ANALYSIS OF HOW THE INCONGRUITIES MANIFESTS HUMOUR: PERSPECTIVE FROM KANSIIME'S JOKES

[1]*Monicah Onyancha, [2]Dr. Helga Schroeder & [3]Prof. Kithaka Wa Mberia

[1]Post Graduate Student, University of Nairobi

[2, 3]Lecturer, University of Nairobi

*Email of Corresponding author: monnyancha816@gmail.com

Publication Date: May 2025

ABSTRACT

Purpose of Study: This study sought to investigate how the incongruities manifests humour in Kansiime's jokes.

Problem Statement: Humour, a tool of language used by comics can be employed in various texts. Studies conducted from philosophical, psychological, sociological, anthropological and linguistic perspectives focus on humour and have shown that it is important to investigate the various ways in which humour can manifest itself in a discourse.

Methodology: In assessing Kansiime's sketches an insight was drawn into how hearers are able to interpret texts so as to perceive them as humorous. Having adopted the relevance theoretical framework which tries to give account of how hearers interpret texts during verbal-communication it necessitated that we define the place of the hearer, and at the same time that of the speaker, since the comedian endeavors to judge their minds. For a successful interpretation of a text during a given discourse the hearer must be able to judge the intentions of the speaker, while the speaker must also be able to give sound context for the interpretation process.

Results: For an incongruous interpretation to be successful the hearer must be aware of the speaker's communicative intention, it is then that the hearer is able to attain the intended cognitive effects. It is within the jurisdiction of the speaker to predict the interlocutor's capability to access certain cultural assumptions.

Conclusion: The humorist in creation of humour takes advantage of rhetorical power such as hyperbole, metaphors. Irony is part of this kind of language use but in this study the mentioned rhetorical language has been used to create ironies.

Recommendation: Since this was a case study of one comedian which looked at how Kansiime uses irony to create humour, it is necessary to explore the use of this communicative feature across different comedians to establish its manifestation of humour.

Keywords: *Incongruity, Humor, Irony, Audience Perception, Kansiime*

INTRODUCTION

The creation of humor involves various elements of language use that contribute to its effectiveness. Humor arises from the interplay of multiple factors, each operating at different levels (Attardo 2001a, Alexander 1997) in Capelli (2006). Not only is there an engagement of different elements in production of humour, but also a display of disjunction between the way things are, and the way they are represented in the joke, and between expectations and actuality. At the heart of the process that result in a humorous or witty interpretation lies, a particular kind of interaction between the perception and manipulation of the incongruous and the search for relevance. This is what leads the hearer into the entertainment of the incongruous through language to direct his process of interpretation to the recovery of conflicting propositional forms (Curcio 1995:27). This follows from one of the oldest and most developed theories of humour adapted by Kant and refined by Schopenhauer which claims that humour happens when there is an incongruity between what we expect and what actually happens. However, not all incongruities are necessarily funny. I will look at the incongruities that lead to the production of humour as manifested through irony.

Humor manifests in various forms, including narrative jokes, nonsensical slapstick, irony, and sarcasm, and is typically evident in the behavior of participants through smiling and laughter (Vuorela, 2005:105). Although humour is considered to be mere entertainment, it is a powerful resource to social commentary and transformation (Black, 2012:87). Verbal humor is that, produced by means of language or text (Dynel, 2009:1284). The present study will concentrate on verbal humour. According to (Dynel, 2008:1) linguistic literature on humour, mostly of the verbal type, consists of discussions primarily on semantic mechanisms and cognitive-perceptual processes, translation, as well as sociological and pragmatic analyses of humour in various types of interactions. Humour researchers assume diversified methodological perspectives, conducting analyses of real-life or media discourses, doing sociolinguistic research, carrying out laboratory studies, or theorizing on humour processes with recourse to pragmatic or cognitive proposals concerning human communication. Regardless of the methodologies and particular postulates advocated, the global aim of language researchers is to describe chosen aspects of humour, rather than account for its funniness or the provenance of laughter, which is, not the only humour appreciation response.

This study looked at how the incongruities manifests humour. A speaker of verbal irony produces an explicit evaluative utterance that implicates an unstated opposing evaluation. Producing and understanding ironic language, as well as many other types of indirect speech, requires the ability to recognize mental states in others. This is sometimes described as the capacity for metarepresentation which can be used to describe the effective use of verbal irony in social interaction (Bryant 2012: 673). The study focused on incongruities in the ironic expressions by one Ugandan comedian, Anne Kansiime, who having studied social sciences at Makerere University, realized that in many social interactions, she often made people laugh. This is what motivated her to produce sketches in comedy production. Her sketches posted on YouTube have acquired a great deal of audience in, and outside Uganda, her home country. It is through this kind of popularity that her series of sketches have been aired in the Kenyan Citizen Television, through which she has gained many followers in Kenya.

Besides producing sketches, Kansiime sometimes does standup comedy shows. Here there are live presentations in which, her audience are entertained by jokes, and presenting the image that she can indeed manipulate her audience into achieving humorous effects. This explains why she is a popular comedian in Kenya. Her popularity due to humour motivated this study. I therefore sought to establish how the audience of Kansiime is able to make out humour, specifically from the way she manipulates the use of irony in her sketches, and consequently

try to connect the common elements in verbal irony that aid in the effective use of verbal irony to create humour. The analysis was within the theoretical and methodological framework of Relevance Theory, a pragmatic inferential theory of communication.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Humour is a tool of language used by comics can be employed in various texts. Comedies have formed part of the entertainment industry. As a competitive venture, comedians endeavor to employ different rhetorical devises to capture the attention of their audience and at the same time maintain their audience. Studies conducted from philosophical, psychological, sociological, anthropological and linguistic perspectives focus on humour and have shown that it is important to investigate the various ways in which humour can manifest itself in a discourse (Dynel 2009:1). The possibility of expressing oneself ironically and being understood as doing so, follows from very general mechanism of verbal communication rather than from some kind of extra level of competence. In Relevance Theoretic Framework, the claim is that irony involves no departure from the norm. Despite this fact, ironic utterances generate humour. This opposes the traditional view of irony, that it uses language that deviates from the norm, language which in stylistics will be called figurative and is regarded as deviating from the norm in stylistics. This formed the basis of interest in the study which sought to establish that this kind of qualification is judged not sufficient enough to cover everything about irony. Relevance Theoretical Framework intervenes to fill this gap.

The most common types of joking are the ironic exaggerations and jokes expressing incongruity (Vuorela, 2005:105). These incongruities are the ones the study will tried to discover, so as to establish how hearers understand the jokes. The analysis was done through assessing Anne Kansiime's sketches, with the aim of establishing whether she indeed uses irony in her sketches, and if she does, how do the incongruities manifests humour. The study alos sought to find out if it possible to establish a comprehensive, justifiable generalization, if the analysis is conducted using Relevance Theory. This study anticipated to make these issues clear.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To investigate how the incongruities manifests humour.

RESEARCH QUESTION

The incongruities in ironic expressions manifest humour

LITERATURE REVIEW

Kinuu (2013), used a pragmatic approach to analyze stand-up comedy in Kenya, by narrowing to Eric Omondi's performances. She limited herself to the use of stereotypes in Kenyan stand-up comedies. She identified various categories of stereotypes that are used extensively by the comedians which included stereotypes on women, tribes, body sizes, nationalities and regions. She too observed exploitation of explicatures and implicatures. Kinuu recommends studies on other aspects that create humour. It is from this perspective that the present study draws insight. Dynel (2009), in her study of types of conversational humour, characterizes several semantic and pragmatic types of verbal humour, primarily those which cannot be reduced to (canned) jokes. She concludes that all the types and forms of humour offer corpus research material, which can be approached from a variety of linguistic vantage points, these approaches she claims could include cognitivism, semantics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics or translation. To cater for a scope and limitation in the present study, pragmatics has been taken as the measure of evaluation as an approach to studying verbal humour, with specific interest in irony.

Yus (2003) analyses how humorous interpretations are produced using, Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, basing on the main foundations of the cognitive theory that human beings rely on one single interpretation. According to this principle, the first interpretation provides an optimal balance of interest. In this account, cognitive effects, and mental effort, are valued as what the speaker possibly intends to communicate, which is valid for any ostensive communication. This approach will aid in the analysis of the data in the present study. Hancock (2004), concludes that speakers use a range of cues to signal ironic intent, including cues based on contrast with context, verbal and paralinguistic cues. Speakers also rely on cues provided by addressees regarding comprehension of irony. In the absence of such cues, speakers may be less willing to use irony because of the risk of miscommunication, and addressees may be more likely to misinterpret irony. Hancock justified this by examining the production and comprehension of irony in multimodal (face-to-face) and unimodal (computer mediated conversation).

Bryant (2012) tries to connect the common elements between the major theoretical approaches to verbal irony, to recent psycholinguistic development and neuropsychological research and consequently demonstrates the necessity of metarepresentation in the effective use of verbal irony in social interaction, arguing that verbal irony is one emergent strategic possibility, given the interface between people's ability to infer mental states of others, and use language rather than think of ironic communication as a specialized cognitive ability. The present study borrows the basic idea of metarepresentation from this article and will also incorporate the account of incongruity on the use of irony to create humour. Burgers et al (2012) take a genre based approach, having a content analysis of ironic utterances from six written genres (commercial and non- commercial advertisement columns, cartoons, letter to the editor, book and film reviews). They investigate how irony is used within different communicative situations and open up a procedure for empirically comparing verbal irony based on usage and indicate, how in future research, this kind of analysis may be used to predict differences in processing of ironic utterances.

Hancock (2004) asserts that a considerable amount of theoretical work, explores the linguistic mechanism that a speaker uses to convey an ironic meaning that is different from what is literary said. In the words of Grice, he says that one of the earliest psychological model of irony argued that the ironist intentionally violates conversational maxims (e.g. the maxim of quality) during conversation, and that this type of violation suggests to the addressee that, some figurative meaning may be implied by the utterance. These are the foundations upon which Wilson and Sperber claim that, Relevance Theory may be seen as an attempt to work in detail the above Grice's claim. This study anticipates justifying the application of Relevance Theory in the analysis of irony as a particular manifestation of humour. In modern times, many theoretical models, as well as empirical works, are based on this concept. He wonders whether the concept of incongruity has already been examined and exploited to its full potential, and nothing new, of theoretical or experimental usefulness, may be drawn from it. It is proposed to conceptualize incongruity as follows: a stimulus is perceived as incongruous when it diverts from the cognitive model of reference. Incongruity in characterizing jokes, underlies one of the basic objectives adopted by this study in a bid to identify the ironic jokes in Kansiime's productions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study was underpinned by Relevance Theory, a cognitive and psychological framework that explores how individuals communicate and derive meaning from messages. The theory is designed for one to be able to test one's own relevance-theoreticexplanation of a particular utterance and other communicative phenomena. (Clark 2013:41). The study in the light of this

introductory explanation, sought to confirm the theory, by testing its applicability in the analysis of use of irony in creating humour. The theory is based on two main principles and two sub principles which are stated in relation to relevance. The first principle which is, the cognitive principle of relevance (that, human cognition tends to be geared towards the maximization of relevance), explains that, relevance is a potential property, not only, of utterances and other observable phenomena, but of thoughts, memories and conclusions of inferences. (Wilson and Sperber 2002:251). In this account any input whether external stimulus or internal representations to cognitive processes may be relevant to an individual. The second principle in Relevance Theory is the communicative principle which claims that every utterance (or other ostensive stimulus) creates a presumption of optimal relevance.

Cognitive effects come in three main varieties: strengthening existing assumptions, contradicting and leading to the elimination of existing assumptions, and contextual implication (deriving new effects from the interaction of new and existing assumptions), other things being equal the more such effects a stimulus has, the more relevant it is. To justify relevance, people not only look at cognitive effects, but also relate them to processing effort. Sperber and Wilson point out that, other things being equal, the more mental effort involved in processing a stimulus or phenomenon (which involves accessing contextual assumptions and deriving positive cognitive effects), the less relevant that phenomena is. Processing effort is affected by a number of factors which include: the recency of use, frequency of use, perceptual salience, ease of retrieval from memory, linguistic or logical complexity.(Clark 2013:104).

The overall task of inferring the speaker's meaning may be broken down into a variety of pragmatic sub-tasks. There may be implicatures to identify, illocutionary indeterminacies' to resolve, metaphors and ironies to interpret. (Sperber &Wilson 2004:613). Owing to this sense,the communicative principle of relevance and the presumption of the optimal relevance, suggest a practical procedure for performing these subtasks and constructing hypotheses about the speaker meaning. To regulate the interaction between effort and relevance, the speaker should follow a path of least effort. He/she should enrich it at the explicit level and complement it at the implicit level, until the resulting interpretation meets his expectation of relevance. This can only be possible under the guidance of the Relevance-Theoretic Comprehension Procedure, illustrated as:

a) Follow a path of least effort in computing cognitive effects; test interpretive hypothese(disambiguation's, reference resolutions, implicatures, etc.) in order of accessibility

b) Stop when your expectations are met. (Wilson & Sperber 2004: 613)

Finally in complementing the overall comprehension process, there are subtasks that are inclusive. These are:

a) Constructing a hypothesis about explicit content (which is the explicature) through decoding, disambiguation, reference resolution and other pragmatic enrichment processes.

b) Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual assumptions (which are the implicated premises).

c) Constructing an appropriate hypothesis about the intended contextual implications (which becomes the implicated conclusion). (Wilson & Sperber 2004:615)

This is however an on-line comprehension procedure according to Wilson and Sperber (2004:615). The following preliminary claims are useful to understand why RT is particularly suited to explain how humorous communication is devised and how hearers extract humorous effect. Wilson (1995:259) summarizes the basic ideas of RT in four statements:

a) Every utterance has a variety of possible interpretations, all compatible with the information that is linguistically encoded,

b) Not all these interpretations occur to the hearer simultaneously; some of them take more effort to think up,

c) Hearers are equipped with a single, general criterion for evaluating interpretations and

d) This criterion is powerful enough to exclude all but one single interpretation, so that having found an interpretation that fits the criterion, the hearer looks no further.

These qualities of communication are exploited by humorists who, one way or another, are more aware of multiple interpretations than their audiences, and are able to predict which interpretation is more likely to be picked up as the intended interpretation, and know that their audiences are going to be surprised to discover that this interpretation is eventually questioned or invalidated. (Yus 2008:138). Within a relevance theoretic approach, humor is no longer a property of texts and, instead, characterizes the audience's mental processes in the interpretation of humorous texts. Underlying this approach to humor is the premise that communicators can predict and manipulate the mental states of others. Knowing that the addressee is likely to pick out the most relevant interpretation of the joke (or some part of it), the humorist may be able to produce a text that is likely to lead to the selection of an accessible interpretation which is then invalidated at some point.

In developing relevance- theoretical classification of jokes Yus (2008:25) asserts that RT pictures communication as a highly inferential activity of human beings, who have to develop the schematic string of words that arrives at their mind into fully contextualized and relevant information. This development is applied to the enrichment of explicit content, to the derivation of implicatures and to the extraction of the necessary amount of contextual information. Crucially for humor, these inferential tasks can be predicted to a greater or lesser extent and hence manipulated to obtain humorous effects. These general RT ideas have been applied to a broad proposal of classification of jokes as discussed in Yus (2008: 25):

a) Jokes which are based on some invalidation of inferred explicit content;

b) Jokes which are based on a clash between inferred explicit information and some implicitinformation accessible to the audience;

c) Jokes which are based on the audience's recovery of implicatures (either implicit premises or implicated conclusions); and

d) Jokes which move beyond the specific processing of the joke into more broad collectiveinformation which normally generate humorous effects through a reinforcement of previously held stereotypes on issues such as sex roles, nationalities, ethnic differences or professions (or an attempt to contradict and eliminate them)

Yus (2006:371) provides an interface between Relevance Theory and the interpretation of humorous texts in his claim that, within the relevance-theoretic approach, people characterize the audience's mental process in the premise that communicators can predict and manipulate the mental states of others. Comics are inherently aware of this, that their audience is likely to pick out the most relevant between the intended interpretations. They use this to manipulate the minds of their audience.

METHODOLOGY

The nature of data collected was twofold. The first kind of data was that, collected from the sketches of Kansiime. A sketch comprises of a series of short comedy scenes, which are performed by a group of comic actors either on stage or through an audio and/or visual medium such as radio or television. They are often improvisations which are written down based on the outcome. Anne Kansiime's sketches were be obtained by downloading from the internet using YouTube which was the main source. This was done on the basis of her uploads, dubbed best

compilations, from which citizen TV also uploaded their shows that they also dubbed, 'Don't mess with Kansiime'. A total of twelve of these shows were be collected, by systematically selecting the first and second sketch of every Best Compilation from all the six best compilations as Dubbed by Kansiime in the YouTube.

The second kind of data collected was that from the stand up comedies in which Kansiime had performed. As opposed to sketches, stand-up comedy is a comic style in which a comedian performs in front of a live audience, usually speaking directly to them while using a monologue routine. Kansiime however prefers the former to the latter. The study included this specific kind of data, to complement my generalized opinion of the humour in Kansiime's performances. Only one was randomly picked from the YouTube since the standup comedies are very long and at the same time few. There were a total selection of twelve sketches and one standup comedy in which Kansiime is involved. The selected sketches and the standup comedy were transcribed to aid their display in written text.

To analyze the data, all the twelve sketches and the stand-up comedy were analyzed according to ironic expressions. These ironic expressions were identified through establishing the echoic use and scornful attitude. After that the incongruities were identified as manifested in the ironic expressions. This was done through the help of relevance theoretical framework, which enabled the manifestation of humour to be explained. The ironic expressions were then assessed to establish the incongruities in them.

Most studies on humour production and perception do not pass without handling the concept of incongruity. For humour to be realized there must be an element of incongruity. In this chapter we will search the incongruities in the ironic expressions identified in Kansiime's jokes. The ironic expressions have been identified and classified according to the echoes in them in the previous chapter. In this chapter we asses these ironic expressions by identifying the incongruities in them according to the classifications that have already been established, hence find the;

1) Incongruities in the ironies on norms and values of the society.

2) Incongruities in the ironies on what people have said before.

3) Incongruities in the ironies on implicated thoughts.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

For the language of humour to be successfully interpreted there are two theoretical principles needed, first is that humour requires incongruity that could be mooted in the stylistic twist in the pattern of language used or any situation where the is a mismatch between what someone says and what they mean. The second principle echoes that incongruity can be situated in any layer of linguistic structure and can operate at any level of language and discourse and can even play one level off against another. Simpson (2002:45). For the purpose of this research we look at these principles and relate them to RT. Since the aim of this research is to asses verbal irony which according to Curcio (1995:37), relies on the accessing of two contradictory propositional forms and the recognition of their incompatibility. Then it is important to assess what is entailed in the perception of incongruities and consequently the operation of recovering a propositional form and then transforming it into its opposite with no principled motivation because these play a natural or important role in the interpretation of humorous texts. In elaborating this fact (Yus 2008:134) shows how the comprehension procedure from RT can establish a standard procedure for the interpretation of jokes. The study considered these parallel sub-tasks for interpretation as explicated by Yus reference in the summary below, which shows the path that the hearer will follow:

a) Construction of appropriate hypotheses about explicit content (*explicatures*) viadisambiguation, reference assignment and other pragmatic enrichment processes.

b) Construction of appropriate hypotheses about the intended contextual assumptions(*implicated premises*).

c) Construction of appropriate hypotheses about the intended contextual implications(*implicated conclusions*).

As outlined by Yus above we don't expect these processes to follow some chronology but instead the kind of comprehension procedure involves several steps which include, the hearer identifying the sequence of words uttered by the speaker, as explicated in the logical form or semantic representation of the utterance. Which is "a well-formed formula, a structured set of constituents, which undergoes formal logical operations determined by its structure", a context-free schematic interpretation which is useless at this stage and consequently has to be enriched inferentially in order to be communicatively effective. This logical form is conceptualized via inferences which are the set of assumptions intended by the speaker, or the humorist in this case. The procedure as outlined will be used to clearly establish how the incongruities are perceived and processed to lead the hearer to manifest humorous effects. In order to establish this we are going to assess how the incongruity is usually induced by the punch line and the resolution of the incongruity Rutch (1988:861). The structure here would involve;

1. Incongruity -resolution-humour; jokes in which surprisingly the incongruity is resolved.

2. Incongruous punch line that may provide a partial resolution; part of the incongruity

Incongruities in the Ironies on Stereotypes

In this section we establish the incongruities that are found in the ironies on stereotypes. We will establish the incongruities here as could be encompassed within these kinds of stereotypical establishments or on cultural assumptions that are shared by both the speaker and the hearer. For the resolution of the incongruities here, the hearer must have to acknowledge the stereotype that the speaker is referring to in the text hence have the capability to access certain cultural assumptions that are shared in the environment that has been created by the humorist. These shared assumptions are fundamentally responsible for the function of humor.

According to Cappelli (2003:5) for an incongruous interpretation to be successful the hearer must be aware of the speaker's communicative intention, it is then that the hearer is able to attain the intended cognitive effects. It is within the jurisdiction of the speaker to predict the interlocutor's capability to access certain cultural assumptions. As outlined by Yus (2008:142) in his fourth category of jokes it is evident that jokes that are based on stereotypes of a society can serve as a strong basis for the exploitation of humorous effects, as episode (13), illustrates below

(1) A Mkinga will not say excuse me if he can push you out of the way. Why waste time? Excuse me! Excuse me aaah they will push you and pass. That's a typical Mkinga. If youhave a Mkinga boyfriend, and he says excuse me mmmh. He is not pure, he is not pure

Kansiime is making a standup comedy presentation. She decides to give a picture of the men from her village by evoking the shared assumptions about the Bakinga men. From this text we can deduce that the Bakinga men are known to be arrogant. Having known this Kansiime is aware of the kind of assumptions that her audience will attend to and therefore, she leads the

audience to access this stereotype about the Bakinga men by implicating that the Bakinga men are arrogant. In the first part of the joke she works on the background knowledge that is shared about the Bakinga men She does this by making the hearer anxious to create premises in the mind about the Bakinga, in this context the most salient premise that satisfies the principle of relevance is that the Bakinga men are known to be impolite, so they will not excuse themselves. When in the second part of the joke, Kansiime gives the reason as to why they don't excuse themselves, that it is because they have an option of pushing, it turns out to contradict the premises built about the Bakingas that they don't excuse themselves because they are not polite as was built by the audience, this leads to the rejection of the earlier built assumptions, that the Bakingas don't excuse themselves, because they are impolite and adoption of the new proposition as implicated by the speaker that they don't excuse themselves because they have an option of pushing.

The incongruity is resolved when she says this stereotypical nature of the Bakinga can be used to identify a Mkinga from other men. This is what generates the humorous effects to the hearer. and at the same time aid in building the tension by leading the hearer in building other anticipatory hypotheses about the picture of this new Mkinga. An hypothesis such as if a Mkinga man excuses himself then probably, he decided to be polite or maybe he does not like the traits of his fellow Bakingas. However it turns out that this is a wrong path that the humorist intentionally leads the audience. Kansiime concludes that a man who excuses himself is not a pure Mkinga man. At this point the hearer will come to a final contextual implication by building appropriate hypothesis that the speaker intended to make a joke by creating an incongruous conclusion that a girlfriend can use this to distinguish between a Mkinga boyfriend and a non Mkinga because one who would excuse himself will not be a pure one and therefore not a Mkinga man. It is this kind of qualification that Kansiime gives the Bakinga men that puts a smile in the face of the audience. The world knowledge about courtship and marriage in relation to the option a girl would go for in choosing a boyfriend is violated here. This is what makes the incongruity salient.

It is possible that, a hearer may be led to expect relevance in a given direction and suddenly discover some other unpredicted way in which the utterance achieves it. This happens during the online processing of an utterance that a hearer can build anticipatory hypotheses which include accessing and processing some of the concepts it encodes, and their associated logical and encyclopedic entries, before others. This happens on the basis of what they have already heard, about the overall structure of the utterance being processed. These include hypotheses about its syntactic and logical structure on which hearers rely to resolve potential ambiguities and eliminate vagueness. The following text illustrates how this can manifest humorous interpretation of a text.

(2) Kansiime: ha ha ha. aiyayayaya…*Fiup* (Philip) you have really dishonored me to the bream now. So now your side dish has called you Filp (Philip). He is now Filp. He is noronger (nolonger) Fiup. Ma… young girl. What is your name again? You said you are. Called, who? Called whati (what)? Has anyone ever told you are that you are very ugly?

A hearer interpreting this text will build anticipatory hypotheses on the proposition about Philip dishonoring Kansiime. For the purpose of achieving relevance the hearer expects that by the end of the text she/he shall have confirmed how or why Philip has really dishonored Kansiime. But the subsequent utterances register an incongruity as Kansiime disguises Grace's utterance of the word Philip as bad. This calls for the adjustment of the anticipatory hypothesis so as to

be consistence with the principle of relevance. So the hearer does not land on a contradictory proposition as such, but instead perceives that there is contradiction in the kind of what and it the register of the language that is actually contradictory here. Though it is tricky to establish contradictory register in language, but the speaker in this case controls the perception of the hearer by parallel repetition of the contradicted register which has been used by Grace to pronounce the term Philip which in this case seems to be the trigger of the annoyance that Kansiime is portraying.

The speaker here wants the shift in the assignment of reference to be established on this register of language and not other assumptions that could be easily built from the proposition of Philip dishonoring Kansiime. This is what leads to contradictory propositional forms, hence an incongruity. That the hearer thought Kansiime will explicitly complain about the dishonor from Philip, however she goes on to complain about how Grace has pronounced Philips name. This it what the hearer will attend to. Humour then is generated as the hearer realizes that it is actually the register of the so called 'side dish' that has actually made Kansiime mad, while Kansiime's own register is questionable. Again this is if the hearer has an established dictionary pronunciation of the term Philip which also depends on the cognitive ability of the hearer that humour will be perceived. The hearer finds the wit in why Kansiime would think hers is the best register and Grace's register is not. The violation of our expectation about Kansiime's reaction as a wife who has met her husband's girlfriend also manifests humour that this is what is annoying Kansiime about Grace's not the fact that, this girl she has met is the girlfriend to her husband. The hearer is led to make the conclusions that first Kansiime sounds stupid in making this kind of judgment in this text.

The humorist in this case is aware of this fact and intends that the set of assumptions the hearer constructs fit in this kind cognitive environment. The plausibility of incongruity comes in here when the hearer conceives the fact that the girlfriend to Kansiime's husband has been called the 'side dish' relating to Kansiime being the main dish. Here there is actually no clashing proposition that leads the hearer to generate humour but instead the activation of the encyclopedic entry about the side dish in the scenario of crockery, is itself enough to make the hearer smile. That the side dish has inferior characteristics as compared to the main dish. The entries of the side dish as would be activated in the encyclopedic memory would be;

1. It is small.
2. Not used for main meal.
3. Used for putting leftovers.
4. Can only be used as an option if the main dish was absent.

The speaker here intends that the hearer builds hypothesizes on this encyclopedic entries by assigning reference to the proposition 'side dish' will make a hearer amazed at the attribute. Kansiime has given her husband's girlfriend. The violation of the world knowledge of what is expected of Kansiime to do that she should be mad because she has got to know the truth that the husband has a mistress and not to approve of this fact. To make it salient one would awe still at the fact that Kansiime is actually approving of the fact that this is indeed her husband's which is way beyond our world knowledge of how a wife would perceive the fact that she has met her husband's girlfriend. All these have a part in human and subsequently in humour production hence humor experience. The humorist can choose to explore either of these facts and Kansiime chooses the aspect of emotions and relationships in episode (6) as illustrated below:

(3)   Kansiime: (crying) daddy I think I have fever (shivering immediately) I feel fever. Daddy if you love your daughter you will have to tell her to go for bed rest(touching herself from head, hands to chicks while

	crying)
Father:	okay (taking his phone from the pocket) So let me call Doctor James, thenhe can come and give you some injection.
Kansiime:	(bright, and surprised) injection for

what?Father: you are sick

Kansiime:	ooh wait, isn't today Friday (*brighter now*) today we have scie… and mathematics. What am I doing home? Today it is Friday, I should be at school. Why did you change the calendar? Please let me go and prepare,me I love school. I want to go to school (*runs in to change*)

Kansiime is not ready to go school and decides to arouse her father's emotions by creating the picture that she is very sick and playing on her father's emotions by challenging his love for his daughter that if he really does love his daughter he should let her have bed rest instead of letting her go to school. She knows very well that her father will feel for her sickness and will not let her go to school as he has suggested. These emotions form part of the hypotheses that the humorist intends the hearer to build. Her father takes up the challenge, and does what any father who owns responsibility over his child's health and happiness would have done. He follows the explicit information which disguises Kansiime's intention that she does not want to go to school. The father calls for the doctor who will should give Kansiime an injection. This supports the anticipatory hypotheses that the hearer had already constructed. The incongruity is perceived when Kansiime reacts negatively against her father's thoughts. She becomes bright and feigns to wonder why her father would talk about an injection. The path that the speaker had led the hearer to, breaks at this point and since the hearer is constrained by the inherent search for relevance, he/she is forced to reject the earlier assumptions and build new hypotheses to cover for the implicated premises.

The above joke also covers the recovery of stereotypes about doctors that they easily resort to the injection without proper diagnosis that leads to the establishment of contextual implications. The hearer will make the inferences that doctors in this environment, do not do proper diagnosis before they resort to injections, and in this case it is this fact that actually scares Kansiime off . The incongruity here is that her father is convinced that Kansiime is indeed sick. As a caring parent he wants to help his sick daughter by indicating that he is going to call the doctor to administer an injection. And since Kansiime was actually pretending, she also can't fall for the jab, she has to rather find her way out of this situation again, so she decides to change her reaction; this is when the incongruity comes in, that Kansiime becomes bright and then questions why the father is talking of the injection. Besides this she indicates that she loves school and she wants to go to school. And the hearer will smile because he/she discovers Kansiime's real motives that she indeed does not want to go to school and that she was just pretending about being sick. What is important here is that all these three parameters aid in the relevant theoretic processing of jokes. All this three parameters are explored in episode (2) as illustrated below.

Kansiime: you are a thief. No right now what you are doing is theft. Robbery, robbery, because its like someone giving… when she says that, you have a very nice shoe (jumps to Grace' side and pointing at where she left) just say it is Kansiime. When she says you are a fashion designer, you look hot, you you are stylish (jumps to Grace side once more), you say complements go to Kansiime. That is not yours. It's like if a person gives you a package directed to me, and just because you have received it. Instead of giving it to me, you keep it.

  (4)

So right now you are a thief. You have stolen all the complements of Kansiime (turns to the girl) and you, you went to the war, and when other people were running from the war, fleeing for their lives, you were running to the war, picking costumes. And you wear clothes that suffocate your products, mmmh, you wear clothes that make you look like that, and you go round saying, I watch fashion TV. What do you learn when you watch fashion TV? What exactly do you learn?

Kansiime is not impressed because her friend Grace whom she lent her clothes has been given complements while Kansiime has not been given any by this girl they have met. Her utterances are trying to portray her attitude about this fact. And she decides to refer to Grace as a thief, Grace is a thief who has stolen what in the encyclopedic memory of a hearer cannot be stolen per se, that is complements. This is why an incongruity is perceived as this defies the world knowledge about theft and about complements and appreciation. It is not possible for someone to steal complements, and that complements are given by beholders according to their perception about the bearer of the complements. Here the incongruous is resolved when the hearer establishes that the speaker intended to make a joke about the situation. The shift of focus from accusing Grace to have stolen Kansiime's complements to scolding the girl on how the girl has dressed. It leads to the creation of a salient verbal irony and at the same time aids in creation of tension.

1) Calling the dresses of the girl a possession of looting from the war during an episode of looting.

An audience in this case builds anticipatory hypotheses on the proposition of the war, in attending to Kansiime telling the girl that she went to war. Her audience can be expected to build hypothesis such as, going to war and getting hurt, going to war and witnessing people being killed or build any other hypotheses that could depict an unfortunate outcome of the war. But this is a path that the speaker leads the hearer to, intentionally, which is finally broken by the explanation Kansiime gives about how the girl acquired what she has on. It is then that the hearer rejects the earlier built assumptions in a bid to maximize relevance and the hearer builds new hypotheses that create a picture of people humiliated running from a distress war zone, while there is this girl who is running into this distress just to pick the dropped clothes, and these is what Kansiime refers to as 'costumes'. What makes the hearer smile is the picture of a girl who is not scared by the activities of the war but who instead is thinking of what she will acquire and put on, this shows some uncommon courage that the girl has for a reason that is uncalled for. In this case the incongruity in (2) is resolved. However incongruity in (1) is partly resolved because the hearer is not led to build a contextual implication of the shift of focus from blaming Grace to blaming the girl. This turns out to be a stepping stone which has been made through the cut of coherence in the flow of events within the text.

Incongruities in the Ironies on Politics of the Country

These are incongruities found in the ironies that reflect on the political situation of the country. They refer to the type of leadership in a given country, they nature of elections that are held in a given country and even talk on the weaknesses and strengths of specific leaders and even the government as a whole. This is an illustration picked from episode (13) where Kansiime alongside other comedians is doing a live presentation in Kigali Rwanda. Within her jokes she decides to refer to the political situation in her country. When she talks about her new development of singing for children and tries to create the impression that this is not an easy task she relates this to the political situation in her country.

(5) Mmm you are very lucky you don't have tear gas here. You don't know, you don't know!In in in Uganda, for us our games if you ask our kids, about tear gas, you

are corrupt, you have embezzled funds, you are going to prison. Those are our games. Our games of playing. Those ones yea. Aaah even me I want to be mbavazi, Even me I want to be corrupt, meee..

Kansiime explores the issue of political instability by the use of the concept of tear gas and corruption in reference to the political situation in her country. In the text Kansiime starts by attracting the audience to the notion of tear gas, the audience will naturally build anticipatory assumptions on the proposition about tear gas. This can be successfully hold through accessing the encyclopedic entries about tear gas, based on the broad ad hoc concept about tear gas which will aid create the premises about tear gas. These premises would include such assumptions that these are situations associated with the police combating law breakers, dispersing a rowdy crowd which will be broadened to facts about political instability of a given country as in an obvious scene which depicts an unsettled country.

The kind of environment that has been created by the speaker is one in which, we naturally don't expect child participants. If a child is caught up in such a scenario then it is expected that it should be by accident. But this kind of assumption is contradicted. The hearer does not expect to have children participating in this scenario. So when now Kansiime refers to tear gas, then the kind of games that the children in Uganda play, games that depict that the children are also aware of the political situation in their country, the incongruity is perceived here, because this contradicts the world knowledge about politics, which is known to be an avenue of mature adults and not children.

Incongruities in the Ironies on Hopes and Aspirations

In this section we look at the incongruities that are found in the ironies on hopes and aspirations of the society or of an individual. It is accepted that incongruity is a necessary component for many cases of humour perception. Cundall (2007:203) observes that what allows the individual perceiver to recognize an incongruity as humorous as well as allowing for pleasant effective shift, has much to do with the setting in which the incongruous stimulus is perceived. Since incongruity works on different clashing propositional forms Curcio (1995:28) confirms that the speaker can choose to lead the hearer into the entertainment of incongruity using a clashing assumption that could be manifest from the current context of interpretation. The humorists can also decide to design their humorous discourses by resorting to this mind-reading ability in which they will predict that certain stimuli will be more relevant than others and that certain assumptions will inevitably be entertained by their audience during comprehension. This is typical of jokes which base the humorous effect not on explicit interpretations but on the audience's extraction of contextual implications as it is in the text below:

(6) Has anyone ever told you that you are ugly? You look bad!

The utterances above might not present any incongruity if the hearer does not give attention to the context of interpretation thus by using contextual adjustment for free enrichment The example has been taken from episode (4) and the incongruity will only be perceived if the hearer creates the picture of who is being asked the question and why is it being asked. Kansiime is asking Grace this question, a girl she has just met and discovered is the girlfriend to her husband. In the previous discourse there is an utterance that is suggestive or leading the hearer to build assumptions on the beauty of Grace When Kansiime just decides to question Grace's beauty it becomes incongruous for the hearer who must search for relevance to suit the context. This is an example that makes explicit the notion of context as being relevant in the interpretation of a joke. To make it worth the hearer's attention, the humorist ensures that the set of assumptions that the hearer builds must be in line with the context of interpretation. And this must happen for relevance to be achieved. So in this case therefore building relevant

assumptions is very tricky, however if the hearer chooses the context of interpretation in which Kansiime intends to humiliate Grace because of the kind of relationship they have, then the hearer reaches an congruous interpretation, It becomes the duty of the hearer to to build the assumptions that Kansiime is jealous and that is why she says things like this., see the following example: Kansiime: Actually first wait. Piece of advice my dear. Never go to the Zoo.

Grace: why?

Kansiime: If you go to the zoo, animals will strike. They will wonder why a fellow animal is meandering freely in the park. That animal being you, meandering freely in the park, While for them they are being caged. Actually in case you don't have pocket money. Cage yourself, put yourself in the street. People will get to come and look at you, you look bad! Actually if ugliness was contagious, do you know what I would do? This would be a phone call   Just cage yourself and people will look at you and pay money. And be as if they have gone to the zoo someone looks at you and you are evidence that evolution happened. We came from chimpanzee coz am seeing a chimpanzee ape moving around.

We find the violation of the world knowledge about the expectations of a cheated wife which contradicts our expectations of what she would have done in such a situation that is Kansiime resorts to complain about Grace's looks. Hence what is perceived in the incongruity is in the metonymic attributes that Kansiime accords Grace, by replacing the features of Grace after successfully drawing Grace's attention to what seems to be a good advice for a dear one. The humorist here explores the ability of lexical broadening of the hearer in the sense that the ad hoc concept of the word animal as encoded is broadened to denote all wild animals that need to be caged in the zoo.

As it is in RT the hearer will follow a path of least effort to look for the expected level of cognitive effects, this is what will make the hearer here to activate assumptions from his encyclopedic entry for animals. The attributes of caged animals include the fact that

They are not human therefore Grace is not human

They have four legs therefore Grace has four legs, this is however a weak implicatures and to achieve optimal relevance this is not likely to be activated since the hearer chooses an assumption as consistence with the principle of relevance. They are caged to be viewed since they are rare species or they are dangerous therefore Grace is included in this rare species category since she is ugly and therefore a rare species.

Since Grace is human these attributes make the hearer achieve humorous effects since they violate the world knowledge of the attributes of humans, and one is left to wonder how ugly the speaker wants to create the picture of Grace. Kansiime relates talks about being caged in because of the kind of ugliness that which is in Grace, so that people can get to see this rare ugliness. There is also a clash in the proposition that that animals can go on strike because of Grace's ugliness. It is these embedded contradictions that create the punchline.

(8)   Grace: (sneering)

Kansiime: hahaha don't try those facial expressions. Those   are   very expensive facial expressions for beautiful people. Someone who looks the way you look (making ugly faces). Cannot manage to look…   You don't make those expressions, they areexpensive, my dear, make sure you smile, and ugly people smile, so that the best runs off. Or or others… You must be feeling pains (*reaching out to touch her face, while Grace moves her face*

away) you can't look like that and not feel pain. Madam you are ugly! What was *Fiup* (Philp) looking for when he was looking at you? What is it exactly? Exactly what is it? I cannot believe you walked in public… Are you sure there is no stampede outside…

In this Episode (6) Grace sneers because Kansiime has referred to her as ugly. Kansiime laughs this off and the incongruity comes by when Kansiime tells her not to try those facial expressions as they are expensive expressions for beautiful people. This is a fact that violates the world knowledge of facial expressions and beauty. We know that facial expressions are not meant to be specific to some people and can be used by anybody for the purpose of communication regardless of their looks.

More incongruity is perceived when Kansiime says 'ugly people smile so that the best rubs off on them' because another violation of the world knowledge is perceived that an ugly person must smile for the best of her to be seen She then adds by saying 'you can't look like that and not feel pain' which is incongruous because ugliness does not actually cause any pain to someone.

The list of incongruities on facial expressions

1) They are specific to specific people, beautiful people in this context. So Grace is uglytherefore some of these expressions are not for her.
2) They can be bought from shops
3) Only beautiful people can afford them
4) Ugly people can only afford a smile. Because a smile will make the best run off them.
5) Ugliness can make people feel pain.

In the relevance theoretic comprehension procedure the search for relevance will make the hearer here to construct appropriate hypotheses about the explicit which in this case is the ostensive communication of the sneer in Grace's face. So the hearer will build assumptions about the sneer. That Grace sneered to communicate some attitude of rejection to some stimulus in this case, the sneer is supposed to show the hearer to find out that Kansiime attributes Grace's looks as ugly. But when Kansiime disapproves of this, the hearer is forced to build appropriate hypotheses about the implication of Kansiime's utterance's to get her intended implicature. It is at this point that the hearer meets clashing propositions on why Kansiime is telling Grace not to make the facial expressions because they are too expensive and are for beautiful people then one gets the joke that Kansiime means to say there are types of facial expressions, and that these facial expressions are specified for specific people according to their looks and more still that the expressions can be bought at the shop. It is not just any way of arriving at contradictory assumptions that will play a significant part in producing humorous interpretation. Clashing assumptions may manifest either from the current context of interpretation or explicitly from the content of the utterance Curcio (1995:28). Often the implicatures are intended by the speaker to arouse humorous effects. Through the entertainment of the implicatures the search for relevance is recovered as the awareness is created Kihara & Shroeder (2012:13). In episode (10) the humorist utilizes the recovery of implicatures in leading the hearer to perceive humorous effects: this is the case with the text below:

(9) Kansiime: Ng'e ng'e ng'e ng'e ng'e ng'e ng'e… its okay, its okay. Let me go with these clothes. Today you are going to learn a lesson. Avery very good lesson. Bye bye. I don't know how you are going to leave. Actually am going to close the house also.

Next time, before you dare to borrow money from someone. You will first do investigations anda background check on who you think you are going to mess around with. They… me they don't rob me. You are going to have to pay me, and me I don't work on your terms mmh. *(Peeps to see his nakedness as she leaves)*. In this text we see a violation of the world knowledge about politeness, when Kansiime utters Nge nge. which is the trigger upon which anticipatory hypothesis will be built   lacks a logical form, that it does not have a semantic representation as it has neither lexical nor syntacticrepresentation so the hearers here does not have a logical form of an utterance so as to proceedon with the interpretation. What the speaker supplies the hearer is a signal which lacks cognitive content. So the hearer is forced to create a hypothesis on the   intent of the speaker to have used such a signal and must therefore build assumptions that can create logic out of this kind of utterance which is attributed to some given proposition.

The tension built by a proposition like 'ng'e ng'e ng'e ng'e…' leads the hearer to search for the implicated premise in order to satisfy the principle of relevance in qualifying. This premise is then supplied by preceding utterances. So it is possible for the hearer to perceive an incongruity that will still be resolved by the speaker's effort According to Curcio (1995:33), if the implication is on the scale of correct anticipatory hypotheses that have contextual effects of its own then a foreground implication will be achieved,   but if then an implication which exactly is the implicature spell it out that is not relevant on its own is achieved as in the text above, then it will lead to a background implication.

To yield contextual implication the hearer builds anticipatory hypothesis on the utterance Nge nge…to achieve a background implication. This would mean that probably the speaker was implicating a negative attitude towards an earlier presented proposition,In the next example, the humorist explores the suitability of courtesy and manners in the office; thus working on the hearers capability to perceive sense in a given situation, the example stems from episode (12)

(10)   (*Kansiime gets into an office to get a Director speaking on phone*)

Director: (speaking on phone) ai! Kakai is there? Haha make sure you hidemy wine (*pause*) eeh hahaha. Banange I cant wait, I cant wait to see George. When is he coming?

Kansiime: (*interrupting*) Excuse me

Director: (*waves her hand to have Kansiime wait as the director is Still on phone*) eeehrea… on Tuesday (pause) my God I

don't want to miss bana… I don't want to miss eeh. Yee (turning to Kansiime) Yes, sorry madam. How can I helpyou?

Kansiime: (*grabs the phone*) First get off the phone. You do not ask meHow you can help me when I am… you are the people, why you are… you are the people why there is no job, and people think you are very unserious. What if a potential investor am,I have come to invest in your

kacheap cheap business. Or I have brought good
business actually in the shop. And you just sit there
malingering. You are just there wasting time on phone
'ooh keep me wine, also Lucozade, also porridge (
with a sneer) and you cannot attend to clients. What is wrong with
receptionists,Eeh? These are jobs that should be scrapped off any business!
I cannot believe this. As a matter of fact Iwant to talk to your boss right
now.

We expect that as Kansiime is excusing herself when talking to the director that she has the intention of depicting good manners in the office and that her interruption is in good faith and is probably called for. So the hearer builds anticipatory hypotheses on this foregrounded information that Kansiime has the need to talk to the director urgently. But when the director apologises for Kansiime waiting and seeks to have Kansiime's audience, Kansiime grabs the phone and commands that this director gets off the phone first before attending to her. This now creates an incongruity. The subsequent utterances depict a lot of incongruites:

First the demining of the business, that she has come to invest in by calling it 'Kacheap cheap business' Here she uses the morphological prefix Ka- that is used by most Bantu languages to show diminutives. So one who has the prior knowledge of this morphological aspect will easily perceive the joke that Kansiime has come to invest in a business that she feels is substandard which means she is also doesn't have any good established investment idea. Secondly by the hyperbolic indication of how the director is wasting time and expressing how the director does this when she is asking on phone to be kept a drink. The hearer will here be led to entertain lexical adjustment of the concept encoded about drinks hence realize the exaggeration in Kansiime's intentions. Is to implicate that the director is wasting time.

The hearer will broadly encode the concept of drinks in this context relating to the drink the director ordered on phone which is alcoholic while Kansiime includes even other non-alcoholic drinks lists other drinks which are actually soft drinks. This makes the hearer to access the encyclopedic entry to be able to adjust the concept encoded here, humorous effects are derived when the hearer realizes that all the drinks enlisted here are actually not the drinks the director ordered but an exaggeration of the one drink she ordered. And the incongruity is resolved when the hearer establishes that all this broadly encode concept is meant to explain that the director is wasting valuable time on phone a skin for various drinks, instead of attending to visitors in the office, while the director was only justifying that she can have a drink kept for her as part of her entertainment which is of course outside the office.

CONCLUSION

Establishment of humour is within the jurisdiction of the humorist, because it is the humorists who defines the context that the hearer will rely on in making successful interpretations, which means that both the humorist and the audience must have a shared background. Having established these concepts then it was observed that, the humorist in creation of humour takes advantage of rhetorical power such as hyperbole, metaphors. Irony is part of this kind of language use but in this study the mentioned rhetorical language has been used to create ironies. The attitude of the speaker during an event of expression was also noted to be important in establishment of humour as it leads the hearer, in making a justifiable interpretation of the text as humorous. Kansiime specifically used a dissociative attitude to establish ironic expressions that would later lead to incongruities.

RECOMMENDATION

The study recommends that a similar study be done extensively, but with a specific interest on the stand up comedies in which Kansiime has performed as opposed to the sketch genre that this study explored. Since this was a case study of one comedian which looked at how Kansiime uses irony to create humour. It is necessary to explore the use of this communicative feature across different comedians to establish its manifestation of humour. A study can also be done using a different communicative theory to justify how texts can be made humorous.

REFERENCES

Black, S. P. (2012). "Laughing to Death: Joking as Support amid Stigma for Zulu-speakingSouth Africans Living with HIV". *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *22*(1), 87–108.

Bryant, G. (2012). "Is Verbal Irony Special?" *Linguistics and Language Compass*, *6*, 673–685.

Burgers, C., Van Mulken, M., & Schellens, P. J. (2012). "Verbal Irony: Differences in UsageAcross Written Genres." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *31*, 290–310.

Cappelli, G. (2003). "Expats' Talk": *Humour and irony in an expatriate's travel blog*, 1–21. Clark, B (2013). *Relevance Theory*. Cape Town: Cambridge University Press.

Critchley, S. (2002). *On Humour; Thinking in Action*. New York: Routledge.

Cundall Jr, M. K. (2007). Humor and the limits of incongruity. *Creativity Research Journal*, *19*(2-3), 203-211.

Dynel, M. (2008). "Introduction to Special Issues on Humour: A modest attempt at presenting comtemporary Linguistic approach to Humour Studies." *In Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*. 4.1 Special issue on Humour: 1–12.

Dynel, M. (2009). "Beyond a joke: Types of Conversational Humour". *Linguistics and Language Compass"*, *3*, 1284–1299.

Hancock,J,T.(2004)."Verbal Irony Use in Face-To-Face and Computer-Mediated Conversations." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *23*(4), 447–463.

Jodlowiec, M. (1991). "What makes jokes tick". *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics 3*: 241-253.

Kihara, P, & Shroeder H. (2012) "A relevance-Theoritical Analysis of Aspects of Mchongoano." *Journal of Language and Linguistics: vol 2*, Derpartment of Linguistic and Languages, University of Nairobi: 67-78.

Kinuu, K, C (2013). *A Pragmatic Approach to Kenyan Standup Comedy: A Study of Erick Omondi's Performances.* Unpublished MA Dessertation.

Ruch, W. (1988). Sensation seeking and the enjoyment of structure and content of humour: Stability of findings across four samples. *Personality and individual differences*, *9*(5), 861-871.

Sperber, D. & Wilson D (2002) "Pragmatic Modularity and Mind reading". *Mind and Language*

17.1-: 3-23.

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). Relevance: Communication and cognition. Oxford Blackwell

Vuorela, T. (2005). "Laughing Matters: A Case Study of Humor in Multicultural Business Negotiations". *Negotiation Journal*, *21*(January), 105–130.

Wilson, D. (1994). Relevance and understanding. In G. Brown, K. Malmkjæ, A. Pollit, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Language and Understanding* (pp. 35–58). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, D. (1995) *Relevance: Communication and cognition.* 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wilson, D (2006). "The Pragmatics of Verbal irony:Echo or Pretence?" In Lingua.116, 1722-1743.

Wilson D. & Sperber D. (2004) 'Relevance Theory.' In L, Horn and Ward. *The handbook ofpragmatics.* Oxford. Blackwell: Oxford 633-657

Yus, F. (1999). "Misunderstandings and Explicit/Implicit Communication. *Pragmatics*, *9*, 487– 517.

Yus, F (2003) "Humour and the Search for Relevance." *Journal of Pragmatic.*35 (9):1295-1331.

Yus, F. (2008). "A Relevance-Theoritic Classification of Jokes". *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics,4.1*, 131–157.

Yus, F. (2012). "Strategies and Effects in Humorous Discourse: The case of Jokes. In Decade ofRelevance. *Journal of Pragmtics*, 30, 305-345.

.