

Illocutionary Speech Act Strategies in Stand-Up Comedy by Indra Jegel and Russell Peters: A Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Perspective

Putri Kholifatun Nafisah ✉, Eti Setiawati

Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia

Article Info

History Articles

Received:

7 Februari 2026

Accepted:

6 Maret 2026

Published:

30 April 2026

Keywords:

Stand-up comedy,
Illocutionary speech
acts, Cross-cultural
pragmatics

Abstract

Stand-up comedy is a monologue-based comedy that relies on the use of language as a means of constructing humor and conveying criticism. The use of language can be influenced by cultural backgrounds, which may potentially result in differences in the types and strategies of illocutionary speech acts employed by comedians. This study aims to describe and compare the types and strategies of illocutionary speech acts used by comedians Indra Jegel and Russell Peters from a cross-cultural pragmatic perspective. This research employs a qualitative approach using a case study method. The research data consists of utterances produced by Indra Jegel and Russell Peters containing illocutionary speech acts, obtained from two YouTube channels, namely Stand Up Kompas TV and the Just for Laughs channel. Data collection was conducted through observation and note-taking techniques. The data analysis technique consists of three main stages: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing/verification. The results of the study indicate that Indra Jegel tends to employ expressive and representative speech acts with varied strategies, while also utilizing nonverbal elements that reflect the characteristics of a high-context culture. Meanwhile, Russell Peters predominantly uses directives and representative speech acts with direct and literal strategies, reflecting the characteristics of a low-context culture. This study demonstrates that differences in the types and strategies of illocutionary speech acts in the stand-up comedy performances of Indra Jegel and Russell Peters are closely related to the cultural communication patterns of their respective countries, as explained through cultural context theory. This research is expected to contribute to the development of cross-cultural pragmatic studies and help society better understand intercultural communication patterns.

✉ Correspondence address:

Kampus Sekaran FBS UNNES

E-mail: putrinafisah@student.ub.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

In the entertainment industry, verbal interaction becomes an important element that shapes a performance. One form of entertainment that highlights communication dynamics is stand-up comedy. This performance relies on the combination of verbal and nonverbal language as the primary means to create humor, build closeness, and engage audiences (Ashabi et al., 2024). Stand-up comedy is a form of monologue-based comedy that contains observations, opinions, and personal experiences, which are often rooted in concerns and realities of life (Pragiwoksono in Gunawan & Yohana, 2022). This performance highlights various social phenomena and presents them in a humorous yet reflective manner.

Currently, stand-up comedy has emerged in various countries with different cultural characteristics, causing comedians' language practices to be influenced by their respective socio-cultural norms. Culture is one of the elements that shapes how individuals communicate and understand the meaning of a message (Sunata, 2023). This is in line with Hall's (1976) argument that culture and communication are closely interconnected; culture is expressed through communication, and vice versa. In cross-cultural communication, misunderstandings may occur when interlocutors come from different cultural backgrounds and do not share the same knowledge regarding applicable cultural norms. Differences in ways of thinking and language habits also influence comedians in constructing their utterances.

This phenomenon makes stand-up comedy relevant to be analyzed from the perspective of cross-cultural pragmatics. According to Kecskes (in Gunawan & Yohana, 2022), cross-cultural pragmatics analyzes how speakers from different cultural backgrounds use language based on their cognitive experiences, social practices, and cultural values. In this context, pragmatics does not only study the meaning of language produced through context but also examines how culture influences this process. Language functions not only as a

communication tool but also as a representation of cultural identity and social values that develop within the speaker's community. Djajasudarma (2012) emphasizes that cross-cultural pragmatics examines language use within cultural, social, and psychological contexts, as well as the influence of cultural values on how individuals convey and interpret the meaning of utterances.

One important aspect of pragmatics is speech acts. Speech acts are forms of communication that do not occur merely as linguistic expressions but contain certain functions, intentions, and purposes, and have the potential to create effects on the interlocutor (Herlinah, 2021). In pragmatics, speech acts are divided into three types: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. Among these three, illocutionary acts are related to communicative aspects expressed in an attempt to achieve understanding (Arma & Katubi, 2022). Searle (1969) classifies illocutionary speech acts into five categories: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives. Representative speech acts are used to convey information believed to be true by the speaker; directives aim to encourage the interlocutor to perform an action; commissives indicate the speaker's commitment to future actions; expressives express the speaker's psychological state; and declaratives have the power to change social status or reality through utterances.

Furthermore, it is also important to consider the language strategies used by speakers. Speech act strategies refer to the ways speakers realize certain actions or speech functions through particular forms of utterances (Isnaini & Rahmawati, 2022). Wijana (1996) categorizes speech act strategies based on the level of directness and literalness, namely direct speech acts, indirect speech acts, literal speech acts, and non-literal speech acts. The selection of these strategies is influenced by cultural backgrounds reflected in Hall's (1976) dimensions of high-context and low-context cultures. In low-context cultures, messages are delivered explicitly, directly, and clearly, and communication highly depends on spoken and written language.

Communication tends to be logical and straightforward, so the utterances delivered generally correspond with the intended meaning. Conversely, high-context cultures are implicit, intuitive, and relationship-oriented. Speakers do not only rely on words but also on nonverbal cues; therefore, messages are often conveyed through subtle and indirect forms of expression.

Research on speech acts has been conducted in various forms of media, such as talk shows, films, YouTube content, and talent search programs. Wulandari (2021) examined the similarities and differences in expressive speech acts used by hosts Sarah Sechan and The Ellen DeGeneres Show. The study found that the most dominant expressive speech act in both programs was the act of complimenting. However, differences were found in The Ellen DeGeneres Show, where the host did not use expressive speech acts in the form of criticism or complaints, whereas Sarah Sechan utilized compliments, criticism, and complaints in interactions with guests and audiences. This difference demonstrates variations in communication styles that emerge due to the influence of speakers' cultural norms.

Furthermore, Harris & Sartini (2025) investigated persuasive utterances in politeness strategies used by judges on The Voice Indonesia and The Voice United States. The study showed that Indonesian judges predominantly used negative politeness and off-record strategies, reflecting indirect communication typical of high-context cultures. In contrast, judges on The Voice United States more frequently used bald on record and positive politeness strategies, demonstrating a direct communication style typical of low-context cultures. These findings indicate that Indonesian collectivistic culture and American individualistic culture strongly influence the selection of communication strategies. Another study by Alisia & Salimulloh Tegar (2022) compared utterances indicating illocutionary speech acts among judges of the fifth season of American Idol and the tenth season of Indonesian Idol. The results showed that complaining speech acts (34%) were dominant in American Idol, whereas

complimenting speech acts (28%) were the most frequently found in Indonesian Idol. These findings further confirm that cultural differences influence the selection of speech acts used in each culture.

Unlike previous studies that focused on types of speech acts or politeness strategies, this study examines illocutionary speech act strategies by integrating Hall's (1976) high-context and low-context cultural context theory. This approach is used to examine the influence of cultural communication patterns on the selection of speech act strategies. In addition, this research focuses on the utterances used by comedians Indra Jegel and Russell Peters in stand-up comedy performances. Indra Jegel is an Indonesian comedian who often presents materials about daily experiences, social phenomena, and the use of *pantun* as one of the distinctive characteristics of his opening performance. Meanwhile, Russell Peters is a Canadian comedian who frequently raises issues related to culture, social stereotypes, and cross-cultural experiences. The selection of these two comedians is based on differences in cultural backgrounds and the characteristics of their materials, which potentially produce variations in the use of illocutionary speech acts to be examined from a cross-cultural pragmatic perspective.

This study is expected to reveal variations in illocutionary speech acts and contribute to the development of cross-cultural pragmatic studies, while also helping society understand differences in communication patterns. Based on the background described above, the research questions of this study are as follows: (1) What types of illocutionary speech acts are used in the stand-up comedy performances of Indra Jegel and Russell Peters?; (2) What strategies of illocutionary speech acts are used in the stand-up comedy performances of Indra Jegel and Russell Peters?; and (3) How are the types and strategies of illocutionary speech acts compared between the two cultures based on Hall's (1976) cultural context theory?

METHODOLOGY

This research is a qualitative study employing a case study method. A case study is a type of research that aims to examine a phenomenon in depth through the use of various data collection and data analysis techniques within a certain period of time (Assyakurrohim et al., 2022). The research data consist of utterances produced by comedians Indra Jegel and Russell Peters containing illocutionary speech acts, while the data sources were obtained from two YouTube channels, namely Stand Up Kompas TV through the video entitled “Special Performance: Jumatan Indra Jegel Gak Kayak Dulu Lagi | Grand Final SUCI 11” and the Just for Laughs channel through the video entitled “Russell Peters | Opinionated and Mic'd Up.” Data collection was conducted through observation and note-taking techniques. The observation method is a data collection method carried out by observing the use of language (Astika et al., 2021). Furthermore, the researchers transcribed the comedians' utterances and recorded relevant expressions related to the research questions. In addition to verbal elements, this study also considers nonverbal elements such as intonation, facial expressions, and gestures as supporting factors in interpreting the meaning of utterances.

The data analysis technique refers to the model proposed by Miles and Huberman (in Fiantika et al., 2022), which consists of three main stages: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data reduction was carried out by selecting, categorizing, and simplifying data according to the research focus, namely the types and

strategies of illocutionary speech acts. Data presentation was conducted in the form of tables and categories to facilitate interpretation. Furthermore, conclusions were drawn by interpreting the patterns of speech acts identified and relating them to Searle's theory, Wijana's speech act strategies, and Hall's cultural context theory.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the analysis of utterance data obtained from the stand-up comedy performances of the two comedians. The presentation of the analysis results covers three main focuses: (1) the types of illocutionary speech acts used in the stand-up comedy performances of both comedians, (2) the strategies of illocutionary speech acts used in the stand-up comedy performances, and (3) the comparison of the types and strategies of illocutionary speech acts between the two cultures based on Hall's (1976) cultural context theory.

Types of Illocutionary Speech Acts in Indra Jegel's Stand-Up Comedy

The analysis of the comedian's utterances was conducted based on Searle's (1969) classification of illocutionary speech acts, namely representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative speech acts. Each form of utterance was analyzed to identify the tendency of illocutionary strategies employed. The following section presents the types of illocutionary speech acts found in the two performances.

Table 1. Types of Illocutionary Speech Acts in the Stand-Up Comedy Performances of Indra Jegel and Russell Peters

Types of Illocutionary Speech Acts	Indra Jegel	Russell Peters
Representative	13	6
Directive	6	9
Expressive	10	3
Commissive	-	1
Declarative	-	-

The illocutionary speech acts in Indra Jegel's stand-up comedy that frequently appear are representative and expressive speech acts. In representative speech acts, several utterances were found that function to state, report, and express opinions. The following are data of utterances categorized as representative speech acts.

- (1) **Context:** Indra Jegel discusses the first-place prize in a competition, which is a car. He is comparing the conditions of the participants.

Indra Jegel: "*Aldo udah punya SIM, punya mobil. Kalau dia dikasih mobil, kena progresif.* (hand swinging gesture)" (JR1/ID/1:03)

- (2) **Context:** A response to Virza's stand-up material about a zebra at Taman Safari being made into soto.

Indra Jegel: "Hah? Kok gitu? **Soto tuh daging ayam, Pak Min.**" (JR1/ID/2:18)

In data (1), he states that Aldo already has a driving license and a car, so receiving a car as a prize is considered less appropriate because it would result in progressive tax. In data (2), factual information is conveyed that soto is a food made from chicken meat, not zebra meat. Both utterances demonstrate a declarative mode used to convey facts. Lexical choices such as *udah punya* (already has), *kena progresif* (subject to progressive tax), and *tuh daging ayam* (it is chicken meat) emphasize the accuracy of the information. In addition, the use of firm intonation and gestures in data (1) functions to emphasize the validity of the proposition being conveyed. Therefore, these utterances fulfill the characteristics of representative speech acts as explained by Searle and reinforced by Arma & Katubi (2022), namely utterances that require compatibility between statements and reality through the acts of stating, reporting, and expressing opinions. Both utterances are categorized as representative speech acts with the function of stating because the speaker conveys propositions considered true, namely "*kena progresif*" and "*soto tuh daging ayam.*"

- (3) **Context:** This utterance appears when Indra Jegel discusses the film *Agak Laen*.

Indra Jegel: "Film dengan 9,1–9,2 juta penonton, film nomor dua terlaris." (JR2/ID/2:39)

In data (3), Indra Jegel mentions factual data regarding the ticket sales of the film *Agak Laen*, allowing the audience to understand the topic being discussed. The utterance is categorized as a representative speech act with the function of reporting because the speaker conveys facts regarding the number of viewers of the film and its position as the second best-selling film in Indonesia. In the reporting function, Indra Jegel does not merely state information but also positions himself as a source who provides an objective description of an event or situation. The use of concrete numbers "9.1–9.2 million" demonstrates the presentation of data that emphasizes the accuracy and credibility of the information. Meanwhile, the expression "film nomor dua terlaris" (the second best-selling film) provides hierarchical context that helps the audience understand the significance of the information.

- (4) **Context:** Indra Jegel compares the conditions of participants to determine who is the most deserving of receiving the car prize.

IndraJegel: "*Rizki punya SIM, enggak punya mobil. Kalau dikasih, kepakai eh, driver online paling kan, ya kan?*" (JR3/ID/1:18)

In data (4), Indra Jegel explains that Rizki has a driving license but does not own a car, allowing him to potentially utilize the prize optimally. This utterance is categorized as a representative speech act with the function of expressing an opinion because the speaker does not merely convey facts about Rizki but also includes an assessment that Rizki would use the car for work, such as becoming an online driver. Linguistically, the speaker's opinion is marked by the use of modality elements such as "*paling kan?*" and "*ya kan?*" which function as evaluative markers while also building agreement with the audience. This utterance does not only convey a proposition but also contains an implicit

invitation for the audience to agree with the speaker's assessment.

Second, expressive speech acts. The following are data of utterances indicating expressive speech acts.

- (5) **Context:** The speaker opens the performance by greeting and appreciating the audience's presence.

Indra Jegel: "*Terima kasih yang udah hadir*" (JE1/ID/0:24)

- (6) **Context:** The speaker feels annoyed when a child disturbs him while performing ablution.

Indra Jegel: "*Udah malas aku. Udah malas. Aku enggak mau nih*" (JE5/ID/3:46)

In data (5), Indra Jegel expresses appreciation to the audience at the beginning of his performance. This utterance is used to build the atmosphere through an expression of gratitude. This utterance is categorized as an expressive speech act with the function of thanking because the speaker expresses gratitude for the audience's presence. The realization of this speech act is marked by the performative verb "terima kasih" (thank you), which is used to convey appreciation.

Meanwhile, in data (6), the speaker expresses annoyance caused by the disturbance he experienced. The annoyance is shown through the repetition of the phrase "udah malas" (already tired/unwilling), which is used to emphasize the negative emotion felt by the speaker. In addition, intonation emphasis strengthens the expression of annoyance conveyed to the audience. This utterance represents an expressive speech act with the function of expressing annoyance because the speaker directly states a negative emotion. This is in accordance with Arma & Katubi (2022), who explain that expressive speech acts are speech acts that describe the psychological condition of the speaker.

Finally, the type of illocutionary speech act that appears least frequently in the data is the directive speech act.

- (7) **Context:** The speaker asks the audience to applaud.

Indra Jegel: "Tepuk tangan untuk grand final" (JD1/ID/0:25)

- (8) **Context:** The speaker prohibits discussing topics related to his colleague's personal life.

Indra Jegel: "Jangan dibahas, jangan dibahas." (JD4/ID/5:20)

In data (7), Indra Jegel directs the audience's attention and encourages them to give appreciation through applause as part of creating the atmosphere of the SUCI 11 stage. This utterance is categorized as a directive speech act with the function of requesting because the speaker encourages the audience to perform a certain action, namely applauding. The realization of this speech act is strengthened by nonverbal elements in the form of an open-hand gesture directed toward the audience. These nonverbal elements function to emphasize the intention of the request and encourage the audience to provide the expected response.

Meanwhile, in data (8), the speaker attempts to stop a discussion regarding a personal topic about his fellow comedian. This utterance represents a directive speech act with the function of prohibition because the speaker explicitly asks the interlocutor not to continue discussing the topic. The prohibition is realized through the use of the word "jangan" (do not), which represents control over the interlocutor's action. The repetition of the phrase demonstrates emphasis and strengthens the intensity of the prohibition.

Types of Illocutionary Speech Acts in Russell Peters' Stand-Up Comedy

Unlike Indra Jegel's stand-up comedy, Russell Peters' stand-up comedy is more dominant in using directive speech acts. The following are data of utterances categorized as directive speech acts.

- (9) **Context:** This utterance appears in an imaginary scenario about the Ancestry feature detecting Chinese names. Russell Peters imitates the voice of a system that "instructs" users to search for other possibilities.

Russell Peters: "Hey, take a closer look. Give me one possibility of something other than the obvious." (JD1/RP/3:18)

(10) **Context:** A continuation of the imaginary scenario, where the system automatically directs the user to Alibaba.

Russell Peters: "Go to Alibaba.com. Enter promo code V1." (JD1/RP/3:39)

(11) **Context:** The speaker refers to the "N-word," which is a sensitive term and should not be used carelessly.

Russell Peters: "Don't say it if you don't want to die." (JD3/RP/0:20)

In data (9) and (10), Russell Peters delivers utterances by imitating a digital system in an imaginary scenario. In data (9), the speaker asks the interlocutor to take a closer look and provide another possibility besides the obvious answer. Meanwhile, in data (10), the speaker continues the instruction by asking the interlocutor to access the Alibaba website and enter the promotional code. Both utterances are categorized as directive speech acts with the function of requesting because the speaker explicitly directs the interlocutor to perform a certain action.

Unlike the previous two data, in data (11), the speaker prevents the interlocutor from performing a particular action, namely saying the N-word. This utterance is categorized as a directive speech act with the function of prohibition, indicated by the use of "don't," which demonstrates the speaker's attempt to stop the interlocutor's action. Directive speech acts are utterances that aim to encourage or make the interlocutor perform something according to the speaker's intention. In this type of speech act, an obligation emerges for the interlocutor to carry out the requested action (Arma & Katubi, 2022).

In addition to directive speech acts, Russell Peters also employs commissive, representative, and expressive speech acts. A commissive speech act refers to an utterance in which the speaker

promises or commits to doing something in the future, with the obligation placed on the speaker rather than another person (Arma & Katubi, 2022). Commissive speech acts appear in the utterance "We'll take it. I mean, if you're going to get rid of it, give it to us" (JK/RP/0:42), which is delivered while imitating the response of Black people regarding the N-word. This utterance demonstrates the speaker's commitment to "taking" the word if it is truly intended to be removed by white people. The commitment is indicated by the use of the form we'll (we will), which indicates the speaker's willingness to perform an action in the future.

Representative speech acts are shown in the audience's utterance "I'm a mix of Vietnamese and Chinese" (JR1/RP/1:20), which is used to convey factual information regarding their ethnic identity. Meanwhile, expressive speech acts are reflected in the utterance "I worry" (JE3/RP/0:01), in which the speaker expresses concern about changes in language and the habit of replacing words with letters.

Speech Act Strategies in the Stand-Up Comedy Performances of Indra Jegel and Russell Peters

The analysis of speech act strategies in the stand-up comedy performances of Indra Jegel and Russell Peters was conducted to examine the delivery of illocutionary intentions through direct, indirect, literal, and non-literal utterances. The classification of these strategies refers to Wijana (1996), who divides speech act strategies into these four categories. Each utterance was analyzed based on the level of directness and literalness, allowing the communication patterns of the comedians to be identified. The following table presents a comparison of speech act strategies.

Table 2. Speech Act Strategies in the Stand-Up Comedy Performances of Indra Jegel and Russell Peters

Strategy	Indra Jegel	Russell Peters
Direct	11	16
Indirect	12	1
Literal	5	2

Non-literal	1	-
-------------	---	---

Speech Act Strategies in Indra Jegel's Stand-Up Comedy

Indra Jegel's stand-up comedy employs various strategies, namely direct, indirect, literal, and non-literal strategies. The results in Table 2 show that Indra Jegel's stand-up comedy tends to use direct and indirect strategies. The following are utterances that demonstrate direct strategies.

(12) **Context:** A response to Virza's stand-up material about a zebra at Taman Safari being made into soto.

(13) Indra Jegel: "*Hah? Kok gitu? Soto tuh daging ayam, Pak Min.*" (SL/ID/2:18)

(14) **Context:** An utterance delivered after the opening performance with a pantun.

Indra Jegel: "Ya, pantun itu juga yang kupakai waktu aku di grand final. Dua kali aku grand final." (SL/ID/0:33)

(15) **Context:** The speaker asks the audience to applaud.

Indra Jegel: "Tepuk tangan untuk grand final." (SL/ID/0:25)

In data (12), Indra Jegel expresses confusion regarding soto. This utterance uses a direct strategy because the mode and function of the utterance are aligned. The expression "Hah? Kok gitu?" directly indicates surprise, while the statement "Soto tuh daging ayam, Pak Min" is delivered through a declarative sentence that provides information straightforwardly.

In data (13), the speaker also uses a direct utterance strategy when conveying information that the pantun he delivered had previously been used during his grand final performance. The declarative sentence is used to explicitly convey facts. Meanwhile, in data (14), the direct strategy appears through the use of an imperative sentence in the utterance "Tepuk tangan untuk grand final," which clearly requests the audience to perform an action, namely applauding.

Generally, a direct strategy is a form of utterance in which the mode corresponds with the intended function of the utterance (Sumarlam et al., 2023). These three utterances also demonstrate a literal strategy because the

meaning of the sentences corresponds with the speaker's intention. Therefore, the three data are categorized as a combination of direct-literal strategies.

Furthermore, indirect strategies were also found. The following are utterances demonstrating indirect strategies.

(16) **Context:** Indra Jegel discusses the first-place prize in a competition, which is a car. He compares the conditions of the participants.

Indra Jegel: "Aldo udah punya SIM, punya mobil. Kalau dia dikasih mobil, kena progresif."

(STL/ID/1:03)

(17) **Context:** The speaker explains the impact of popularity and the wide reach of audiences.

Indra Jegel: "Salat Jumatku tidak pernah seperti dulu lagi."

(STL/ID/2:56)

(18) **Context:** Indra Jegel compares the conditions of participants to determine who is most deserving of receiving the car prize.

Indra Jegel: "Rizki punya SIM, enggak punya mobil. Kalau dikasih, kepakai eh, driver online paling kan, ya kan?"

(STL/ID/1:18)

In data (15), the speaker uses humor to imply that the car prize is not appropriate for participants who already own one. This utterance represents an indirect strategy because the speaker does not explicitly state his intention. Structurally, he only provides information about progressive tax; however, pragmatically, the speaker intends to convey an assessment that Aldo is not the ideal candidate to receive the prize. The mismatch between the declarative mode and its function indicates the use of an indirect strategy.

In data (16), the indirect strategy is also shown through the expression of personal experience regarding the changes in Friday prayer atmosphere due to his popularity. Although it is in the form of a declarative

sentence, the utterance functions as a complaint about the disruption of privacy and concentration during worship.

Furthermore, in data (17), the indirect strategy is again used through a declarative sentence expressing Rizki's condition of having a driving license but not owning a car. The speaker implicitly conveys an assessment that Rizki is more deserving of receiving the prize because it would be more beneficial for him. These three utterances are consistent with the concept of indirect strategies, namely forms of utterances whose forms do not correspond to or contradict their intended functions (Islami et al., 2026).

Literal and non-literal strategies were also found in Indra Jegel's stand-up comedy. A literal strategy appears in the utterance "Terima kasih yang udah hadir." (SLR/ID/0:24). This utterance is categorized as a literal strategy because the meaning conveyed corresponds with the lexical meaning of the words used. The speaker genuinely intends to express appreciation to the audience without any sarcasm or implied meaning. In addition, the utterance is delivered directly, making it a combination of direct-literal strategy.

Meanwhile, a non-literal strategy appears in the utterance "Virza logika. Dia punya SIM tapi enggak punya akal." (STR/ID/1:33). This utterance employs a non-literal strategy because its illocutionary meaning differs from its literal meaning. Literally, the phrase "enggak punya akal" (does not have intelligence/common sense) implies that the participant lacks the ability to think; however, pragmatically, the speaker does not actually mean this. The speaker is creating a wordplay between "logika" (logic) and "akal" (reason/intelligence) to produce a humorous effect. Furthermore, the utterance is delivered directly through a declarative sentence, making it a combination of direct non-literal strategy.

Speech Act Strategies in Russell Peters' Stand-Up Comedy

The most dominant speech act strategy used in Russell Peters' stand-up comedy is the direct speech act strategy. The following are utterances that demonstrate direct strategies.

(19) **Context:** The speaker discusses word abbreviations.

Russell Peters: "And there was really only one letter-to-word that we universally agreed on the N-word." (SL/RP/0:14)

(20) **Context:** The speaker interacts with the audience.

Russell Peters: "Hi, wife. How are you?" (SL/RP/1:38)

(21) **Context:** The speaker refers to the "N-word," which is a sensitive term and should not be used carelessly.

Russell Peters: "Don't say it if you don't want todie." (SL/RP/0:20)

In utterance (18), the speaker emphasizes that among various forms of "letter-to-word," only the N-word has universal agreement, and it is delivered directly through a declarative sentence without any hidden meaning. In utterance (19), the speaker also uses a direct strategy when greeting and asking about someone's condition through the expressions "Hi, wife" and "How are you?", which are conveyed straightforwardly. Meanwhile, in utterance (20), the speaker uses a direct strategy through the explicit prohibition "Don't" to emphasize that the audience should not say the N-word. The prohibition is expressed clearly and directly.

These three utterances also demonstrate a literal strategy because the meaning of the sentences corresponds with the speaker's intention. Therefore, these three utterances are categorized as a combination of direct-literal strategies.

Furthermore, indirect and literal strategies were also found. The indirect strategy can be seen in the utterance "You know what one of my biggest fears is?" (STL/RP/0:02). Structurally, the speaker uses an interrogative sentence; however, the actual function is not to receive an answer but rather to encourage the audience to focus, introduce a topic, and create a transition toward the material. This is consistent with Septiani et al. (2024), who state that indirect strategies are conveyed implicitly through question forms, so they are not perceived as direct commands or instructions.

Meanwhile, the literal strategy appears in the utterance “I worry.” (SLR/RP/0:01). When the speaker says “I worry,” he is indeed expressing concern straightforwardly. The simple, direct form of the utterance and its alignment with its expressive function classify this utterance as a literal strategy because the words used have the exact meaning intended by the speaker. This is consistent with Nurjannah & Saerudin (2023), who explain that literal strategies are characterized by the compatibility between the speaker’s intention and the meaning of the words used. In addition, the utterance is delivered directly, making it a combination of direct-literal strategy.

Comparison of Types and Strategies Based on Cultural Context Theory

The results of the analysis show that differences in the types and strategies of speech acts used by the two comedians not only reflect variations in linguistic aspects but are also related to cultural communication patterns. According to Hall (1976), culture is divided into two types, namely high-context culture and low-context culture. These differences in cultural contexts influence how individuals convey messages and select communication strategies.

Regarding the types of speech acts, Indra Jegel tends to use expressive and representative speech acts based on the expression of emotions, personal reactions, and narratives of everyday experiences. This finding is in line with the research by Alisia & Salimulloh Tegar (2022), which shows that expressive speech acts are dominant, while commissive speech acts are relatively rarely used. In contrast, Russell Peters is more dominant in using directive and representative speech acts that are firm and explicit in delivering criticism. This difference indicates that Indra Jegel’s humor relies more on emotional closeness, whereas Russell Peters’ humor emphasizes the direct delivery of criticism.

These differences become more apparent in the use of speech act strategies. Indra Jegel uses more varied strategies, including direct, indirect, literal, and non-literal strategies, with a tendency

toward indirect strategies reinforced by nonverbal elements such as facial expressions, intonation, and gestures. This can be seen in the utterance:

“Udah malas aku. Udah malas. Aku enggak mau nih.”

The utterance demonstrates annoyance, which is strengthened through the repetition of the phrase “udah malas” and intonation emphasis, allowing the emotion conveyed to be understood by the audience. This shows that humorous meaning does not only depend on verbal elements but also on the accompanying context.

This pattern reflects the characteristics of high-context culture, which emphasizes implicit meanings and the use of nonverbal cues in communication (Hall, 1976). In this culture, messages tend to be conveyed subtly to maintain social harmony and avoid direct conflict (Nuraeni et al., 2021; Tjuatja, 2022). This tendency is consistent with the cultural orientation of Indonesia, which prioritizes harmony, politeness, and avoidance of direct conflict, while also reflecting the characteristics of collectivistic cultures that emphasize contextual and indirect communication by prioritizing social relationships among groups (Gupta & Sukanto, 2020; Widiyanarti et al., 2024).

Conversely, Russell Peters almost entirely uses direct and literal strategies, causing the messages conveyed to be explicit, clear, and minimally ambiguous. This pattern makes his humor more confrontational and directly targeted at certain issues. This is consistent with the characteristics of low-context culture, which is logical, analytical, and oriented toward clarity of actions and messages. This tendency is related to individualistic cultural orientation, which emphasizes freedom of expression and openness in delivering opinions, resulting in language use that is more direct and less indirect (Guan & Li, 2017; Widiyanarti et al., 2024).

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of illocutionary speech acts and speech strategies, Indra Jegel and Russell Peters demonstrate differences in the use

of speech act types and strategies that cannot be separated from their respective cultural backgrounds.

Indra Jegel tends to use representative and expressive speech acts combined with direct, indirect, literal, and non-literal strategies, reinforced by nonverbal elements. In contrast, Russell Peters is more dominant in using directive and representative speech acts with direct and literal strategies.

These differences reflect differences in cross-cultural communication patterns. Through the integration of the analysis results with cultural context theory, it can be concluded that Indra Jegel demonstrates characteristics of a high-context culture based on collectivistic values by emphasizing harmony and politeness, whereas Russell Peters demonstrates characteristics of a low-context culture based on individualistic values by emphasizing explicit, straightforward communication and clarity of messages.

REFERENCES

- Alisia, E., & Salimulloh Tegar, S. (2022). Tindak Ilokusi Dalam Komentar Juri American Idol Dan Indonesian Idol: Kajian Pragmatik Lintas Budaya. *UNDAS: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 18(2), 189–205.
<https://doi.org/10.26499/und.v18i2.5170>
- Arma & Katubi. (2022). *Tindak Tutur dan Kesantunan*. Perkumpulan Rumah Cemerlang Indonesia.
- Ashabi, M. M., Wahyuni, I., & Nugroho, B. A. (2024). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi pada Komika Yono Bakrie Stand Up Comedy Indo Samarinda: Kajian Pragmatik. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan Budaya*, 8(2), 170–178.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v8i2.12215>
- Assyakurrohman, D., Ikham, D., Sirodj, R. A., & Afgani, M. W. (2022). Metode studi kasus dalam penelitian kualitatif. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Dan Komputer*, 3(01), 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.47709/jpsk.v3i01.1951>
- Astika, I. M., Murtiningrum, D. A., & Tantri, A. A. S. (2021). Analisis Tindak Tutur Ekspresif dalam Acara Mata Najwa" Perlawanan Mahasiswa". *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia Undiksha*, 11(1), 55–66.
<https://doi.org/10.23887/jjpbs.v11i1.29366>
- Djasasudarma, F. (2012). *Wacana dan Pragmatik*. Refika Aditama.
- Fiantika, F. R., Wasil, M., Jumiyati, S. R. I., Honesti, L., Wahyuni, S. R. I., Mouw, E., Mashudi, I., Hasanah, N. U. R., Maharani, A., & Ambarwati, K. (2022). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Global Eksekutif Teknologi.
- Guan, X., & Li, X. (2017). A cross-cultural examination of family communication patterns, parent-child closeness, and conflict styles in the United States, China, and Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Family Communication*, 17(3), 223–237.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15267431.2017.1293062>
- Gunawan, S. A., & Yohana, S. (2022). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Dalam Film Outsourced: Sebuah Analisis Pragmatik Lintas Budaya. *Journal of Indigenous Culture*, 1(2), 107–122.
<https://doi.org/10.30872/jic.v1i2.9>
- Gupta, M., & Sukanto, K. (2020). Cultural communicative styles: The case of India and Indonesia. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 8(2), 105–120.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Anchor Books.
- Harris, S., & Sartini, N. W. (2025). Strategi kesopanan dalam persuasi oleh juri The Voice Indonesia dan Amerika Serikat: Studi pragmatik lintas budaya. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 8(3), 693–702.
- Herlinah, L. (2021). *Analisis Tindak Tutur Ilokusi Pada Film" Mekah I'm Coming"*. Skripsi. Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Syekh Nurjati Cirebon.

- Islami, S. N., Saleh, M., & Usman, U. (2026). Bentuk Dan Strategi Tindak Tutur Direktif Ustazah Oki Setiana Dewi Dalam Video Ceramah. *Bahasa: Jurnal Keilmuan Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 8(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.26499/bahasa.v8i1.1739>
- Isnaini, Z. D., & Rahmawati, L. E. (2022). Strategi Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Dalam Tayangan Mata Najwa Series “Gaduh Tiga Periode.” *Diglossia: Jurnal Kajian Ilmiah Kebahasaan Dan Kesusastraan*, 13(2), 92–108. <https://doi.org/10.26594/diglossia.v13i2.2674>
- Nuraeni, M., Pratama, M. I. F., & Ananda, R. (2021). Pengaruh perbedaan budaya terhadap perilaku komunikasi mahasiswa. *ProListik: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.35335/kampret.v1i3.22>
- Nurjannah, & Saerudin, S. (2023). Tindak Tutur Literal Dan Tidak Literal Dalam Ungkapan Penolakan Antara Penjual Dan Pembeli. *Cakrawala Listra: Jurnal Kajian Sastra, Bahasa, Dan Budaya Indonesia*, 6(2), 215–225. <https://doi.org/10.33772/cakrawalalistra.v6i2.2460>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. *Language* (Vol. 46, Issue 1). Cambridge University Pres. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412428>
- Septiani, R., Lailiyah, N., & Dwi, M. (2024). Bentuk, Strategi, dan Fungsi Tindak Tutur Direktif dalam Promosi di Media Sosial TikTok. *Prosiding SEMDIKJAR (Seminar Nasional Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran)*, 7, 1058–1072.
- Sumarlam, Pamungkas, S., & Susanti, R. (2023). Pemahaman dan Kajian Pragmatik. Bukukatta. <https://jurnal.uisu.ac.id/index.php/Bahastra>
- Sunata, I. (2023). Kajian tentang komunikasi dan budaya. *Journal of Da'wah*, 2(1), 100–131. <https://doi.org/10.32939/jd.v2i1.2566>
- Tjuatja, C. M. (2022). *Kompetensi Komunikasi Antarbudaya dan Adaptasi Budaya dalam Menjaga Hubungan Pertemanan dengan Masyarakat Lokal di Negara High dan Low* Skripsi. Universitas Multimedia Nusantara.
- Widiyanarti, T., Fadianti, C. A., Yunandar, F., Ningsih, F. S., Aji, J. F., & Syifa, M. (2024). Analisis perbedaan pola komunikasi verbal dan non-verbal dalam interaksi antar budaya. *Interaction Communication Studies Journal*, 1(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.47134/interaction.v1i3>
- Wijana, I. (1996). *Dasar-dasar Pragmatik*. Andi Offset.
- Wulandari, A. (2021). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Dalam Talkshow “Sarah Sechan” Dan “The Ellen Degeneres Show”: Kajian Pragmatik Lintas Budaya. *Jurnal Lite*, 17(1).