Sarcasm In K-Van's Stand-Up Comedy Show: A Critical Stylistic Perspective

Zainab Haider Hussein[1], Prof. Iman Mingher Obied[2]
hum919.zanab.haider@student.uobabylon.edu.iq[1], hum824.eman.mnghr@uobabylon.edu.iq[2]

Abstract
Sarcasm is a common mode of emotional expression in everyday life, often communicating goals or perspectives that contradict their literal interpretation via humour. The current study investigate the concept of sarcasm in K-van's stand-up comedy show. This study investigated sarcasm from a critical stylistic analysis perspective. Therefore, this study is expected to answer the following questions: What is the purpose of sarcasm used in the provided data? And What are the critical stylistics tools utilised by the stand-up comedians in the selected data. The study aims at Identifying the purpose of sarcasm and clarifying the critical stylistics tools that are used in the selected data. It is worth mentioning that Jeffries's (2010) critical stylistics modal of textual conceptual tools is utilised by the researcher as an eclectic model. Consequently, only qualitative analysis is used to verify the findings and draw conclusion.
Keywords: *sarcasm, critical stylistic, stand-up comedy, Jeffries's model of critical stylistic, stylistics.*

INTRODUCTION

Since language is the essence of humanity which enables us to accomplish our objectives, it serves as the primary means of communication in communities. People need to talk to each other every single day of their life. An essential component of human communication is language. Human thoughts, feelings, and ideas are expressed through spoken and written languages. Since language is meant to facilitate better and more comfortable contact between people, it cannot be detached from human life otherwise (Davies, 2007).

The present research is an attempt to account for the relationship between sarcasm and critical stylistics. Jeffries (2010) claimed that critical stylistics examines texts in terms of their conceptual meaning in order to reveal a text's ideological components. It seeks to understand how texts convey reality to the reader or hearer by analysing both literary and nonliterary texts.

This study is concerned with analysing sarcasm from a critical stylistic perspective. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, it has received insufficient study, particularly from a critical stylistics standpoint. As a result, the current study is an attempt to fill the gap of analysing sarcasm as a critical stylistics concepts in order to seek answers to the following questions: What is the purpose behind using sarcasm by the stand-up comedy K-van? And What are the critical stylistics tools utilised in the study? To answer the study's questions, certain processes are followed starting with providing a theoretical foundation for critical stylistics as well as sarcasm. Moving to selecting 5 samples of analysis taken from K-van's official instagram account. Then, following an eclectic model of analysis based on Jeffries' (2010) the textual conceptual tools, and Attardo's (2002) purposes of sarcasm. Finally, drawing certain conclusions by using qualitative type of analysis. It is intended that the current research will be useful to individuals who are interested in the field critical stylistics. By offering fresh perspectives on the language employed by producers to formulate particular ideologies through particular linguistic techniques, it could advance the area of critical stylistics. It is also expected that the study will be useful for researchers in many fields, including stylistics, critical discourse analysis and critical linguistics because CS has a relationship with all the fields mentioned above. Last but not least, it is also believed that this paper can be beneficial to those who are interested in the concept of the study, that is sarcasm.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Sarcasm

Attardo (2000), defined sarcasm as an openly aggressive kind of irony. McDonald (1999) asserts that sarcasm is a kind of ironic discourse often used to express implicit criticism directed at a specific target. Toplak and Katz (2000) identify several factors influencing the utilisation and intensity of sarcasm in quotidian conversations: exaggeration, the speaker's characteristics, the relationship between the speaker

and the target, the weight of the critique, and the context in which the criticism is delivered, whether privately or publicly.

The Oxford Dictionary of Language (2006) indicates that another function of sarcasm is to ridicule others in order to make them seem foolish. Thus, the Cambridge and Collins dictionaries concur that sarcasm, mostly verbal and seldom written, encompasses not just mockery or criticism but also entails insult and emotional harm. For example, *Thank you for explaining that my eye cancer isn't going to make*

me deaf. I feel so fortunate that an intellectual giant like yourself would deign to operate on me. This example clearly demonstrates that the speaker intends to insult and critique the addressee's laziness, rather than just attempting to be humorous.

Fowler (1991) asserts that the core of sarcasm is in the purpose to inflict pain via ironic or harsh language. He asserts that irony often serves as the primary mechanism for generating sarcasm; yet, a sarcastic situation does not inherently need irony. Haiman (1998) shares a similar viewpoint, asserting that the speaker's purpose is fundamental for individuals to discern sarcasm or irony. He characterises sarcasm as a deliberate act by speakers to deride others. He asserts that individuals may exhibit unintended irony, but sarcasm requires a deliberate effort.

Crystal (2004) states that sarcasm is a kind of verbal irony in which only the speaker finds amusement, while the listener is subjected to assault and abuse. Abrams (2012) characterises sarcasm as a kind of irony, often seen as synonymous with all types of irony, however it is distinguished by the exaggerated inflection of the speaker's voice. According to Abrams' definition, sarcasm has an additional fundamental characteristic beyond intention: intonation. Crystal (2011) asserts that variations in intonation significantly influence personal communication attitudes, such as sarcasm and anger.

In conclusion, based on the previously mentioned viewpoints, sarcasm can be defined as an indirect form of verbal irony wherein the speaker intends to convey a predominantly aggressive stance towards interlocutors, encompassing actions such as blaming, insulting, hurting, and criticising. Sarcasm is often spoken verbally but never documented in writing.

Purposes of Sarcasm

The purposes of sarcasm, listed by Attardo (2002) in Humour and Irony in Interaction: From Mode Adaption to Failure of Detection, are explained below:

Sophistication Sarcasm is a complex, sophistication and indirect form of communication, requiring the listener to interpret hidden meanings in sarcastic statements. Sarcasm, as an example of verbal irony, serves as a sophisticated means of demonstrating one's linguistic skills to generate humour. A speaker articulates one statement while intending to convey a different meaning. Dews, Kaplan, and Winner (1995) assert that the distinction between explicit and implicit meanings in statements may generate comedy. It establishes a connection between sarcasm and comedy. Furthermore, sarcastic remarks are more often seen as humorous compared to non-sarcastic remarks (Kreuz, Long, & Church, 1991). Research indicates that sarcastic remarks are more humorous than literal statements due to the unexpected contrast between the spoken words and the suggested meanings conveyed by the speaker (Dews, 1995). Nonetheless, there are instances when humour is not sarcastically build and vice versa sarcasm sometimes lacks humour.

Evaluation

The use of sarcasm, which is a kind of verbal irony, is meant to convey unfavourable feelings when directed at another person. According to Grice (1989), it is connected to the outward manifestation of an emotion, attitude, or evaluation. In addition, Sperber and Wilson (1986)

assert that the purpose of utilising sarcasm is to convey a negative view on life. On the other hand, Dews (1995) and Dews & Winner (1995) claim that the use of sarcasm as a form of evaluation has the potential to mute both the negative effects of criticism and the beneficial characteristics of praise. Due to the fact that the true meanings are suggested in utterances, the aim of employing sarcasm becomes the function of muting.

Tool for Politeness

The use of sarcasm as a means for politeness is one way for showing politeness. Overt aggressiveness in direct speaking actions is believed to be more damaging than this kind of behaviour. According to Dews and Winner (1995), the use of sarcasm helps to reduce the potentially threatening impacts of the meanings that are intended. Barbe (1995) also makes the observation that a speaker is able to prevent disagreements from occurring by using sarcasm since he does not convey his statements in a manner that is openly insulting. The imposition of politeness in the speaker's statement helps to reduce the negative impacts that are caused by negative feelings. Because of this, the use of sarcasm serves as a tactic for face-saving strategy.

Persuasive Aspect

The use of sarcasm as a persuasive tool may be used to convince someone to carry out a certain action. There are three different subtypes of sarcasm that may be used in persuasive situations. To begin, sarcasm is a powerful rhetorical tool because it helps the reality of an intended meaning reveal itself in a straightforward and obvious manner (Carston, 1981). It is necessary for the speaker and the addressee to have a shared understanding in order for the addressee to fully understand the speaker's implied meaning. On the other hand, sarcasm is easy to remember (Kreuz, 1991). It is necessary for a speaker to be successful in properly performing his message. lastly, according to Giora (1995), sarcasm may be used as both an informative statement and an approach for politeness. As a result, in order to accomplish good communication, it is essential for both the person who is speaking and the person who is listening to have some knowledge in common.

Group Affiliation

As a kind of group affiliation, sarcasm has the ability to establish both an inclusive and exclusive situation. It establishes the nature of the connection that a group has. For example, according to MyersRoy (1981), sarcasm serves two purposes. First and foremost, sarcasm has the potential to promote emotions of in-group cohesion or unity among members of a group. Secondly, it may also be used to convey unfavourable judgements towards other individuals and to exclude them from the group. As a result, it demonstrates whether or not an individual adheres to the criteria that the group has established.

Critical Stylistic

The developmental approach to stylistics and critical discourse analysis is represented by critical stylistics. Thus, critical stylistics fills in the ideological gap between them. Despite being founded by Roger Fowler, CS and CDA have evolved into progressively different fields over time (Jeffries, 2014). According to Jeffries (2014), textual-conceptual functions are a crucial component of the stylistic approach to critical language study, and there is no one relationship between linguistic form and meaning. So, in order to reveal the underlying ideologies within a message, CS examines the relationship between textual choices and ideology.

Founded by Lesley Jeffries, Critical Stylistics is an area of applied linguistics that examines the connection between ideology and literary choices. The goal is to better understand how language reproduces social identities and inequities by exposing the hidden ideologies that are communicated through language. With a more comprehensive theory and methodology than Critical Discourse Analysis, Critical Stylistics offers a full range of tools for examining the linguistic decisions made by text creators (Jeffries, 2010).

In order to examine language, Jeffries has developed a critical stylistic analysis that integrates stylistic analysis with critical discourse analysis (Ahmed, H., & Abbas, 2019). In recent years, the study of critical stylistics has developed and proven useful in supplying ideational meaning for

speech (Khalil, 2020). Compared to Critical Discourse Analysis, the Critical Stylistics approach offers a far more comprehensive theory and a far stronger methodology (Hasan & Hameed, 2019). Text analysis is the main emphasis of the stylistics subfield of CS. It aims to reveal the hidden beliefs within texts as well as how they reflect the outside world to listeners or readers. It is an analytical technique developed in response to the drawbacks of critical discourse analysis in CDA (Ahmed & Abbas, 2022). Through the use of a range of linguistic tool analyses, CS seeks to provide a response to the question "what the text is doing" by revealing the ideologies that underlie both literary and non-literary works. Furthermore, Halliday's notion of grammar as social semiotic and critical linguistics serve as the foundation for the CS framework (Ibrahim & Hussein, 2018).

Jeffries' Model of Textual Conceptual Tools

Jeffries (2010), in her book Critical Stylistic The Power of English, introduced a set of tools which she believed that are more comprehensive, although not complete, if compared with any provided in the history of CDA. These tools, provided by Jeffries (2010), focusses on providing the critical analyst with a cohesive set of tools that encompass the areas proposed by Fairclough, Fowler, Simpson, and others, while also introducing new instruments that appear effective in semantic and pragmatic contexts. As for the tools used in this study, the researcher utilised five of them: naming and describing, negating, hypothesising, prioritising, and questioning. only the last one is adopted from Quirk et al (1985), the rest of tools are taken from Jeffries model of critical stylistics (2010).

Naming and Describing

One of the most significant choices made by writers is the choice of names which concentrates on the language processes that allow a text creator to describe a referent. She recognises that the noun phrase, in addition to the head noun, might provide more information on the referent. Text creators may convey ideas and assumptions on the referent by the use of pre-modification and post-modification of the head noun. The idea of naming and describing investigates how language enables us to classify and define things. Examining the decisions taken in naming and the extra information sent by the noun phrase helps us to understand the complexity of language usage and its influence on communication (Jeffries, 2010).

Negating

Jeffries (2010) claims that, as a conceptual tool, negation goes beyond just negating a verb. It is a strong language tool that both suggests the probable existence of something and highlights its absence (Nahajec, 2012). Jeffries (2010) claims that negation in writings may have narrative and/or ideological relevance. It may emphasise what is lacking, consequently strengthening it; it can also convince people or picture a desired replacement universe. Jeffries argues that negation may help the reader form a mental picture and offers an instance that sharply differs from the one claimed in the provided text.

Hypothesising

Jeffries (2010) emphasises how modality may be used to identify ideologies in texts, especially when it comes to speculative scenarios. In his account of language, Halliday (1985) made substantial use of the functional concept of modality, which has been heavily used in critical approaches. According to Jeffries (2010), modality may be found in a variety of textual elements, including modal auxiliaries, lexical verbs, modal adverbs or adjectives, and conditional structures. Additionally, Based on Jeffries (2010), modality allows the reader or hearer to imagine hypothetical scenarios, whether they are desired or undesirable, in addition to highlighting the speaker's or writer's apparent authority.

Prioritising

The role of prioritising within a text is to evaluate how the placement of focused information could have ideological consequences. Using certain syntactic options such information structure, transformation, and subordination helps one to highlight some information while minimising others, hence producing an ideological effect. Giving priority means more than just spotting the

important sentence and emphasising it. Rather, it exposes to the reader the values and views of the text's makers (Jeffries, 2010).

Questioning

Quirk et al. (1985) declare that there are main and minor categories of question is English language. The main type are: Yes-no question, wh-question, and alternative question. The first type of questions are created by putting the operator before the subject. These questions anticipate a response in the shape of either yes or no, usually with a rising intonation. The second of questions are created by putting an interrogative word, e.g. who, whom, whose, what, which, when, where, how, and why, at the start of the sentence. These questions anticipate an answer in an open range of options. Where as the third type are those questions that anticipate a response choosing one of two or more provided choices.

Method

This research employs a qualitative approach as an analysing method. The data used for analysis in this research comprises clips extracted from K-van's stand-up comedy show, which includes several examples of the idea being examined. The selection of data employs a deliberate sampling method, purposely excerpting instances when sarcasm is present. Thus, the selected excerpts exemplify the concept of sarcasm most thoroughly. Moreover, Jeffries analytical tools are followed to evaluate the samples. The data used in the present paper has not been chosen randomly, however, it has been intentionally selected according to certain criteria:

1.   All of the selected clips have been taken from the comedian's official instagram account.
2.   This data is freely accessible kind of data. That is, it can be accessed for research and can be utilised efficiently by anyone.
3.   It helps the current study to reach its established goals.
4.   Each extract contains sarcasm which makes it a solid basis to rely on when analysing the data.

Extract one

"A woman I didn't know pulled up a knee she goes "is that your son? I go "no it's my nephew" and without any hesitation she says "he's adorable, what's your name? You are so cute, Marcus when you turn 18 I'm coming Back for you you're a little heart breaker, save him for me. So cute" she walked away. Went back to shopping! I challenge any man in this room... any guy go to the mall, just approach a woman you don't know "is that your niece? Can I have a word with her please? Wow! When you turn 18 I'm coming back for you. Save her for me." You don't get to walk out of the mall. They escort you out of the mall. "I was just talking to kids!" "That's right, R Kelly. Tell it to the judge. Tell it to the judge."

The Analysis

Sarcasm can be indirectly used to express negative judgment, often through out saying the opposite of what is meant. The purpose of evaluation is highly expressed in the text by narrating the same event but from different viewpoint and by highlighting the absurdity of a man behaving, which is similarly to that acted by a women. The speaker implicitly criticises the woman's actions and the societal reaction to them.

Sarcasm can also be employed to persuade others by trying to reinforce a particular viewpoint or by making the opposing idea seem undesirable. This is what happened in the text. The speaker convince his audience with his viewpoint by presenting a scene that he came across once and another hypothetical imaginary one and put them all together in front of the audience and asked "I challenge any man in this room..." which does actually matter in the persuasive ack.

It is possible for sarcasm to serve as a marker of identification of a group affiliation, so reinforcing the links between those who get the intended meaning and, on the contrary, excluding those who do not. The phrase "any man in this room," might serve creates an "us vs. them" two dynamic groups. The first one, us, understands the absurdity of the woman's words. On the other hand, the second group, them, who would react differently based on gender or might not see the issue. The speaker used direct name when producing this text for instance: "Marcus" to refer to his nephew, "niece and nephew". He also used pronouns in order to identify individuals like: "my

son, my nephew, any man in this room, and any guy". Furthermore, adjectives are being utilised as well to describe feelings, shapes or physical appearance for example: "adorable, cute and little heart breaker" also "pulled up a knee" which express a physical sort of descriptions.

The text is rich with different kine of negation. Lexical negation "without", pronouns negation "no, any", and the syntactic negation with evolve the addition of negative particle attached to the auxiliary " didn't, don't". All the previous mentioned negations triggers explicitly appeared in the text. On the other hand, the entire hypothetical story about a man talking to a little girl in a mall serves as a negation of the woman's behaviour being acceptable if the genders were reversed. So this situation might be implied as follow: "this situation would *not* be the same for a man."

 The whole second half of the speaker's story, which begins with the phrase "I challenge any man in this room..." Is an obvious hypothetical situation presented here, and the speaker encourages the listener to picture it.

Questions are categorised based on their structure and expected response. For example: "is that your son?", can I have a word with her please? And is that your niece?" Are obvious illustrations for yes/no questions where they seeks either affirmation or negation respond. While a wh-question like "what's your name?" Serves a more expanding or open answer. In other words, it is a type of question that requires an informative respond.

Only one textual conceptual tool is not used in the text above that is prioritising. The text does not show any strange sentence structure that might refer to prioritising or emphasising certain information over the other.

Extract Two

"I know I'm getting older but I'm not old and there's little signs that we're getting older every day like when you go to buy a flight you have to pick the year you were born on that stupid spin dial, yeah I used to not mind. I see some young people you don't mind you're right there on the default, "there I go, that's my birthday" that was me not long ago but lately it's been a little bit of a Brrrr (referring to spinning of a spin dial) I don't like that Brrrr. And some of you are laughing you're Brrrr aren't you? Your arms are crossed. Because young people have good lives. We have a bad memory to go with every single one of those years "oh, that's when the stock market crashed, should have sold my home there, that's when you know who got elected" we all had a bad memory. But be positive. You know who I feel bad for? My

grandmother, I had to buy a flight for her that was like I was on the price is right. Wow! Got on the wheel and just Brrrrr we went had lunch, came back it was still spinning ."

The Analysis

Although weakly presented, the phrase "And some of you are laughing you're Brrrr aren't you? Your arms are crossed. Because young people have good lives." Might give a hint for a possible in-group and out-group. By in- group, the speaker includes older people including himself. While on the other hand by out-group, younger people are referred to.

A strong negative emotion towards the process of ageing and the "Brrrr" of wheel spin dial to the selection of the birth year can definitely shows evaluation, so he, the speaker, does not directly express that he is annoyed for the length of the time he, and other old people, has to go through in other to find his year of birth by scrolling through all other years compared to others, young people, who can find it so easy and fast "there I go" nevertheless, this emotion is expressed more via straightforward criticisms and personal experiences. So the text does involve evaluation.

The following phrases "getting older, spin dial, stock market crashed, who got elected, price is right, wheel" are named by the speaker which basically are associated with the aspect of ageing. Meanwhile, phrases like: "stupid spin dial, Brrrr I don't like that Brrrr, bad memory to go with every single one of those years" are also used by him to describe his feelings related to them. He perhaps tried to contrast his experience with the spin dial now, when he is old, and in the past, when he was young. Which make the description focuses on the change over time.

The negation tool is explicitly presented in the text. The speaker stated, "I'm not old." and "you don't mind" (referring to young people) employs negation to highlight a difference in experience. Within both phrases he used the syntactic type of negation by adding "not" to the original sentence.

The text shows prioritising by the appearance of the subordinate clause more than one time. In phrase like "I'm getting older but I'm not old" two sentences are contrasted by using "but" where the speaker tried to prioritise one thing, although two ideas are mentioned, that he is NOT old. Same thing happen such words are used to illustrate or provide reasons for the main point, consequently prioritising the main point being explained. For example: "when you go to buy a flight you have to pick the year…" and

"Because young people have good lives."

When questioning is concerned, then two questioned are tackled by the speaker in the text. First, "you're Brrrr aren't you?" Is a tag question where the speaker used to ask for agreement or to make his claim confirmed by raising such question and then getting it answered by the audience. Second, "You know who I feel bad for?" This is an affirmative sentence by form but, due to the tone used by the speaker when uttering it, it functions as a question and more specifically rhetorical question which does not need to be answered.

Extract Three

"As I watched the olympics, I realised America cheats. We're all American, we can talk about this. What we do is not even against the rules, we take the best ethnicities from all over the world and put them on our team. That is not fair to the other countries.. but we do it. Best black dude get over here basketball. German guy volleyball come here. Asian woman... look at out ping-pong team we're winning those medals. You'd be mad if any other countries did that. If next olympics, Japan had an all-black basketball team. It wouldn't look right. You'd be like, what is this?! "Oh, you don't like it now, do you? Lebron James play for us now." They got Lebron? You can't have Lebron he is from Cleveland. "No, he is from Nagasaki!"

The Analysis

The main purpose behind using sarcasm in the first place is trying to entertain the audience. The speaker is not using sarcasm against someone in front of him, however he is being sarcastic about his own country, America. The text contains more than one purpose of sarcasm.

Firstly, since sarcasm is a form of verbal irony which is intended to express negative sentiment towards someone. It is related to the expression of a feeling, attitude, or evaluation. The text definitely conveys a critical evaluation of America's Olympic strategy, framed as a proud remark. The speaker emphasises the "unfairness and cheating" idea through what they do in Olympic and the way they gather all the good players form all over the world and place them in the American team.

Secondly, persuade and convince the audience is another purpose when the speaker express his point of view by giving examples from reality "players who are not Americans yet they played with the American team". Like "Best black dude get over here basketball…". Moreover, he presented an opposite scenario "If next olympics, Japan had an all-black basketball team. The phrase "It wouldn't look right. You'd be like" gives more evidence that this would upset them so of course others would also be upset.

Lastly in group affiliation purpose, the phrase "We're all American, we can talk about this" explicitly attempts to establish group affiliation. By including the listener in the "we," the speaker creates a sense of shared identity and invites them to participate in the critique. This can strengthen the bond between the speaker and the audience by creating an "in-group" that understands the humour and the underlying message. The sarcasm becomes a shared joke that reinforces their American identity while simultaneously allowing for a critical (though exaggerated) look at it.

Concerning textual conceptual tools, the text names several concepts and entities: Olympics, America, other countries, basketball, volleyball, ping-pong, ethnicities, Japan, Lebron James, Cleveland, Nagasaki. It also implicitly names the concept of "cheating" although the speaker reframes it. Furthermore, it describes America's Olympic strategy as "taking the best ethnicities from all over the world and putting them on our team." It describes this as "not fair," yet within the rules. It describes specific examples like "best black dude" for basketball, "German guy" for volleyball, and "Asian woman" for ping-pong. It also describes a hypothetical scenario of Japan having an all-Black basketball team, labelling it as something

that "wouldn't look right."

The text implicitly negates the idea that America's actions are cheating by stating, "What we do is not even against the rules." It also negates the implied fairness of other countries doing the same thing by highlighting the hypothetical (and negatively framed) example of Japan's all-Black basketball team. The speaker negates the idea of nationality being tied to origin (Lebron from Cleveland) by sarcastically suggesting he's from Nagasaki.

The core of the argument is built on a hypothetical: "If next Olympics, Japan had an all-black basketball team. It wouldn't look right." This hypothetical scenario is used to illustrate the perceived unfairness of America's actual practice. The speaker also hypothesises the reaction to this hypothetical scenario: "You'd be like, what is this?!"

When the text prioritises winning as the ultimate goal, The speaker suggests that America's strategy, while potentially unfair, is effective because it brings home medals. The implication is that winning justifies the means. The text also implicitly prioritises a certain visual/cultural "normality" in sports representation, as shown by the negative framing of the hypothetical Japanese all-Black team.

While the text doesn't pose direct questions, it uses rhetorical questions to emphasise its points. The hypothetical reaction to Japan's team "You'd be like, what is this?!" serves as a rhetorical question, implying a negative judgment. The question "Oh, you don't like it now, do you? Lebron James play for us now." further emphasises the perceived hypocrisy.

Extract Four

"I was teasing the blind guy and he was having a great time. After the show, he said, "most people ignore that I'm even there. So, thank you for making me feel like a part of it." And that's where his head was at. But during the show, I'm teasing the blind guy and a women in the back is like, "excuse me, I'm offended." You're offended for him? He's laughing. He's facing the wrong way, but he's laughing. And to his credit, this is the best part. I go, do you know her? He goes, "I've never seen her a day in my life."

The Analysis

Sarcasm may serve as a means to discreetly critique or convey unfavourable judgement. The comedian's first act of "teasing" may be seen as a type of evaluation; but, the blind man's favourable response contradicts this interpretation. The comic is not evaluating the blind guy in a negative manner of conventional sarcasm. The emphasis transitions to evaluating the woman's excessive response. The comedian's disbelief "You're offended for him?" Therefore, The speaker tried to indirectly evaluate negatively the woman's reactions.

Sometimes sarcasm is used to deliver a potentially face-threatening act, but in a less direct and therefore more polite way. This purpose have nothing to do with the interaction with the blind person, who explicitly enjoyed the attention. The comedian was not attempting to minimise a negative comment towards him. However, one may argue that the comedian's narration of the incident to the audience may indirectly criticise highly sensitive audience members without confrontation "the woman who was offended for teasing the blind man"

Sarcasm may be used to impact an individual's perspective or support a certain position. The comedian's narration of the incident seemed intended to convince the audience of the strange reaction of the woman. By emphasising the blind man's pleasure and his total disconnection from the lady who was offended, the sarcasm encourages the audience to adopt his viewpoint and maybe see the woman's offence as inappropriate.

A sense of group affiliation is created through the feeling of multiple aspects such as: a shared understanding and enjoyment develops among the comic, the blind guy, and the audience as a result of the humour, which, in contrast to the "offended" lady.

Concerning naming & describing tool, this tool is found in the text which technically involves labelling things and delivering information about them. The phrase "the blind guy" can be functioned as a direct naming of the individual. While "a woman in the back" is another instance of naming, which is less specific compared to the previous one. Describing on the other hand is also used by the speaker in the text above. The events, emotions, and viewpoints of the persons involved, all can contribute to the elucidating of these descriptions illustrate the interaction and

the differing responses which are clearly viewed by phrases like: "teasing the blind guy," "he was having a great time," "I'm offended," "He's laughing," "He's facing the wrong way," "most people ignore that I'm even there," "making me feel like a part of it," "teasing the brand guy".

As for Negating, it is also presented in the text. The word "ignore" in the sentence "most people ignore that I'm even there" is an example for a lexical trigger in which the word itself basically refers to a negative meaning. So it negates the fact that the blind guy is generally recognised or included. It also emphasises the importance of what the speaker says about him. Another example that involves another lexical trigger of negation is "I've never seen her a day in my life" the adverb "never" bring up a negative effect on the sentence that is a clear and emphatic negation from the blind man, denying any prior knowledge with the woman who was offended on behalf of him.

Questions can not only be a way of seeking information, they can cary multiple functions. Taking for example "You're offended for him?" Which is a normal affirmative statement by its form but a rhetorical question by its function that is, a type of question that is asked not for the sake of receiving answer but rather to actually highlight a more significant matter which is to express the speaker as well as the audience disbelief. However, the "do you know her?" is a genuine question that seeks information, directed at the blind man to find the relationship between him and the offended woman and the answer was provided within the text when the blind guy said "I've never seen her a day in my life."

The speaker, through the using prioritising, can play with the organisation of the sentence structure. what is important or significant might be dragged to the beginning of the sentences. In the sentence "And that's where his head was at" the speaker used fronting when he bring the most important part of it to the front to signal the place "where" of the blind man's perspective.

Extract Five

"Women are better looking than men. Can we agree? I was thinking about it, guys. Don't lose hope. Under the right conditions. We would improve our looks, too. Like if the plane were to crash and we all survived. The longer we're waiting for help, the better the men would finally start looking. We can prove it, we would prove it in this situation.. because like after week1, we're tan. Week2, scruffy. Women love that. Week3, we're hunting. Week4, our abs are showing because we're starving for the first time. Cuz we're not good at hunting. But damn it, we're improving. Something interesting happens. The longer we're waiting for help, the worse these beautiful women will finally start looking.. weeks1, your eyebrows start growing in.. just In the middle starts slow just a little unibrow action. Unless you're middle eastern

= day2 (he lift up the wire of his microphone and place it on his eyebrows) "when is the rescue helicopter coming?" Or if you're Latina your eyebrows wipe off on day3. It's like "oh Mijo look what I done- I need a sharpie does anyone have a sharpie in the carry-on?" I don't know why the black women are laughin' your weave blew off upon impact! "Oh hell no we're going back for that"

The Analysis

The text above humorously criticises beauty standards, gender stereotypes, and cultural differences, while simultaneously granting the speaker a measure of building connection with those who appreciate the humour. It covers many purposes of sarcasm:

Starting with sophistication, the humour depends on the audience's recognition of the scenario's nonsense and the hyperbolic comments about beauty. It is not a direct, clear comedy. The speaker believes that the audience will comprehend the implicit contrast between social beauty standards and the strange circumstances shown, the survivor from a plane crash. The act of "complimenting" males in such horrible circumstances, while playfully narrating the women's apparent fall, requires a level of cognitive
processing that beyond a literal understanding.

Following with evaluation, the paragraph serves as an evaluation sarcasm of traditional beauty standards and maybe gendered expectations on appearance. The speaker carefully challenges the superficiality of societal norms by reversing conventional praises and emphasising the horrible scenario for men's "improvement." The humour comes from representing the unfavourable masculine characteristics as advantageous for beauty, whereas conventionally valued feminine qualities are humorously criticised.

Another purpose is tool for politeness, although seeming offensive, the hyperbole and absurdity may serve as a means to approach potentially sensitive subjects (gender disparities in appearance) in a less direct and aggressive manner. The comedy serves as a barrier, enabling the speaker to engage with stereotypes without really supporting them. The audience are encouraged to find humour in the stereotypes instead of seeing a direct criticism as an insult.

The sarcasm, characterised by its humour and unexpected turns, may have an indirect persuasive influence. By illustrating such an unrealistic situation, the speaker may be implicitly indicating the excessive attention of surface looks. Humour may force the audience to rethink of the perceptions of beauty by presenting them in an exaggerated and comedic manner.

Lastly, the humour, especially the unique references to cultures (Middle Eastern unibrow, Latina eyebrow cleaning, Black women's weave), presumably seeks to foster a feeling of collective comprehension and solidarity within a designated in-group. Individuals who comprehend what is being said and the implicit humour are included into the jokes, creating a feeling of belonging. Looking at name and describing tool, different names are explicitly mentioned in the text for example: "Women, men, guys, middle eastern, Latina, and black women." And it also provides descriptions, although exaggerated and stereotypical, on how the two groups might look If a plane crashs. Examples included: "tan," "scruffy," and showing "abs." When describing men. "eyebrows start growing in," and "little unibrow action." Referring to women. And he described the Latina women's eyebrows as to "wipe off." And finally, he give a description for the black women's "weave blew off upon impact."

Another tool is negating which is being used in the text to actually contrast two different ideas which is the men and women looking and appearance. Phrases like "Don't lose hope" and the statement "Cuz we're not good at hunting". The speaker obviously has only used one trigger of negation which is the syntactic one that involves the addition of a negative particle with an auxiliary verb or a dummy verb.

As for hypothesising, the text is based on an entire premise which is a hypothetical situation a plane crash and the subsequent changes in appearance while waiting for rescue. The conditional statements "If the plane were to crash...", "Unless you're middle eastern...", "Or if you're Latina..." are clear indicators of hypothesising about different scenarios and their outcomes. The phrase "The longer we're waiting for help..." Also introduces a hypothetical variable (time) and explores its potential impact on appearance. Cleary, the speaker expresses his ideology by mostly Conditional constructions though out the use of if.

Information structure, transformational choices and subordinated clauses are used by the speaker. The statement, "Women are better looking than men," presented by the speaker as "given", immediately grabbing attention and setting up the subsequent discussion. The following elaboration explains on the speaker's "new" reasoning that confirms this initial assumption. Also, by the use of short and declarative sentences like "Week1, we're tan.", "Week2, scruffy. Women love that" creates an emphasis to each point individually. Moreover, the contains only active voice which creates a sense of directness. And concerning subordinated clauses, they are presented in the text but not overly complex. For instance:

"Under the right conditions" is functioned as an adverbial clause. And "Women love that" could be seen as a nominal clause.

Last tool utilised in this text is questioning. The text begins with a direct question: "Women are better looking than men. Can we agree?" And also contain another question in its body "when is the rescue helicopter coming?" Two distinct questions are raised with two distinct structures. The first one, which was a yes-no question, is explicitly invites agreement and sets up the subsequent discussion. The second one, however, was constructed by using a question word "when" it functions as a question within the narrative since it was generating by the speaker when he was trying to mimic a Middle Eastern person.

CONCLUSION

The aim of the current paper is to provide a critical stylistic analysis of sarcasm in selected stand-up comedy clips presented by the English comedian K-van to investigate the stylistic tools employed to convey sarcasm within the text. The analysis results in the following conclusions.

1.   Number of sarcastic purposes are utilised in the data by K-van. Each purpose presented here was carefully use by the speaker to employ certain need. It is important to mention that the most used purpose is evaluation where sarcasm can be indirectly used to express negative judgment, often through out saying the opposite of what is meant.

2.   Critical stylistic tools are evidently applied to construct the concept of sarcasm, revealing the ideologies embedded in the speaker's language. The selected data reveals varying frequencies of tool. Naming and Describing, as well as Negating and Questioning, are employed extensively across all extracts, while Hypothesising is utilised the least since it was missing in two extracts.

REFERENCES

a.   Abrams, M.H. (2012). Glossary of Literary Term. 4th ed. New York: Rinehart.

b.   Ahmed, H., & Fadhil Abbas, N. (2019). Critical Stylistic Analysis of the Concept of Extremism in DeLillo's Falling Man (2007). AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies, 3(3). 82-106

c.   Ahmed, A. S., & Abbas, N. F. (2022). A Critical Stylistic Analysis of Transcultural Identity in Lyer's The Global Soul (2001) Using the Tool of Negation. Global Academic Journal of Linguistics and Literature

d.   Attardo, S. (2000). Irony as relevant inappropriateness. Journal of Pragmatics, 32(6), 793–826. doi: 10.1016/ S0378- 2166(99)00070-3.

e.   Attardo, S. (2002). Humor and irony in interaction: From mode adoption to failure of detection. In L. Anolli, R. Ciceri. & G. Riva (Eds.), Say not to say: New perspective on miscommunication (pp. 159-179). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

f.   Barbe, K. (1995). Irony in context. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.-Carston, R. (1981). Irony and parody and the use-mention distinction. The Nottingham Linguistic Circular, 10(1), 24-35.

g.   Crystal, D. (2004) A Glossary of Netspeak and Textspeak, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

h.   Crystal, D.(2011). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

i.   Davies, A. (2007). An introduction to applied linguistics. Edinburgh University Press.

j.   Dews, S., Kaplan, J. & Winner, E. (1995). Why not say it directly? The social functions of irony. Discourse Processes, 19, 347-367.

k.   Dews, S. & Winner, E. (1995). Muting the meaning: A social function of irony. Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 10(1), 3-19.

l.   Fowler, R. (1991). Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press. London: Routledge.

m.   Grice, H. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P. and Morgan, J. L. (Eds), Syntax and Semantic Speech act, vol 3 p.p. (41-58) New York: Academic press.

n.   Giora, R. (1995). On irony and negation. Discourse Processes, 19, 239-264.

o.   Haiman, J. (1998). Talk is Cheap: Sarcasm, Alienation, and the Evolution of Language. New York: Oxford University Press

p.   Hasan, H. F., & Hameed, S. K. (2019). The Image of Politicians in Tony Kushner's Play Homebody/ Kabul; A Corpus Critical Stylistic Analysis. Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences, 58(4), 47-74

q.   Halliday, M. A. K (1985), An Introduction to Functional Grammar, London: Edward Arnold.

r.   Ibrahim, R. K., & Hussein, L. A. K. (2018). Critical stylistic analysis of the ideological positioning in some selected poems by John Donne. Journal of the College of Languages (JCL), (37), 1-16.

s.   Jeffries, L. (2010). The Power of English: Critical Stylistics. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

t.   Jeffries, L., (2014). ‗CS'. In M. Burke (Ed.). The Routledge handbook of stylistics . London: Routledge.

u.   Khalil, h. H. (2020) Attitude as a Tool for Critical Stylistics Analysis in Literary Discourse. Asian EFL Journal. 27. 91- 112.

v.   Kreuz, R., Long, D. & Church, M. (1991). On being ironic: Pragmatic and mnemonic implications. Metaphor and Symbolic Activity, 6(3), 149-162.

w.   Myers-Roy, A. (1981). The function of irony in discourse. Text, 1(4), 407-423.

x.   Nahajec, L. (2012). Evoking the possibility of presence : Textual and ideological effects of linguistic negation in written discourse. Doctoral thesis, University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield.

y.   Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of English. London: Longman.

z.   Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). Relevance: communication and cognition. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

aa.   Toplak, M. and Katz A.N. (2000). On the Use of Sarcastic Irony. Journal of Pragmatics. 1467-1488: 32.