

TYPES AND FUNCTION OF HUMOR IN INDONESIAN STUDIUM GENERALE LECTURES (*Jenis dan Fungsi Humor pada Kuliah Umum Bahasa Indonesia*)

Mohammad Rizqi
Balai Bahasa Provinsi Jawa Barat
Jalan Sumbawa 11, Kota Bandung, Jawa Barat 40113
Posel: qqlelennon@gmail.com

(Naskah diterima 24 Oktober 2020—Direvisi 17 Desember 2020—Disetujui 17 Desember 2020)

Abstrak

Artikel ini membahas jenis dan fungsi humor dalam mata kuliah umum bahasa Indonesia. Ada beberapa aspek yang dianalisis dalam kuliah umum bahasa Indonesia yang dikaitkan dengan budaya akademik. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memerikan jenis dan fungsi humor dengan menelaah penggunaan humor di lingkungan akademik di Indonesia. Data yang dianalisis adalah transkrip yang dipilih dari video YouTube yang dipilih dari kuliah umum oleh tiga tokoh politik Indonesia. Data diunduh terlebih dahulu lalu kalimat yang terkait dengan penelitian dicatat. Data yang terkait humor diidentifikasi dan dipilah sesuai dengan jenis dan fungsinya. Selanjutnya data diklasifikasikan berdasarkan klasifikasi humor oleh Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray & Weir. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat empat jenis humor, yakni *affiliative humor*, *self-enhancing humor*, *aggressive humor*, dan *self-defeating humor* yang ada dalam kuliah umum di Indonesia. Yang paling sering digunakan adalah *aggressive humor* yang termasuk dalam lawakan ofensif.

Kata kunci: kuliah umum, *affiliative humor*, *self-enhancing humor*, *aggressive humor*, *self-defeating humor*

Abstract

This paper discuss the type and function of humor in Indonesian studium generale lectures. There are some aspects that analyze in Indonesian studium generale lectures related to the academic culture. This aim of the research is to describe types and function of humor by analyzing the use of humor in Indonesian academic scope. Data is taken from YouTube video of studium generale lectures given by three political figures of Indonesia. First, the writer downloaded the data of humor style, then identified the data and separated them in accordance with the style and function. Furthermore, the writer classified the data based on classification of humor by Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Grey & Weir. The result of this study show that there are affiliative humor, self-enhancing humor, aggressive humor, and self-defeating humor in Indonesian studium generale lectures, all four types of humor in the theory occurred, and the most frequently used type of humor is aggressive humor, to which offensive jokes belong.

Keywords: studium generale, *affiliative humor*, *self-enhancing humor*, *aggressive humor*, *self-defeating humor*

INTRODUCTION

It is widely believed that humor is an important resource for well-being.

Confronted with a difficult life situation, a German saying goes “have a sense of humor” and reveals the implicit assumption that making jokes or enjoying

absurdities of current life circumstances might help in overcoming a stressful life situation. Humor, conceptualized as a habitual behavior pattern with the general tendency to laugh or tell funny stories, is a multifaceted construct that might be used, for example, to cheer up others as well as oneself or to engage in personal relations (Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, 2003). One might also differentiate humor-related behaviors by the manner in which the humor is delivered, for example, if humor is used to devalue oneself or others or to appraise one's or others' abilities, respectively. The manner in which humor is delivered is widely accepted as disposition and therefore as certain style of humor. There is reason to believe that humor plays an important role in explaining well-being. Several sayings, like the one introduced earlier, remind us of the "healing nature of laughter" or the effectiveness of "coping with humor". Empirical evidence, particularly by Martin et. al. (Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, 2003), shows important associations of humor styles with well-being. However, humor as a psychological construct is characterized by styles that are closely interrelated but not equally adaptive for well-being (Ruch, 2007). By investigating different constellations of humor styles, new associations might emerge and advance the understanding of humor styles and their association with well-being. Therefore, the present study will develop and use a typology of humor styles similar to the approach of Galloway (Galloway, 2010). Building upon the framework of Martin et. al. and in an attempt to further clarify the associations between humor styles and their contribution to promote well-being, this contribution will investigate how humor types are related to self-regulatory strategies, quality of life, and well-being

(Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, 2003).

The study concerns the types and function of humor in academic lectures. Humor is a commonly used pragmatic strategy in various contexts. In language interaction, it can maintain and develop social relations, create solidarity, and even construct identities. It may even be a way to informally command or give instructions (Aarons, D. & Mierowsky, 2017). Also, the occurrences of humor are not exclusive to humorous situations such as stand up comedies or TV shows only—it is also used in professional and even academic contexts. The present study focuses particularly on academic contexts because the traditional advice on the context is to be cohesive, clear, and to avoid ambiguity, since audiences in the discourse tend to expect the exercise of academic language norms by each speaker and writer. Meanwhile, for a situation to be humorous, it requires semantic incongruity and the flouting of pragmatic principles.

It has been found that in academic contexts, humor can be used to construct a certain kind of power relation (Reershemius, 2012), to maintain an identity (Nesi, 2012) or to enhance students' understanding. These, however, are mostly based on Western academic cultures. Meanwhile, both humor and academic discourse are culture specific; in fact, understanding humor in different cultural settings is one the most significant demands affecting students' effective comprehension of lectures (Hyland, 2009).

This study described and explained the types and function of humor style in Indonesian studium generale lectures used by three Indonesian political figures; Sri Mulyani (Minister of Finance), Susi Pudjiastuti (Minister of Marine Affairs and Fisheries), and Ignasius Jonan (Minister of Energy and Mineral

Resources). The writer collected the data from three YouTube videos of studium generale lectures in Institut Teknologi Bandung's channel. The university claimed that weekly studium generale lectures are made required course for all the students as part of their effort in building a generation with a sense of responsibility and respect toward their country (Andis, 2011). The analysis of this study looked from the pragmatic scope of linguistics; contexts would be the main consideration in determining the functions of humor. The following part discussed previous studies related to the topic and the theories that used in this research.

Academic Discourse and as an Expanding Field of Study

Hyland defined academic discourse as paradigms and language use existing in the academy (Hyland, 2009). When discussing the genres included in the discourse, he mentioned lectures, to which studium generale contexts could be included, as one of the key genres in the academic world.

As a field of research, academic discourse is an expanding one. Hyland mentions that studies into the field has grown massively since the mid-1960s due to several factors, one of which is how in many countries in Europe, Asia and Australia, increasing social inclusion had caused an expansion of Higher Education in the last two decades.

The Pragmatics of Humor in Academic Discourse

Though an unlikely pair, the relation between humor and academic discourse has become an underlying notion for a number of studies. For one, examined the linguistic features of humor and their link to a quality of a writing. The surprising

finding of the study was that there is a "small but positive link" between the two. In the field of spoken academic discourse, Nesi studied the reasons why lecturers use humor in their teaching, and it was found that humor serves several social functions—to preserve social order and break tension—as well as functions related to maintaining the speaker's academic and professional identity (Nesi, 2012). While the previous two only focuses on the functions of humor, a corpus-based research by Reershemius examined the pragmatic functions of humor in relation to academic cultures of different academic environment (in this case German and English) of the speakers (Reershemius, 2012). The results revealed that German and English presenters equally use humor in their academic lectures, but for different purposes, thus confirming the notion of academic culture.

The background of this study was to find out how humor used in stadium generale lectures in Indonesian university as a specific academic scopes. To examine the underlying structure of the humor styles, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses with the whole sample were performed. Differential constellations of humor styles, so called humor types, were investigated. Therefore, in order to find different humor types, hierarchical clustering was performed.

Typology of Humor Styles

To assess differences in humor styles, Martin developed the Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ), an instrument designed to assess habitual humor-related behavior patterns, that is, different styles of humor (Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, 2003). They distinguish four humor styles on the two continua "humor to enhance self-versus

relationships with others” and “benign versus potentially detrimental humor”. To define these humor styles, Martin et. al. illustrate the humor styles with their potential outcomes in terms of well-being and social interactions.

In the field of psychology, humor has been examined through a number of scales focusing on aspects of the sense of humor related to a speaker’s mental health. Martin argued that these scales, however, are often inadequate for analyzing humor in relation to mental health since they do not assess the difference between “positive” humor and “negative” humor. Thus, Martin developed a questionnaire which arguably assesses whether or not the humor used share a positive link to someone’s mental health, namely the Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ). This scale is argued to focus on the interpersonal functions of humor by individuals in their everyday lives. In developing this scale, Martin et. al. developed a theoretical classification of the functions of humor into four types: the affiliative humor, self-enhancing humor, aggressive humor, and self-defeating humor (Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, 2003).

Affiliative Humor

Affiliative humor reflects a humor style that is used to enhance one’s relationships with others in a relatively benign way. It is the tendency to tell jokes and funny stories, in order to amuse and laugh with others. Considered to share a positive link to a speaker’s mental health, affiliative humor is a type of humor in which the speaker simply “tell jokes”. The purpose of this type of humor is merely to amuse or to release tension in communication. Affiliative humor may be produced through narratives, anecdotes, wordplays, etc. This type of humor usually does not

took an expense, neither the speaker’s self, nor the listener of the joke.

Self-Enhancing Humor

Different from the affiliative type of humor, instead of simply telling jokes, *self-enhancing humor* serves a certain purpose in communication. This type is used by individuals to take a stance and control of the social relationship in a conversation. *Self-enhancing humor* refers to humor to enhance the self in a tolerant way and is the tendency to maintain a humorous outlook on life to cheer oneself up. In this present study, the jokes categorized into this type are those related to the speaker’s self, more specifically those making the speaker seemed “better” in the eyes of the audience.

Aggressive Humor

Aggressive humor is a hostile form of humor to enhance the self at the expense of others and included sarcastic or criticizing humor. The individual using it tells jokes, attempts to amuse or to cause laughter, at the expense of others. This type of humor is used in a communication, simply put, to insult or ridicule others. This may be produced through a sarcasm, direct teasing, etc. Sharing a negative link to an individual’s mental health, this type of humor is even related to an attitude of ignoring the possible impact of the joke towards others. Thus, offensive jokes such as sexist and racist jokes belong to this type. Aggressive humor can be seen as antisocial and detrimental for social interactions, but could also be useful in enhancing one’s feelings of being superior to others or useful in keeping one’s place in the social hierarchy, which both might involve a sense of competence, control, and well-being.

Self-Defeating Humor

Self-defeating humor is used to enhance relationships with others at the expense and detriment of the self. A self-defeating use of humor is to make fun of oneself for the enjoyment of others, that is, to use humor in a self-disparaging way, or laughing along with others when being made fun of (Chen, G.-H., & Martin, 2007). This last type of humor also took an expense, which is the speaker's self. It can simply be described as the type of humor in which we insult ourselves to cause laughter in a communication. This type of humor, similar to aggressive humor, may be produced through sarcasm, direct teasing, etc. *Self-defeating humor* might be useful to (re)negotiate one's place in the social hierarchy, to amuse others by making a fool of oneself, and therefore, in general, to affiliate with others.

METHODOLOGY

The data for this analysis are three videos of *studium generale* lectures by Indonesian political figures set in Institut Teknologi Bandung (ITB). Speakers invited for these lectures varied from national political figures, local successful entrepreneurs, etc., and they would deliver presentations related to their own field. In order to compose a balanced set of data, the three videos chosen are of lectures by three current Indonesian ministers.

This study will adopt a descriptive qualitative analysis in examining the data. The three videos were downloaded from ITB's YouTube channel. Afterwards, the videos were carefully watched, and taking up the methods in previous studies (Nesi, 2012; Reershemius, 2012), the use of humor were identified through the audience's instances of laughter. Each occurrences of humor was analyzed

pragmatically to be classified into the four types of humor according to Martin et. al., by putting them in a table. Following this classification, the patterns found the the types of humor used will be analyzed to make a generalized conclusion which would answer the research question (Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, 2003).

From each tape, I took a twenty minute excerpt and transcribed all instances of humor. Unanalyzed portions of the tape were also monitored, in order to extract maximum background information and understanding of the group dynamics, which would help to inform the analysis. For the purposes of this paper, I regard humor as being anything the speaker intends to be funny. Tannen points out that the true intention of any utterance cannot be established from the examination of linguistic form alone. This is clearly a problem. I was interested in intentional humor, including humor that remained unsupported by the audience. This precluded a definition based on audience response. While criteria based on speaker intention are clearly fraught with problems of indeterminacy and subjectivity, I decided to work within these limitations, and attempt to use as much objective evidence as was available in each case. As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, this technique effectively amounted to situating myself as part of the audience, and assessing the utterance's function by its effect on me.

In identifying and coding the humor, numerous clues were used to determine the speaker's intention. I drew on my knowledge of the speakers and the groups as a whole, and also on knowledge of the groups gleaned from the remaining non-analyzed tape. I relied heavily on context to determine the speaker's intention, and also took into account the audience's response. The audience formed part of the

group as a whole and so probably shared a similar sense of what is funny with the speaker, so if something appeared to be meant humorously, then an amused audience would provide evidence in support of this. The speaker's tone of voice was also important. Sudden changes in pace or pitch, a laughing or smiling voice and other verbal clues were taken into consideration (Crystal, 1969).

DISCUSSION

The writer fitted log-linear models, firstly to investigate the distribution of the four main functions of humor, and then to investigate behavior more closely with

regard to all of the strategies and the specific psychological functions. I outline the overall distribution of the different functions and then move on to describe the model which fits each of the strategies separately.

The research found that all types of humor introduced by Martin et. al., in 2003 can be found in the three videos of Indonesian studium generale lectures. The following is a table of the total usages of humor, broke down in to the four types of humor proposed by Martin et. Al. Further discussion regarding these results will be written per types of humor.

Table 1 Total Usages of Humor

No	Speaker	Total Usage of Humor	TYPES OF HUMOR			
			Affiliative	Self-Enhancing	Aggressive	Self-Defeating
1.	Sri Mulyani	30	14	2	12	2
2.	Susi Pudjiastuti	29	6	5	14	4
3.	Ignasius Jonan	46	17	2	25	2
TOTAL		105	37	9	51	8

That I chose to investigate the data from Indonesian studium generale lectures has no doubt influenced the types of functions for which humor is used in my data. There are very few examples of the particularly negative categories - to control, and to create conflict. These functions have been identified as common functions for humor in the literature (Collinson, 1988; Martineau, 1972), but it seems very plausible that the informal friendly context is the reason there are few instances in my sample.

Achieving the general function described in Table 1 was more often the

only purpose of the humor produced by men. Women were more likely to also use the humor for some further function, such as to create solidarity through sharing. That the general function was used significantly more by men than by women is probably related to the fact that appearing witty seems more central to a male personal identity than to a female identity (Hay, 1995). A short quip or one-liner, then, performs positive work on a male personal identity. In general, this ability seems much less important for women, and so when they use humor, it tends to be performing a further

identifiable function beyond the general function of increasing solidarity and power and positively affecting personal identity.

It could be argued that female was unable to interpret much of the male humor, and so more male humor than female humor ended up in this general category, which could be seen in some ways as an 'other' category. The claim that males more often use humor for the sole purpose of impressing, appearing funny, or creating a positive personal identity is in part supported by past findings.

Ervin-Tripp and Lampert observed that men's humor consists largely of flip wisecracks and that this tendency further increased in mixed-sex groups. Most short wisecracks in my sample fell into this general function. They are typical of a type of humor designed to elevate status and solidarity within the group and to work on personal identity, without performing any further function (Ervin-Tripp, 1992).

Aggressive Humor

As the most frequently used type of humor—from the three lectures as a whole, and for the second and third lecturers individually—the use of aggressive humor gave the most contour to the findings of this study. The third lecturer, Ignasius Jonan, used this type of humor the most. Of the 46 times he used humor in total, 25 of the jokes belong to this type.

As had been stated previously, offensive jokes such as sexist or racist jokes belong to the aggressive type of humor. In Jonan's case, such kind of humor were actually used. Moffit & Carr proposed that sexual objectification of a woman occurs when she is seen merely based on her appearance, rather than her competence (Darwin, S. M., Moffit, L. B., & Carr, 2010). When he was

presenting the profile of New Zealand's female prime minister, he asked some male members of the audience about whether or not they think she was "pretty". He further asked some of them to compare the prime minister to women who sat next to each of them.

Ignasius Jonan: *Eh dek yang belakang (0.4) cantik nggak? (0.5) cantik:k (0.2) sama sebelahmu cantik mana?*

Ignasius Jonan: Hey, you in the back. (Do you think) she's pretty? Yes. Compared to the one next to you, which one is prettier?

By referring to the women as "*sebelahmu*", which can be translated into "the one next to you", a third person pronoun, even though they are equally members of the audience, he was doing an objectification of them (Lochrie, 1999) through language use. As he asked male members of the audience to compare two women, the objectification can be identified as a sexual objectification of women.

Not all of the aggressive humor found in the data share the same degree of offensiveness. A more significant pattern is found, however, in terms of the use of third person pronoun in such humor, marking an objectification. At another time, Ignasius Jonan asked for a volunteer from the audience to read his slide, and after one student did, he made fun of the way she talked, again, using a third person pronoun.

Ignasius Jonan Hmm (0.2) *kaya nangis ya ini bacanya.*

Ignasius Jonan> Hmm, this one read like she's crying.

Though nonetheless an insult, the joke he made this time is not as offensive as the previous one, since he simply made fun of the way one student talked.

As for the other two lecturers, most of the aggressive humor they used were not directed toward the audience.

Sri Mulyani: *Saya kenal banyak sekali menteri keuangan dan pada saat harga minyak seratus mereka gagah banget (.). Pergi kemana-mana naik first class (.). ngomong kayaknya (0.2) dunia itu akan indah terus gitu. pada saat harga minyak tiga puluh mereka menjadi sangat humble (.). Gitu kan? Nah.*

Sri Mulyani: I know many ministers of finance and when oil price was one hundred they were very proud. (They) travel everywhere with first class (planes), talked as if the world is always going to be beautiful. (But) when oil price was three hundred they became very humble. It's always like that, right?

Susi Pudjiastuti: Thailand bilang (0.2) ya we sometime also have problem (0.3) tapi mereka agak pelan kan sebetulnya mereka udah nggak punya ikan. ka↑n.

Susi Pudjiastuti: (The ambassador of) Thailand said, yes we sometime also have problem, but they did not react as much because actually they don't have fishes anymore, see.

The use of third person pronoun “they” and “(the ambassador of) Thailand”, again, marked an objectification toward people who are not included in the audience. Instead of addressing an insult toward the audience, they addressed one toward a third party, those ministers and ambassador of Thailand, who are “actors” of their narrative, making it a humor aimed to express solidarity and inclusion in a group (Lochrie, 1999).

Affiliative Humor

As the second most frequently used type of humor, 37 out of the 109 total usages of humor in the three lectures analyzed belong to the affiliative type of humor. The speaker who used this type of humor

the most is also speaker 3, Ignasius Jonan. This is the second largest number to the third type of humor, which is the aggressive type. The jokes belong in this type are jokes where the speaker simply make fun of something without expensing any party; neither the speaker nor the listener.

With the highest number of total humor usage, Ignasius Jonan also uses the affiliative humor the most out of the three lecturers. As the current Indonesian Minister of Energy and Mineral resources, he has an experience of being the head of PT. Kereta Api Indonesia. The lecture he gave in the video was actually about leadership, and instead of drawing topics from his position as a minister, he drew a lot of topics and advices for the audience, which are mostly students of ITB, from his experience as the head of PT. KAI. He was even offering to give further lecture about the topic for the students who studies transportation, when he made one of his affiliative jokes.

From the four excerpts of aggressive jokes found in the study above, it can be inferred that the abundant use of aggressive humor varied in terms of to whom the insult is addressed and the implicature of the joke.

Ignasius Jonan: *Nanti kalo mau minta sesi sendiri (0.3) mungkin fakultas yang ngurusi prodi transportasi (0.2) kalo mau kelas sendiri sih tentang kereta api sih saya mau cerita sih pak. (1.2) Tapi nggak satu jam setengah sih (0.3) mungkin (0.5) err (0.3) tiga empat jam lah.*

Ignasius Jonan: Later if you want another session, maybe for the faculty that includes studies of transportation, if you want your own class about trains, I would like to share more. But maybe not for an hour and a half. Maybe for about three or four hours.

In this joke, Jonan makes an absurd statement about having a class for “three or four hours”. The audience seemed to think that the additional class he offered would logically take less time than the studium generale lecture, which is about an hour and a half. However, Jonan, aware of this expectation, jokingly said that the additional class would take about three to four hours, which is twice and more of the duration for the studium generale lectures. This humor consist only of a pure joke, an absurd statement of the context. The placement of the joke at the end of a rather long speech is similar to the character of an anecdote. An anecdote is a type of a narrative, which according to Thompson is one of the ways to engage with the audience (Thompson, 2002).

Although Jonan uses the most affiliative humor, relatively, Sri Mulyani is the one that uses the type of humor most often compared to the other types; 14 out of 33 jokes she made in the lecture are of this type. She even opened her lecture with one of these jokes.

Sri Mulyani: Dan yang saya sayangi saya banggakan (.) para mahasiswa ITB yang pada sore hari ini menghadiri kuliah studium generale (.) kreditnya KU0 (0.2) 4 (.) 078 (.) tiga SKS, satu jam (0.4) kira-kira

Sri Mulyani: And the students of ITB whom I love and proud of, who this afternoon are attending this studium generale lecture. The credit for this lecture is KU04978. Three SKS, about an hour.

The audience laughed when she explicitly mentioned the time the lecture would take; three SKS, Indonesian term for university credit unit, which would take about an hour. It is uncommon for Indonesian lecturer to explicitly “translate” the number university credit units into how many hours it would take.

Instead, it is normally students who count the hours themselves. This fits to the incongruity theory of humor by Raskin (Nesi, 2012), which argued that something has to contradict the logical expectation of what is supposed to happen in a context (opposition of scripts). The likely implicature of this joke is probably to make fun of students’ awareness of the time limit. Aside from that, since there is no expense for this joke—neither the speaker, nor the listener—it belongs to the affiliative type of humor.

The usage of affiliative humor, as can be seen from the two examples above, is used to take the place of “understanding” the audience, and even somewhat “choosing their side”. Jonan joked that he will give another lecture for twice the duration of studium generale lecture, and Mulyani made fun of students’ awareness of the time limit.

Although not the most used type of humor, the usage of affiliative humor shows that among the three presenters, there are attempts to amuse the audience and release the social tension of the context.

Self-Enhancing Humor

This type of humor, along with self-defeating humor, are the least used types of humor in the three lectures. Of all three lecturers, the second lecturer, Susi Pudjiastuti is the one who relatively used this type of humor the most. One example of her usage of self-enhancing humor occurred when she was telling a story about the discussion she had with ambassadors of six countries. In narrating the story, she humorously mentioned how the ambassadors underestimate her threat to sink the ships that illegally fished in Indonesian seas.

Susi Pudjiastuti: *Beberapa keliatan mukanya kaget beberapa mukanya oke mungkin mereka belum kebayang masih (0.2) ah paling mikirnya (0.2) bu menteri ini ngomong saja:: dia ngga:*

Susi Pudjiastuti: Some of them looked surprised and some looked fine, maybe because they still cannot imagine (the realization). Maybe they think ‘ah’, this minister only talks about it, she won’t (actually do it).

Since the very definition of self-enhancing humor is closely related to the notion of “face” in Politeness Theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), the analysis of this joke relied heavily on this theory. What Pudjiastuti did was narrating her work as a minister, and made fun of people who underestimated her. Therefore, this joke can be categorized as an implicit act of maintaining a competence face (Ting-Toomey, 2005). Thus, the act of maintaining a positive face makes this joke belong to the self-enhancing type.

Similar employment of humor is also done by the first lecturer, Sri Mulyani. When presenting about the development of Indonesian economy in the last few years, she referred to a particular year when she was serving as Indonesian Minister of Finance.

Sri Mulyani *Indonesia even dalam situasi yang shock waktu itu (.) karena menteri keuangannya Sri Mulyani juga waktu itu (.) Em (0.2) Kita masih bisa menjaga empat koma enam dan kemudian bahkan recover dengan sangat cepat di enam koma dua (0.2) pada tahun selanjutnya.*

Sri Mulyani: Indonesia, even in a in the middle of a shock back then, because the minister of economy was Sri Mulyani too at the time, we can still maintain our position at four point six, and afterwards even recover quickly to six point two in the following year.

Strictly speaking, this act can be another act of maintaining a competence face (Ting-Toomey, 2005). However, the effort is done explicitly by praising her own success in back then—which is not a common way to maintain a face—producing a humor in line with incongruity theory by Raskin. Nonetheless, the act of maintaining a positive face here makes this joke belong to the self-enhancing type.

Though belonging to the least used types of humor, the occurrences of self-enhancing humor shows that from time to time, speakers used joke to maintain positive face in the eyes of the audience.

Self-Defeating Humor

Self-defeating humor, in this study’s case, does not necessarily contradict the purpose of self-enhancing humor. In his study of the way presenters use humor in academic research presentation, Reershemius found some usages of humor which were aimed to flatten the hierarchy between the speaker and the listeners (Reershemius, 2012). Some of those humor that he presented in the article can be categorized as self-defeating humor. However, the self-defeating humor found in this study are not always aimed for that purpose.

For one, when Susi Pudjiastuti told the story of her negotiation with the six ambassadors, she mimic the way she asked for their help in punishing the ships that illegally crossed Indonesian borders.

Susi Pudjiastuti: *We don’t have enough monitoring surveillance (0.2) technology. blablabla (0.5) merendahkan.*

Susi Pudjiastuti: We don’t have enough monitoring surveillance (and) technology, blablabla. I was trying to look modest, see.

In this case, instead of trying to undo the hierarchy of the context, she underline her role as a minister by telling a story of her work as a minister. She simply narrated how she asked for the ambassadors' help, and she made fun of how she tried to look modest in front of them. Hence, she maintained a competence face as a minister, and preserve the hierarchy of the context.

One of such attempt, however, was done by the first speaker, Sri Mulyani. As had been mentioned earlier, she was very aware, and kept showing her awareness, of the time limit for her lecture. Around thirty minutes into her lecture, she mentioned how she was exceeding her own time plan for the first topic.

Sri Mulyani: *Saya sudah lebih dari setengah jam masih belum selesai nomer satu.*

Sri Mulyani: It's past half an hour now and I still haven't finished (topic) number one.

By explicitly mentioning how she exceeded her own time plan, the likely implicature of this joke is that she invited the audience to laugh at her mistake, and then they would somewhat think less of her. Indeed, she did not exactly try to position herself as equals to the audience, but she made an attempt to lower her position in the hierarchy.

The use of self-defeating humor, though one of the least among the other types, showed some interesting findings of this study, from which an inference can be made about studium generale lectures in Indonesia. That is, self-defeating humor are not always aimed to deconstruct the hierarchy of a context; sometimes, it is even used to accentuate it.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study has shown that all types of humor categorized by Martin et. al. can be found in the three videos of studium generale lectures by Indonesian ministers (Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, 2003). The most frequently used type of humor is the aggressive humor—51 out of 105 usages of humor in total—, which include offensive jokes (i.e. sexist joke). Since Hyland defined academic discourse as language within the academy, the use of sexist joke is indeed a surprising and disappointing finding (Hyland, 2009). This implies that awareness of political correctness in Indonesian academic discourse, specifically in studium generale lectures, still needs to be improved.

The second most often type of humor to occur is the affiliative jokes, which implies that attempts to form solidarity and group inclusion do occur in Indonesian academic culture, as in some other academic environments.

As for the usages of self-enhancing humor, they predictably function to maintain a positive face of the speaker. On the other hand, the intriguing finding is that some usages of self-defeating humor do function similarly, though some are aimed more significantly to form solidarity and break down the hierarchy of the academic context.

Humor types were differentially associated with self-regulatory strategies, self-esteem, and well-being. Self-enhancers, characterized by high self-enhancing humor, mean affiliative, low aggressive, and low self-defeating humor showed most favorable associations with quality of life and wellbeing measures. In sum, these findings gained with a typological approach provide further evidence for self-enhancing humor as important resource for well-being, and

especially underline the benefits when self-defeating and aggressive humor are absent.

REFERENCES

- Aarons, D. & Mierowsky, M. (2017). How to do things with jokes: Speech acts in standup comedy. *The European Journal of Humour Research*, 5(4), 158–168.
- Andis, N. (2011). Studium Generale: Berbagi Bersama Menpera. Retrieved from <https://www.itb.ac.id/news/read/3100/home/studium-generale-berbagi-bersama-menpera>
- Brown, P. & S. L. (1987). *Politeness; Some Universals in Language Usage (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics; 4)*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, G.-H., & Martin, R. A. (2007). A Comparison of Humor Styles, coping humor, and mental health between Chinese and Canadian university students. *Humor*, 20(3), 215–234. <https://doi.org/10.1515/HUMOR.2007.011>
- Collinson, D. (1988). Engineering humour: Masculinity, joking and conflict in shop-floor relations. *Organization Studies*, 9(2), 181–199.
- Crystal, D. (1969). *Prosodic systems and intonation in English*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Darwin, S. M., Moffit, L. B., & Carr, E. R. (2010). Sexual Objectification: Advances to Theory and Research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 20(10), 1–33.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. and M. D. L. (1992). Gender differences in the construction of humorous talk. In M. B. and B. M. K. Hall (Ed.), *Locating power: Proceedings of the second Berkeley Women and Language Conference* (pp. 108–117). Berkeley: WOrman and Language Group.
- Galloway, G. (2010). Individual differences in personal humor styles: Identification of prominent patterns and their associates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 563–567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.12.007>
- Hay, J. (1995). *Gender and humour: Beyond a joke*. Victoria University of Wellington.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic Discourse*. London/New York: Continuum.
- Lochrie, K. (1999). *Covert Operations: The Medieval Uses of Secrecy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Martin, R. A., Doris, P. P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the Humor Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(1), 48–75.
- Martineau, W. (1972). A model of the social functions of humor. In J. Goldstein and P.E. McGhee (Ed.), *The psychology of humor* (pp. 101–125). New York: Academic Press.
- Nesi, H. (2012). Laughter in university lectures. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(2), 79–89.
- Reershemius, G. (2012). Research cultures and the pragmatic functions of humor in academic research presentations: A corpus-assisted analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 863–875.
- Ruch, W. (Ed.). (2007). *The sense of humor: Explorations of a personality characteristic*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thompson, S. (2002). As the story unfolds’: The uses of narrative in

research presentations. In *The language of conferencing* (pp. 147–168).

Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). Identity negotiation theory: Crossing cultural boundaries. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 211–233). California: Sage Publications.