section, the description (the linguistic aspect of the data collected were analysed by applying the GTVH theory), interpretation, and explanation (social practice) of the conversation were analysed based on the scene in the *Pamer* (episode 69) video.

Scene 1:

Situation (SI)	Mumu was cooking then his son Bobo came over to him.
Script Opposition (SO)	Biological son vs step child
Logical Mechanism (LM)	Fallacious reasoning
Target (T)	Nining and Kestel, who accused something without reason
Narrative Strategy (NS)	Question-and-answer dialog

Language (LA)	Bobo : <i>Mak, kemarin dibilang si Kestel aku anaknya Bu Rit lo Mak.</i> (Mom, yesterday Kestel told me that I am Rita's son)
	Mumu : <i>Anak Bu Rit?</i> (Did he?)
	Bobo : <i>Iya</i> (yes)
	Mumu : <i>Nggak la. Bobo kan anak mamak.</i> (No, of course. You are my son)
	Bobo : <i>Iya lo</i> (He did tell it.)
	Mumu : <i>Nggak lo, ecek-ecek itu. Kaupun, udah dibilang si Kestel sama mamaknya kau anak Bu Rit, masih saja kau main-main sama dia.</i> (No, it's not true. Kestel and his mom have told you about that, but you still keep playing with him.)
	Bobo : <i>Kekmana la, gak ada lagi kawan Bobo.</i> (I have no other friends.)
	Mumu : <i>Ya udah la, tapi jangan berantam-berantam mainnya ya. Jangan main-main di pasar juga.</i> (Ok, from now on, don't fight with him, and don't play on the street)
	Bobo : <i>Iya mak.</i> (Ok, Mom.)

From the conversation between Mumu and his son Bobo, there is a statement uttered by Bobo that he is Rita's son. The viewers who have already known that Rita and Bobo are played by the same actor will find it amused since no other reason that they have are alike but different in characters. Mumu tried to convinced Bobo that it is not true and asked her son not to fight with others. It portrays a typical character of a mother who tries to protect her son which is a stereotype of women as homemakers. As it is stated by Brannon (2017) they stay at home and have the responsibility to take care of the children and managed household.

Scene 2:

SI	Bobo is calling Kestel in his house, asking him to play together.
SO	permitted vs not permitted
LM	Fallacious reasoning, strong family ties
T	Nining (Kestel's mother who is strict in allowing her son to play)
NS	Question-and-answer dialog
LA	Bobo : <i>Kestel, Kestel</i> (calling Kestel)
	Kestel : <i>Apa Bo?</i> (What happened, Bo?)
	Bobo : <i>Ayo kita main-main yok.</i> (Let's go playing around.)
	Kestel : <i>Nggak boleh aku main-main siang-siang gini. Suruh mamakku aku tidur siang lo.</i> (My mom is not allowed me to play. I have to take a nap.)
	Bobo : <i>wuih..dekat lo, di pohon mangga sana aja kita main-mainnya.</i> (We play not far from here, under the mango tree)
	Kestel : <i>Jaoh itu, nggak mau la aku, nanti dicariin mamakku aku.</i> (It is far. I don't want to. My mom will look for me.)
	Bobo : <i>Ish kau mengkek kali la, anak laki-laki lo kau.</i> (You are too spoiled. C'mon, you are a boy)
	Kestel : <i>Jangan la jauh-jauh, nanti dicubit mamakku aku lo.</i> (Don't be too far, ok. I'll be pinched by my mom if it's too far.)
	Bobo : <i>Ya udah di sini aja kita, dekat rumahmu.</i> (Ok, then, just play here, nearby)
	Kestel : <i>Ya udah la ayok.</i> (Ok, let's go).



The conversation between Bobo and Kestel also described how a mother tries to protect her child by forbidding him to play away from home as a portrayal of strong family ties. There is punishment, something like pinching, given by the mother if the child is disobedient. It indicates that women - as stated by Brannon's (2017) - are homemakers. What makes this scene funny is when in the end of this scene Kestel agreed to Bobo's invitation while putting his finger in his nose which portrays the habit of children.

Scene 3:

SI Bobo and Kestel are playing together.
 SO Childish vs grown up
 LM Stupidity
 T Kestel
 NS Picture from the scene
 LA



From the picture it can be seen that while playing, Kestel accidentally defecated in his pant. It portrays a typical child's behaviour who has embarrassed himself without realizing it.

Scene 4:

SI Kestel returns to his house, calls his mother and tells the incident he has been going through.
 SO Childish vs grown up
 LM Stupidity, rude, talkative, strong family ties
 T Kestel
 NS Question-and-answer dialog
 LA Kestel : *Maaaak..(Moom..)*
 Nining: *Apa sih Kestel? Kau siang-siang manggilin mamaknya. Kenapa jalanmu kayak gitu? (What happened, Kestel? In this hot afternoon you called me. Why do you walk like that?)*
 Kestel : *Terkincit aku mak. (I pooped in my pant.)(crying)*
 Nining: *Kok bisa pula. Mangkanya kalo sesak berak itu jangan ditahan-tahan, langsung pulang. (How can you do that? I told you, don't hold back you pooping desire if you want to.)(grumpying)*

Keste 1 : *Masih main lo tadi mak.* (I was playing.)

Nining: *Itu la kau, nggak kau pikirkan sesak berakmu. Dah cepat masuk..masuk. Mandi sekalian, cebok, habis tu tidur siang.* (That's a typical of you. You didn't even think about your desire to poop. Come on in, hurry up, take a bath then take a nap) (grumpying)

Kestel : *Oya mak.* (Ok, mom.)

Nining: *Ihhh..tengok la tu hitam-itam. Ada-ada aja kau, buat nambah kerjaan orang. Mana belum siap masak lagi.* (Take a look at that black spot in your pan. You make me busy when I haven't finished my cooking hour.) (murmuring)

There are several factors that need to be understood in examining a particular cultural background in the context of communication, namely, the mindset of each individual, stereotypes, emotions, traditions, values, norms, and religious systems (Geertz 1973). The conversation above presents a typical suburban community's situation when a mother keeps grumpying to see her son's childish behaviour as a portrayal of stupidity. The mother's talkative and rude utterances towards his son is understood as a strong family tie between the mother and his son.

Scene 5:

SI	Kestel is having a bath in the bath room while Nining, his mother is cooking. They are having a conversation.
SO	Delicious vs not delicious food
LM	rude, talkative, emotionally expressive
T	Kestel
NS	Question-and-answer dialog
LA	Kestel : <i>Maak.</i> (mom..) (calling) Nining: <i>Apa lagi naaak?</i> (What else?) Kestel : <i>Masak apa?</i> (What are you cooking?) Nining: <i>Masak tahu sama ikan tongkol mamak gule.</i> (The gulai of fish and tofu.) Kestel : <i>Ish, nggak enak, malas la aku makan.</i> (I don't want to eat that bad food.) Nining: <i>Kau buat pulak saksakku ya Kestel. Di luar sana masih banyak orang yang nggak makan. Kau dimasakkan gini nggak mau makan pulak kau. Kau makan itu kincit kau.</i> (You make me angry, Kestel. There are many people who haven't got enough food too eat out there, and now you don't want to eat what I've cooked. Just eat your poop.) (grumpying).

What makes this conversation funny is the way Nining emotionally answered her son questions with some rude and uneducated manner by saying "*Kau makan itu kincit kau*" (Just eat your poop). It supposed to be not uttered by a mother to her son unless she is an uneducated woman.

Scene 6:

SI	Bobo returns to his house and tells his mother the incident about what Kestel has been going through.
SO	Dirty vs clean
LM	Fallacious reasoning
T	Kestel
NS	Question-and-answer dialog
LA	Bobo : <i>Maak, tadi si Kestel terberak di celana. Jorok kali dia kan?</i> (Mom, Kestel pooped in his pan. He is dirty, isn't he?) Mumu : <i>Udah taunya nak si Kestel itu jorok, tapi masih main aja sama si Kestel.</i> (You've known that he is dirty, but you keep playing with him)

Bobo : *Gak apa-apa la mak.* (It doesn't matter, mom)
 Mumu : *Udah sana, makan siang dulu sana. Mamak mau ke tempat wak Tatik. Di kompor sayurnya ya.* (Just go and have your lunch. I want to go to Tatik's stall. You can hve the meal on the stove, Ok.)
 Bobo : *Ya.* (Ok)

It is a typical cultural background of suburban living where the tendency to see the world in the form of opposite words and describe it in extreme forms, such as good or bad, positive or negative, healthy or sick, smart or stupid, and others. Intentional orientation refers to the tendency to see humans, objects and events in accordance with the characteristics inherent in them. In the above conversation, Mumu has given a fallacious reason in forbidding her son to play with Kestel, that portrays the tendency in judging Kestel as the dirty human being. At the end of the conversation -the punch line of the conversation- Mumu stated that she wanted to go to Tatik's stall which indicates that she is going to have a chat or gossip with her neighbours. It is a typical of suburban housewives whose houses are close to each other.

Scene 7:

SI | At Tatik's stall
 SO | Original vs fake jewelleries,
 LM | arrogant
 T | Bordir
 NS | Question-and-answer dialog
 LA | Tatik : *Ish cantik perhiasanmu, asli tu Bor?* (You have beautiful jewelries. Are they original?)
 Bordir : *Gila kau, asli la.* (Yes, of course)
 Tatik : *Ih, jaman sekarang lo, banyak yang pegang KW KW.* (You know that nowadays there are many fake jewelleries)

The above conversation presents a situation in Tatik's stall where the housewives of the neighbourhood usually have a chat or gossip. Started by Bordir who arrogantly shows her jewelleries to Tatik. Gossiping is another typical habit of suburban community's live which becomes a humorous scene in this research.

Scene 8:

SI | At Tatik's stall
 SO | Rita's swamp vs women' vagina, Original vs fake jewelleries
 LM | Arrogant, absurd interpretation
 T | Bordir, B.Kumalasari (Indonesian celebrity)
 NS | Question-and-answer dialog
 LA | Mumu: *Dari mana kau, Bor?* (Where, have you been, Bor?)
 Bordir: *Ish, dari toko mas itu aku sana.* (From the jewellery shop.)
 Mumu: *Ngeri ko ya, rame kali masmu, udah kayak rawa-rawa si Rita ramenya.* (It's marvellous. You have more jewelleries that look like Rita's swamp.)
 Bordir: *Apanya ko. Masih gini ajanya yang kupake.* (Oh, C'mon. It's just what I've usually worn.)
 Mumu: *Aslinya tu?* (Are they original?)
 Bordir: *Asli la.* (Yes, of course)
 Tatik : *Nanti kau tipu-tipu kami.* (You lied to us, didn't you?)
 Mumu: *Iya, nanti kau kayak si Kumal-Kumal itu.* (You'll be like Kumal)
 Bordir: *Yang artis itu?* (an artist?)
 Mumu & T: *Iya* (Yes)
 Bordir : *Ih..asli ni ya.*(Oh, no. It's all original.)

By using GTVH, the content of humour in the above conversation can be elaborated clearly. Firstly, Mumu's statement (*Ngeri ko ya, rame kali masmu, udah kayak rawa-rawa si Rita ramanya.* (It's marvellous. You have more jewellerys that look like Rita's swamp.)) presents a contrast different idea, between *rawa-rawa si Rita* (Rita's swamp) vs women' vagina. Mumu makes use of the phrase *rawa-rawa si Rita* (Rita's swamp) to create a humour through the absurd interpretation as the LM. It also can be seen in Mumu's statement "*Iya, nanti kau kayak si Kumal-Kumal itu*" (You'll be like Kumal) where the fake jewellerys worn by Bordir becomes the object of the conversation as targeted to one of Indonesian celebrity (B.Kumalasari) who likes to wear fake jewellerys.

Scene 9:

SI	At Tatik's stall
SO	Jewellery vs pearl cattle
LM	Absurd interpretation
T	Bordir
NS	Question-and-answer dialog
LA	Mumu: <i>Ngeri kau ya, kau sekalian ternak Mutiara? Kerang di kupingmu.</i> (You are so gorgeous. Are you pearl cattle? There are many oyster at your ears.) Bordir: <i>Iya la, kalo orang kan beli cuma mutiaranya aja, aku sama kerang-kerangnya sekalian. Biar bias kupanen.</i> (Yes, I am. Others can only buy the pearl while I can buy not only the pearl but also the oyster to make me easy to harvest it.)

This conversation portrays an absurd interpretation by using the pearl cattle vs jewellery to indicates that Bordir arrogantly owes many jewellerys. It is in line with Stephen & Philips (2014:17-18) who stated that women are gold diggers, women who are very materialistic and money driven.

Scene 10:

SI	At Tatik's stall
SO	Carat vs stained
LM	Absurd interpretation, sarcastic
T	Bordir
NS	Question-and-answer dialog
LA	Tatik : <i>Ih, jepitan rambutmu emas juga, ya Bor?</i> (Your hair pin is also made of gold, isn't it, Bor?) Bordir: <i>Ih, jangan kau pegang-pegang nanti berkarat.</i> (Don't touch it. It'll be stained) Tatik : <i>Kok bias berkarat?</i> (How can it be?) Bordir: <i>Keringatmu ada belerangnya, mengurangi kadar nanti.</i> (Your sweat contains of sulfur that can be reduced the value of it.)

In the conversation, it is found that Bordir uses absurd interpretation and sarcastic way in not allowing Tatik to touch her hair pin.

Scene 11:

SI	At Ishaya's house.
SO	none
LM	ostentatious
T	Bordir

NS monolog
 LA Ishaya, from her house, saw Bordir, Mumu and Tatik talking, so she didn't want to be left behind and came to the place where the three of them were talking while saying: “*Emang si border aja yang bisa anggar emas, biar kutunjukkan dulu punyaku ini kayak mana*” (It is not only Bordir who has many jewelleryes. I'll show them mine.)

This monolog of Ishaya presents that she is going to show her jewelleryes to others. It indicates women as ostentatious human being. However, the way Ishaya states that she is going to show her jewelleryes to others is a humorous act since it is also happened in real life.

Scene 12:

SI At Tatik's stall.
 SO none
 LM ostentatious
 T Bordir
 NS Picture from the scene
 LA



In this scene, Ishaya sits on the spot where other women are sitting, lifts up her sleeves while showing off the gold jewellery she was wearing. It also indicates that she is an ostentatious woman.

Scene13:

SI At Tatik's stall.
 SO none
 LM ostentatious
 T Ishaya
 NS Picture from the scene
 LA



In this scene, *Bordir* also tries to show off the jewellery she is wearing by pretending to brush Mumu's hair off and also pretending to feel itchy in the neck.

Scene14:

SI	At Tatik's stall
SO	Original vs fake
LM	ostentatious
T	Bordir
NS	Question-and-answer dialog
LA	Mumu : <i>Tapi kok kayak beda emasmu sama emas Ishaya ya Bor?</i> (Why does your gold look different from Ishaya's, Bor?) Ishaya : <i>Kau tau la kak emas yang asli dan yang palsu kayak mana kan?</i> (You know the different between the original and the fake one, don't you?) Bordir : <i>ih..enak aja, asli ni ya..hmm.</i> (Watch out your mouth. It's the original one.)

The Question-and-answer dialog above indicates that Ishaya tries to convey implicitly that Bordir's jewelries are fake but Bordir as the target of the conversation does not agree with Ishaya's implicit statement. Still in this scene the ostentatious characteristic of women is portrayed.

Scene 15:

SI	At Tatik's stall.
SO	none
LM	Ostentatious, sarcastic, brainless being
T	Ishaya
NS	Picture from the scene, question-and-answer dialog
LA	



Mumu: *Bauk kali la kaki kau, Bordir.* (Your foot is smelly, Bordir)

Bordir: *Nggak bauk kok. Mulutmu itu terlalu dekat sma hidungmu.* (No, it is not. It is your mouth which is too close to your nose) while smells her foot.

In this scene, Bordir raised her feet on the table to show off the jewelry she had on her feet. She makes Ishaya as the target of this action. While raising her foot, she also smells it as the result of Mumu's statement that she has a smelly foot. It indicates that one of humorous scenes in which the person tries to show her brainless behavior.

Scene 16:

SI	At Tatik's stall, Rita came calling the women from the rickshaw.
SO	Rickshaw vs car
LM	brainless being
T	Rita

NS Picture from the scene, Rita's shouting

LA Rita: *Kak (Sist..)(shouting)..Ya Allah kakeee..aku punya mobil baru..(I have new car)*



In this scene, it seen that Rita shows her brainless behavior by shouting to other women telling them that she has a new car. It is the way how humorous action and verbal portrayed in the opposite view of reality.

Scene 17:

SI At Tatik's stall, Rita comes showing her ear jewelery.

SO Blue diamond vs goat testicle

LM Ostentatious, brainless being, sarcastic

T Rita

NS question-and-answer dialog

LA Rita : *Kak, kak, aku baru dapat hantaran l, blue diamon. Ini ni...hmm (Sists, I've just got marriage delivery, blue diamond. Here it is.)(while showing the earrings she is wearing).*

Mumu : *Kok kekgitu bentuknya blue diamond? Mana da kekgitu bentuk berlian. (Why is the shape of blue diamond like that. It is not diamond.)*

Ishaya : *Itu bukan blue diamond lo, itu telur kambing.(It's not blue diamond, but goat testicle).*

Rita : *Apanya kelen, nggak kelen tengok aku td turun dari mana. Mobil bak. (Don't you all see that I've just get off from the car?)*

Bordir : *Becak barang itu bodoh. Mana ada mobil bentuknya kek gitu. (That's a rickshaw. Stupid you.)*

From the conversation above, Rita arises the viewers' laughter by showing off her jewelry and saying that her earrings as blue diamond. Here, she explicitly portrays her brainless behavior that makes Ishaya and Bordir reply by saying sarcastic words such as *telur kambing* (goat testicle) and *bodoh* (stupid).

Scene 18:

SI At Tatik's stall

SO Rich woman vs having a lot of debt

LM satirical

T Bordir

NS question-and-answer dialog

LA Rita admits that the Bordir's jewelries are bought from Night market. Bordir feels angry, and says:

Bordir : *Mengarang-ngarang aja si Rita ini. Dah la pulang la aku Tik. Catat ini ya.. (Rita, you plays words. I'm going home. Put it in your note) (pointing to the meals she had eaten)*

Tatik : *woo. Emas banyak, tapi ngutang aja kerja kau. (You have many jewelries as well as your debt.)*

| Mumu & Ishaya : *hahaha* (Laughing)

The funny scene arises when Bordir feels annoyed by Rita's statement that the jewelries she has are bought from the night market. Then, finally she rushes to go home and leaves the debt note in Tatik's stall which portrays the habit of suburban housewives.

5. Conclusion

This paper demonstrates that the GTVH theory may be applied to conversational data in addition to written text. As the purpose of this paper is to ascertain how structural features of conversational humour are related to the functions provided by humorous utterances and actions, it can be concluded from the conversational data of a suburban community in Kontrakan Rempong YouTube content displayed according to the GTVH theory that each of the conversations taken from the Pamer (episode 69) video depicts t More precisely, the visible behaviors of inhabitants become a regular topic of discourse among housewives. The theme is primarily concerned with how members of a particular family behave in the community and how women as homemakers identify as community members. The targeted behaviors include being chatty, materialistic, impolite and pompous, having an unconventional view of the world, and gossipmongers who spread tales about someone's debt.

There are numerous limitations to this work, as it focuses exclusively on the examination of conversational humour in Kontrakan Rempong YouTube footage using the GTVH theory. Additionally, additional research from other academics is necessary to gain additional knowledge in the topic of verbal humour as it relates to humorous dialogue.

References

- [1] Archakis, A., & Tsakona, V. (2005). Analyzing conversational data in GTVH terms: A new approach to the issue of identity construction via humor. doi:[10.1515/humr.2005.18.1.41](https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2005.18.1.41)
- [2] Archakis, A., S. L. (2014). Linguistic varieties in style: Humorous representations in Greek mass culture texts. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 46-55.
- [3] Attardo, S. (2001). Humorous Texts: A semantic and pragmatic analysis. In *Humour research* (Vol. 6). Youngstown State University: Mouton de Gruyter.
- [4] Attardo, S. (1994). *Linguistic Theories of Humour (vol.1, Humour Research)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- [5] Attardo, S. (2017). *The General Theory of Verbal Humor*. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *The routledge handbook of language and humor*. (Routledge, Ed.) New York & London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- [6] Attardo, S & Hempelmann, Christian & Maio, Sara. (2002). Script oppositions and logical mechanisms: Modeling incongruities and their resolutions. *Humor-international Journal of Humor Research - HUMOR*. 15. 3-46. [10.1515/humr.2002.004](https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2002.004).
- [7] Branon, L. (2017). *Gender: Psychological Perseptive* (7th ed). New York & London: Routledge.
- [8] Brock, A. (2005). Analyzing scripts in humorous communication. *International Journal of Humour Research*, 353-360.
- [9] Canestrari, C. (2010). Meta-communicative signals and humorous verbal interchanges: A case study, *HUMOR*, 23(3), 327-349. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2010.015>
- [10] Christian F. Hempelmann, W. R. (2005). 3 WD meets GTVH: Breaking the ground for interdisciplinary humor research. *Humor: International Journal of Humour Research*, 18-4, 353-387.
- [11] Damanik, S. F., & Mulyadi. (2020). Indonesian Humorous Status in Social Media: An Application of Script-Based Semantic Theory of Humour. *Studies in English Language and Education, Vol 7, No 2 (2020)*, 657-671.
- [12] Denis McQuail, P. G. (2005). *Communication Theory and Research (European Journal of Communication)*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [13] Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London & New York: Routledge .
- [14] Geertz, Clifford. (1973). "The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man." In *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books, Inc, 1-15.
- [15] Goebel, B. (2011). *Humour Writing: Activities for the English Classroom*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- [16] Hempelmann, C. F., & Ruch, W. (2005). 3 WD meets GTVH: Breaking the ground for interdisciplinary humor research, *HUMOR*, 18(4), 353-387. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2005.18.4.353>
- [17] Kumar, R. (2018). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. Sage Publication Ltd.
- [18] Lew, R. (1996). An ambiguity-based theory of the linguistic verbal joke in English. Doctoral Thesis, Adam Mickiewicz University.
- [19] Martin, R. A. (2007). *The Psychology of Humour: An Integrative Approach*. Burlington: Elsevier Academic Press.

- [20] Masa'eli, Bahareh & Heidari-Shahreza, Mohammad Ali. (2016). A Linguistic Analysis of Persian Online Jokes in Light of General Theory of Verbal Humor. 3. 230-239.
- [21] Miczo, N. (2014). Analyzing structure and function in humor: Preliminary sketch of a message-centered model. *Humor* 27(3), 461-480.
- [22] Munandar, U. (2004). *Pengembangan Kreativitas Anak berbakat*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- [23] Pasaribu, Truly & Kadarisman, A. (2016). Coding logical mechanism and stereotyping in gender cyber humors. 16. 22. 10.24167/celt.v16i1.485.
- [24] Raskin, V. (1985). *Semantic Mechanisms of Humour*. Dordrecht/Boston/Lancaster: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- [25] Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4), 696-735. doi:10.1353/lan.1974.0010.
- [26] Sacks, H. (1974). *An analysis of the course of a joke's telling*. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [27] Stephens, Dionne & Phillips, Layli. (2003). Freaks, Gold Diggers, Divas, and Dykes: The Sociohistorical Development of Adolescent African American Women's Sexual Scripts. *Sexuality & Culture*. 7. 3-49. 10.1007/BF03159848.
- [28] Tsakona, A. A. (2005). Analyzing conversational data in GTVH terms: A new approach to the issue of identity construction via humor. *International Journal of Humor Research*, 41-68.
- [29] Tsakona, V. (2009). Language and image interaction in cartoons: Towards a multimodal theory of humor. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(6), 1171-1188.
- [30] Warintil Official. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-7OSZK8VzqE>