An analysis of television satire on Kiky Saputri’s roasting in *Lapor Pak!*
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ABSTRACT

Humor has always been and will remain to be part of the political landscape, even though it may take a temporary break from time to time. The range of political humor is immense, including roasting comedy. In general, past research has succeeded in showing the importance of roasting comedy and how it employs the figure of speech. The problem is although the roasting is broadcast on national television, none of them has examined it using the theory of television satire. Thus, this research aimed to analyze the presupposition of roasting comedy and to study the roasting comedy by using the heuristic structures of television satire, which include: space, target, rhetoric, media, and time. The writers used qualitative methods to analyze the data using critical discourse analysis (CDA). This study used Kiky Saputri’s roasting video of DKI Jakarta governor Anies Baswedan in Lapor Pak! comedy program. The video was taken from the YouTube account Trans7 Official entitled “Kiky ROASTING Anies Baswedan, Pasukan Auto Jantungan! | LAPOR PAK! (09/11/21) Part 4”. This program was selected for its popularity and has won the Indonesian Television Award (ITA) 2021 in the most popular non-drama primetime program category. Among the program’s episodes, this episode has become viral with more than 6.8 million views and was widely published in major national news portals. From the analysis, it can be concluded that Kiky Saputri’s roasting comedy has a specific pattern. Furthermore, because the Lapor Pak! program fulfilled Jones’ heuristic structure, Kiky Saputri’s roasting Anies Baswedan attracted much attention.
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1. Introduction

Baumgartner & Morris (2008) believed that even if humor may take a temporary break from time to time, it has always been and will remain to be part of the political landscape. The range of political humor is immense. It includes stand-up comedians, late-night talk show hosts, sketch comedy, news satire, internet memes, videos, television series, and more. However, Rossing (2017) added that one genre remains largely under-examined: the roast. A roast, or a parody of a toast, can be defined as a stand-up performance where a celebrated guest becomes
the target of good-natured jokes that ostensibly honor the individual through derisive jokes. Typically, a host or “roastmaster” emcees the event, while a series of roasters offer speeches that offer biting criticism of the “roastee” (p. 168). In addition, it should be noted that roasting is not lazy insult comedy but joke-writing in its purest form. Roasting comedy is not as simple as treating a person like a punching bag. Instead, roasting comedy must be seen as valuable since it is a celebration of community, a rebellion against political correctness, and an exercise in comic creativity (Cantor, 2011).

Despite its uniqueness, little research has been done to analyze the art of roasting comedy (Lilaifi, 2019; Sihombing et al., 2021). In her research, Lilaifi (2019) analyzed the language play by Ridwan Remin, who is well-known for being a ‘king’ roasting. Therefore, she is interested in investigating what form of language play Ridwan Remin used. First, the study showed that while delivering his roasting comedy, Ridwan Remin violated the agreement and sympathy maxims. She also added that Ridwan Remin used several figures of speech, such as irony and satire. Lastly, she also found out that in his speech, it is shown that Ridwan Remin’s language play functioned mainly as humor. Secondly, Sihombing et al. (2021) studied several videos of roasting comedy by Kiky Saputri. This study used Kiky Saputri’s video when she acted as the “roastmaster” to several ministers such as Susi Pudjiastuti, Rudiantara, Retno Marsudi, and Hanif Dhakari. The study showed that Kiky Saputri, a comedian, roasted to entertain people and criticize the government. She demonstrated that the government, particularly the ministers, could be criticized through roasting. Therefore, roasting could be one of the most effective ways to communicate citizen ideas, provide government critiques, and satirize what politicians have done.

Lastly, Dynel (2020) investigated how roasting comedy is used in a marketing strategy. The fast-food chain Wendy’s is known for its witty Twitter promotional strategy with snappy remarks known as “roasting.” Wendy’s tweets, known for their ingenuity, should be viewed as clever responses to users’ numerous challenging tweets or taunting other firms. In addition, some tweets qualify as aggressive remarks about Wendy’s competitors. Thus, rather than being purely frivolous tweets carried out in a comedic context, these taunts aim to transmit honest critical sentiments (the hallmark of roasting). Overall, a significant quantity of research has succeeded in highlighting the role of roasting comedy and how the figure of speech is used. Yet, none of them has analyzed roasting comedy using the theory of television satire, even when the roasting itself is aired on national television.

Understanding the presupposition is crucial in roasting comedy so that people can accept the jokes the stand-up comedian conveys. Garassino et al. (2022), in their study, conveyed that the pragmatic function is needed to accept criticism, stance-taking, information content, praise, and others. Without the pragmatic function, the audience would find it difficult to relate the jokes to the context. In addition, even though satire is a phenomenon that crosses various media, research focuses on television because satirical shows there have grown more and more popular over the past ten years (Lichtenstein & Nitsch, 2023). However, it should be noted that for satire to be most successful, the audience needs at least to have a basic understanding of the larger context of the critique(s) and the target (Caufield, 2008). Furthermore, satire can influence various audience responses, including learning, persuasion, and both good and negative affect (Burgers & Brugman, 2022). In light of this, it is also essential that the audience understand the wider context of the satire presented by Kiky Saputri to Anies Baswedan.

Thus, in this research, aside from analyzing the presupposition of roasting comedy, the writers also aim to study the roasting comedy by using the heuristic structures of television satire from Jones (2015), which include: space, target, rhetoric, media, and time. On top of that, the writers are interested in studying the video roasting of Anies Baswedan further, delivered by Kiky Saputri on the television program Lapor Pak! episode: ANIES BASWEDAN Datang Padamkan Kebakaran di Kantor Lapor Pak!
2. Method

This study used Kiky Saputri’s roasting video of DKI Jakarta governor Anies Baswedan in the *Lapor Pak!* program. The video was taken from the YouTube account Trans7 Official entitled “Kiky ROASTING Anies Baswedan, Pasukan Auto Jantungan! | LAPOR PAK! (09/11/21) Part 4”. This program was selected for its popularity and won the Indonesian Television Award (ITA) 2021 for the most popular non-drama primetime program (Irawan, 2021; Liputan6.com, 2021; Prambadi, 2021). Furthermore, by the time this paper was written, the program's episodes been viral with more than 6.8 million views and were also widely published in prominent national news portals (Firmansyah, 2021; Tribunnews.com, 2021; Velarosdela, 2021). Regarding the popularity of the video and its impact, the writers aim to analyze roasting comedy by using the heuristic structures of television satire from Jones (2015). In addition, the writers used qualitative methods by employing critical discourse analysis (CDA). Critical discourse analysis is an approach to studying and analyzing the relationship between written and spoken texts with wider social relations to reveal the relationship between the discourse in society (Hunt & MacPhee, 2020; Xie, 2018). It means that the discourses can represent a certain context of society.

Adopting Fairclough’s CDA method (as cited in Cummings et al., 2020; Xie, 2018), four phases were taken in this study. The first phase was to select a research topic and provide the past discourse. In this phase, the authors looked for the research topic and compiled previous research regarding satire and more specific studies on Kiky Saputri’s roasting of Anies Baswedan. The second phase was to select the texts. The data was obtained by transcribing the satire video into text. Each cast’s statements and non-verbal reactions were written in the transcription. From the video transcript, the authors selected the texts to be analyzed. The selected texts were the satire expressed by Kiky Saputri in the video. Then, the third phase was to relate the discourse to the social order needs. In this case, the authors saw the implications of Kiky Saputri’s statements and whether the implications were inherent to the social conditions. The next phase of CDA was to find possible solutions. This study tried to explain why satire was used in TV programs, and analysis, Jones’s heuristic theory was used to reveal why Kiky Saputri’s satire was used.

3. Result

Kiky Saputri’s satire presupposition

The texts observed from the data can be seen in Excerpts 1-5, which will be discussed later. Following the CDA phase, the text is analyzed by looking at the discourse on the social order. In doing so, Amoussou & Allagbe (2018) suggested some questions in analyzing texts using CDA to question whether there are presuppositions made by the speaker that is not stated explicitly. Potts (2015) suggests two kinds of presupposition: pragmatic presupposition and semantic presupposition. Pragmatic presuppositions are the action of the speaker and what the speaker acts based on what they utter. This usually happens in conversation or turn-taking dialogue.

Meanwhile, semantic presupposition can be traced from the aspects of meaning and constructions, which may result in several meanings. In the roasting, the presuppositions allow the speaker to create several meanings for what she says. With several meanings existing, Kiky Saputri plays the situation to roast the governor of DKI Jakarta. Kiky Saputri leads the audience to the pragmatic presupposition and then bends the utterance to mention the satire to criticize the governor. The examples can be seen in excerpts 1-5, where she directed the audience to the pragmatic meaning of what she said.

The first example can be seen in Excerpt 1. Kiky Saputri Saputri said “Seorang gubernur, sosok pemimpin hebat...,” in front of Mr Anis Baswedan. When a speaker speaks to a listener, it implies that the utterance is for the listener. Therefore, the statement presupposed that Mr. Anies Baswedan was a great leader. The pragmatic presupposition appears because the governor
attending the show was Mr. Anies Baswedan. Normally, the compliment should be directed to the governor, who becomes the show's star.

Excerpt 1

Kiky Saputri : Seorang gubernur, sosok pemimpin hebat...
Penonton : /woow/
Kiky Saputri : Tepuk tangan dong buat Pak Ahok [00.26 – 00.34]

Kiky Saputri : A governor, a great leader ...
Audience : woow
Kiky Saputri : Give applause for Mr Ahok [00.26 – 00.34]

However, the statement does not mention names, which raises several meanings, including any governor’s greatness. Therefore, Kiky Saputri gave a punch line: “Tepuk tangan dong buat Pak Ahok.” The utterance was not just bending to the meaning but also started the satire by roasting the governor. The name of Ahok was mentioned since he was a former governor who was popular for the program and was the opponent of Anies Baswedan in the previous election. Therefore, the roasting implies that Anies Baswedan was not as great as the great figure of Ahok.

Then, the roasting continues, as seen in Excerpt 2, when Kiky Saputri mentions the religious and academic title of the governor. She said “Nggak mungkin dong, saya nggak tahu DKI 1... Bapak Haji Anies Rasyid Baswedan, S.E., M.Pp., Ph.D.” The religious title of the governor was “Haji,” and the academic titles were “S.E., M.Pp., Ph.D.” Furthermore, the academic title showed that the governor holds a doctorate. This means that the governor has high titles both in religious and academic matters, which people can be proud of.

Excerpt 2

Kiky Saputri : Nggak mungkin dong, saya nggak tahu DKI 1... Bapak Haji Anies Rasyid Baswedan, S.E., M.Pp., Ph.D.
Penonton : Wuiiiih... Woow..
Kiky Saputri : Betul kan? Mohon maaf, Pak
Anies Baswedan: Siap
Kiky Saputri : PHD nya lagi promo apa engga, Pak?
Penonton : Heeeeyyy... [01.16 – 01.32]

Kiky Saputri : There’s no way I don’t know DKI 1... Mr Haji Anies Rasyid Baswedan, S.E., M.Pp., Ph.D.
Audience : Wuiiiih... Woow..
Kiky Saputri : Is that right, sir? I’m sorry, sir.
Anies Baswedan: No problem.
Kiky Saputri : Is PHD offering a promo?
Audience : Heeeeyyy... [01.16 – 01.32]

The pragmatic presupposition should be that the governor was religious because he had conducted five Islam principles to make the haj pilgrimage. He also had the highest academic title, Ph.D. Therefore, mentioning the governor's name should make the audience aware that he should be considered respectable for having the title. However, instead of showing honor for the title,
Kiky Saputri ridiculed the title by associating the doctorate Ph.D. with *Pizza Hut Delivery* (PHD). *PHD* was one of the popular franchise restaurants that regularly offered discounts for its customers. That is why Kiky Saputri asked the governor about the promotion of the governor who had a doctoral degree.

Thirdly, Kiky Saputri then compared the difference between greeting a governor and the common people. Pragmatically, when talking about greetings, people would use expressions like “How are you?” or “How is your family doing?”. Once again, Kiky Saputri used the same pattern in roasting the governor, as seen in Excerpt 3.

**Excerpt 3**


*Wendy Armoko*: Terancam...

*Audience*: Hahaha...

*Wendy Armoko*: Baik. Alhamdulilah baik

*Kiky Saputri*: Biasa... Kalau sama gubernur tuh nggak bisa biasa. Pak Anies, Formula E apakabar?

[02.05 – 03.35]

*Kiky Saputri*: No, we cannot meet the governor like meeting ordinary people. We greet them differently. When I meet Mr. Andika, I’ll say Mr. Andika how are you? That’s common... Mr. Wendy, how are you?

*Wendy Armoko*: Feeling threatened.

*Audience*: Hahaha...

*Wendy Armoko*: I am fine, Thank God.

*Kiky Saputri*: That is common... When you meet a governor, you cannot greet him in ordinary ways. Mr Anies, how is Formula E? [02.05 – 03.35]

She led the audience to the ‘common greetings” by greeting other cast like Andika Pratama and Wendy Armoko with “how is your family doing?”. In the response, Wendy Armoko said that he felt threatened because he knew it should not be just a common question, although, in the end, he answered that his family was great. From this point, other casts understand that the statement should not be understood pragmatically. They know that Kiky Saputri was using other presuppositions of the questions. The cast’s worry became clearer when Kiky Saputri greeted the governor by asking about the hot issue involving the governor. She said “Pak Anies, Formula E apakabar?”. The greeting here did not aim to ask about the governors’ well-being, instead asking about the progress of Formula E. Many people showed pessimism that the project would benefit society. It can be seen from the news that the Formula E project has surfaced controversy public such as alleged corruption (Tan, 2021) and funding (Arbi, 2022; Azzahra, 2021). Here, Kiky Saputri criticized the governor with questions since society did not know how the project was progressing.
Fourth, similarly, Kiky Saputry was showing her amazement towards the governor’s academic achievement. In Excerpt 4, she said:

**Excerpt 4**


Kiky Saputri: Due to his aptitude and intelligence, he was appointed as the Minister of Education and Culture in 2014. Is that right, sir? Even though it was finally re-shuffled. It's all right, isn't it Sir? And... many people don't know that when he was re-shuffled, Pak Jokowi was offered a new position. But Mr. Anies did not take it. Why sir? You were not ready to get fired twice? [03.20 – 03.41]

The statement “Berkat kehebatan dan kecerdasannya, beliau diangkat menjadi Menteri Pendidikan dan kebudayaan di tahun 2014.” presupposes that he had great academic achievements, so he was chosen by the president to be the minister of education in 2014. The statement also presupposes that he did his responsibility as a minister well regarding his intelligence and greatness. However, the next statement is against the achievement of the governor. Anies’s greatness that Kiky Saputri built in her set-up was broken down by the fact that the president reshuffled Anies. This implies that the governor did not run the ministry well. This implication was strengthened with the next punch line. Kiky Saputri was asking whether Anies Baswedan was afraid that the president would fire him for the second time.

**Excerpt 5**

*Kiky Saputri*: Tapi, it's okay. Tidak ada hasil yang menghianati proses. Kita lihat sekarang Pak Anis, berdiri sebagai gubernur DKI Jakarta dengan banyak prestasi, programnya banyak, kebijakannya banyak... banyak yang menghujat [04.09 – 04.25]

Kiky Saputri: But, it's okay. There are no results that betray the process. We see now Mr. Anis, standing as governor of DKI Jakarta with many achievements, many programs, many policies... many insults [04.09 – 04.25]
The use of compliments in delivering the satire was also seen in Excerpt 5. In the excerpt, Kiky Saputri complimented the governor by using the popular idiom “Tidak ada hasil yang menghianati proses”, which can be translated to “No results betray the process”. The idioms presuppose that when people have made so much effort, they will get success or results. She pointed out the efforts included many achievements, programs, and policies. This made the audience think that the governor has made many efforts for the city. The word ‘many’ here was deliberately used because she would add the last ‘results’ of his effort to be ‘banyak hujatan’ or ‘many reproaches’. The satire here was that the idiom contradicted the intended meaning since the results (achievement, programs, and policies) betrayed the process. The efforts that he had made ended up in people’s disagreement or insults.

All in all, it can be concluded that there is a pattern in the roasting comedy. The roaster begins the setup by convincing the audience that the roastee is consistent with the pragmatic presupposition. The roaster then shares the punchline by contradicting the developed argument once the audience has been pointed to the pragmatic presupposition. The general rule is that the roaster appears to complement the roastee when, in reality, the roaster criticizes the roastee. Similarly, Kiky Saputri constantly praised Anies Baswedan before attacking his work as governor in this roasting segment.

Heuristic Structures of Television Satire

Space

Jones (2005) explained that politics was viewed as something to be discussed exclusively in the most serious of ways back in the television era, with news, public affairs discourse, and documentaries being three of the key genres for serious discussions. As a result, politics-related television programming was regarded as inconsequential at best and dangerous at worst back then. Then, the perception changed due to the national news media’s major journalistic failures in exposing the Bush administration’s fabricated justification for starting the Iraq War. The point is that political humor has a safe space on television. Taking this into account, television also became a safe space for Kiky Saputri in delivering her satiric roasting material about Anies Baswedan. Jones (2015) strongly believed that because it is only on television, politicians will appear on satire shows and actively participate in their satirization. What is suitable for different spaces is dictated by different cognitive schemas. Satire is not what one expects to hear in congressional hearings or rallies (p. 35-36). The original video of roasting was broadcast on the Lapor Pak! program, a crime-comedy show famed for its roasting segment. Thus, the audience's subconscious mind was ready to watch Kiky Saputry act as a “roastmaster.”

Likewise, acting as the “roastee”, Anies fully understood that Lapor Pak! is merely a comedy program. Although Lapor Pak! is a television show, he and his team must have realized that in a space like this, silence is no longer a strength but a weakness for business people and politicians (Jones, 2015, p. 36). As a result, Anies’ decision to follow the screenplay written by the team from Trans7 and Kiky Saputri herself is perfectly reasonable. Furthermore, it is important to highlight that even though Anies did not check the material or script for the roasting session, Kiky Saputry had requested permission from him ahead of time for the future criticism she would deliver (Anjani, 2021; Nabilla, 2021). In other words, less likely Anies would show his anger and attack Kiky Saputri when he was being criticized on television because he consciously knew that the segment’s objective was to criticize the guest. Therefore, it can be concluded that political satire has a safe space on television.

Target

Secondly, Jones (2015) stated in his research that satire had been used to criticize politicians' confusion and double-speak. Satire has transformed into a means for emphasizing the
particulars of the case that made it so ludicrous in the first place – or other words, satire targeted political discourse. Aligning with the previous linguistic discussion, Kiky highlighted heated topics relating to Anies in the video roasting of Anies Baswedan. Kiky brought up at least three issues in her roasting: the Formula E scandal, the failure of Jakarta flood management, and programs that fell short of promises. To begin, Kiky brought up suspicions of corruption in implementing the Formula E car racing event in DKI Jakarta.

Excerpt 3


Wendy Armoko : Terancam...

Penonton : Hahaha...


Kiky Saputri: Biasa... Kalau sama gubernur tuh nggak bisa biasa. Pak Anies, Formula E apakabar?

All cast : Waaahhh... [02.05 – 03.35]

Kiky Saputri: No, we cannot meet the governor like meeting ordinary people. We greet them differently. When I meet Mr. Andika, I’ll say Mr. Andika how are you? That’s common... Mr. Wendy, how are you?

Wendy Armoko: Feeling threatened.

Audience : Hahaha...

Wendy Armoko: I’m fine, Thank God.

Kiky Saputri: That’s common... When you meet a governor, you cannot greet him in ordinary ways. Mr. Anies, how is Formula E? [02.05 – 03.35]

From the excerpt above, it can be seen how Kiky Saputri compared how she greeted the casts of Lapor Pak! program. First, she argued that Anies must be welcomed differently. Then, without a doubt, instead of asking how Anies was doing, she asked about the progress of the Formula E racing venue. Kiky Saputri’s first move struck well as it is reported that the city government has paid Formula E to host a race. But the other hand, the entire commitment cost paid by the DKI APBD is substantially different from the commitment fee paid by other towns worldwide that also host Formula E races (detikNews, 2022).

Parody rejects the top-down nature of news: that those in positions of power (including reporters) get to proclaim to the public "the truth" (Jones, 2015, p. 38). As those in the position of power, the DKI Provincial Government keeps on reporting that there is no problem with the Formula E racing venue even when it is already reported that the tender for the construction of the Formula E track has been announced failed on the JakPro e-Procurement site (Sandi, 2022a, 2022b; Wiryono, 2022). In this case, Kiky Saputri, as the roaster, presented another version of the truth to the audience by bringing up the problem of Formula E.
Excerpt 6

*Kiky Saputri*:

Banjir, Pak Anies salah. Banjir, Pak Anies salah, sampai Pak Anies kesal, dan beliau buat statement, banjir bisa surut satu hari dan hujan bisa dikendalikan. Sekarang saya tahu, Pak Anies bukan gubernur, tapi avatar pengendali air [05.12 – 05.24]

Kiky Saputri: Flood is Mr. Anies’ fault. The flood was Mr. Anies’ fault until Mr. Anies was upset, and he stated that the flood could recede in one day and the rain could be controlled. Now I know Mr. Anies is not a governor but an *avatar* – the water bender [05.12 – 05.24].

Then, Kiky Saputri also brought up Anies’ treatment of flood handling. The excerpt above shows how Kiky compared Anies with characters from the famous animation *Avatar: Legend of Aang*. Clearly, Kiky emphasized how Anies Baswedan failed to focus his efforts on overcoming the capital city’s urban flooding.

Rhetoric

Four components define satire, are (1) *aggression* or verbal attack; (2) judgment while engaging in; (3) *play* and producing; (4) and laughter. And among these four, Jones (2015) believed that *play* is a fundamental component of the audience's pleasure and is crucial to satire's success with the listening or viewing audience. One thing that influences play for its success is *fakery* (pp. 38-39). Unfortunately, in the roasting video, the writers did not find any fakery strategy used by Kiky Saputri. However, even though Kiky Saputri did not use mimesis and she did not parody any of Anies’ behavior, the satirical mockery intensified and run well because all the other cast members supported Kiky’s argument. Whenever Kiky Saputri delivered the punchline – the rest of the cast hyperbolically pretended as if they were about to be arrested. The example can be seen in the excerpt below:

![Figure 1. Andre Taulany acted terrified and pretended to leave the set](image)
Semua pemain: [tertawa]
Wendy: [menghentikan Andre] duduk!
Andre: Saya... [menunjuk keluar set untuk pura-pura mengambil sesuatu]
Wendy: Semua punya keluarga, Ki, yang harus elu sadari satu.
Kiky: Iya?
Wendy: Elu ngomong santai. Kita berempat punya keluarga.
Semua pemain: [tertawa]

From the excerpt above, it can be seen that just after Kiky criticized Anies Baswedan, Andre acted as if he needed to leave the set – implying that he did not want to stay on the set any longer. However, when Andre is about to leave the set, Wendy prevents him from leaving the rest of the cast. Wendy then reminded Kiky that her criticism is dangerous for the rest of the cast as they all are married and have a family to feed.

Media
Fourth, the connection between television and the internet, particularly via social media, is affecting an entirely new sort of satiric intermediality (Jones, 2015, pp. 40). To put it another way, satire invites citizens to 'speak back' to the characters who occupy the television screen, mocking or playing with them on social media platforms. For example, the roasting segment from Kiky Saputri was shared on YouTube after it was aired on television. The decision to share the video on YouTube is understandable because currently, YouTube has become the second most used social media platform (Ertemel & Ammoura, 2021). Consequently, once the video is shared, it can be seen how the citizens used the comment section on YouTube to speak back to the criticized politician. An example can be seen in the figure below.

Figure 2. A citizen’s comment towards the roastee supporting Kiky Saputri’s criticism.

From the figure above, it can be seen that one of the audience shared his opinion as he recalled a headline related to Anies Baswedan’s handling of the flood in Jakarta. Back then, Anies said that the solution to the flood problem was by putting the water back on the ground instead of
making way for the water to the sea. Another citizen shared his opinion that Jakarta citizens had made the wrong decision by choosing Anies Baswedan as the leader.

**Time**

Lastly, Jones (2015) argued that one of the ultimate reasons why satire on television becomes a popular form of critique is also the importance of timing. Two reasons about this time and place make satire and parody appealing as public and frequently used discourse. Firstly, according to Jones, a type of citizen has emerged in the contemporary context of the late twentieth/early twenty-first century: the liberal ironist. The liberal ironists are those who are committed to the liberal democratic principle. Still, at the same time, they also understand that words used in communication are not fixed but contingent. In other words, these people have acknowledged that any statements in a satirical program can be made to look good or bad, just like the principle of postmodernity (pp. 42-43). Likewise, the roasting of Anies Baswedan by Kiky Saputri can be delivered well on TV. People are not angry about it because they have understood that there is no absolute or universal truth. Instead, people nowadays have accepted that the truth changes with the advent of new events and discoveries.

![Image](image.jpg)

*Figure 3. The audiences’ comments show understanding that the roasting does not represent one absolute truth.*

From the figure above, from the comment section, an audience emphasized the part when Kiky compared Anies with Ahok. Interestingly, the other audiences posted that Kiky’s arguments during the roasting segment were made up to entertain the supporters of the previous governor, Ahok. Thus, from the response here, people have understood that all statements in a satire program can be made to look good or bad. In this episode, the producers ask Kiky Saputri to roast Anies Baswedan. Consequently, it is understandable that Kiky prepared a punchline emphasizing Anies Baswedan’s weakness. From the perspective of the supporter of Ahok, Kiky Saputri’s critique can be seen as a desire for political change. But, from the perspective of the supporters of Anies Baswedan, they see the roasting segment as *candaan* – a joke, a part of entertainment only. Therefore, people understood that if Kiky were asked to roast Ahok, she would also deliver harsh criticism toward him.

Secondly, people currently appreciate irony and satire because they understand that toying with or playing with something already existing is better than simply protesting directly (Jones, 2015, pp. 43). In this case, the audience can see that it is easy to complain about Anies’ achievement. However, criticizing Anies Baswedan wittily and putting an element of comedy in the delivery, like what Kiky did, is complicated. An example can be seen in the figure below.
In the figure above, one of the audiences appreciates Kiky’s skill in writing her script. Kiky was even complimented by the audience, who recognized that expressing criticism with wit is difficult. Thus, Kiky Saputri is considered intelligent and wise. The acceptance from the audience here is aligned with the idea that television satire has become an alternative means of making sense of and engaging with the public interest. Furthermore, unlike typical authoritative discourses, the ideas are delivered with intelligence.

3. Discussion
Presuppositions analysis

The presuppositions in the roasting provide the speaker the ability to give her words multiple interpretations. Furthermore, a presupposition is one of the forms of pragmatic functions defined as taking for granted information when the interlocutors share common ground. However, they sometimes do not share the same previous knowledge of the condition (Garassino et al., 2022). This notion is then used to see the function of presupposition in political communication. Their study showed that presupposition is often used to understand criticism, stance-taking, informative content, and praise (Garassino et al., 2022). In a show like roasting comedy, shared knowledge is essential to make the receiver of the message understand the roasting uttered by the stand-up comedian.

Similarly, the jokes also bear functions as what Garassino et al. studied: to criticize, take a stance, inform content, and praise the roastee. If the shared knowledge of the joke’s context is absent, there will be a possibility of misunderstanding. Presuppositions can be understood by examining the context of its utterance. The information or meaning a speaker intends to convey through an utterance can be understood only when we know how presuppositions work. Understanding presupposition helps the audience to reveal the intended meaning of the writer or the speaker (Thoyyibah, 2017). Additionally, in a political context, Garassino et al. (2022) emphasized that the more implicit some content is, the stronger its persuasive and manipulative power may, in principle, be. Therefore, figuring out the presupposition of an utterance is very important so that the receiver or the audience can accept the truth of the utterance regarding a roasting comedy that often bears up the ugly truth of the roastee.

Kiky Saputri uses the occasion to roast the DKI Jakarta governor in a way that has multiple connotations. First, the audience is led to a pragmatic assumption by Kiky Saputri, who then twists the statement to criticize the governor by bringing up comedy. The action that Kiky did on stage is aligned with the previous study (Puksi, 2018) and (Simatupang et al., 2022), which analyzed the contribution of presupposition in stand-up comedy. The studies show that presupposition contributes to creating laughter in the stand-up comedy show. In addition, the creation of laughter can also be seen in the general theory of humor by Attardo and Raskin. One of the parameters in the general verbal theory of humor is a logical mechanism that includes false analogy, fallacious reasoning, absurd neologism, and word repetition (Attardo & Raskin, 1991).
Similarly, in their study, Mulyadi et al. (2021) also exemplified the false analogy of Dodit Mulanto regarding the western eating culture. The comedian told stories that made the audience think he practiced western culture. The presupposition was that he used a spoon, a fork, and a knife when eating. The audience has made the belief that he used the tools. However, he then made a false analogy by saying he used a spoon, a fork, and a blade. The replacement of knife to blade here damages the twisted pragmatic presupposition in the audience’s mind. The bending of the presupposition here then creates laughter.

Television Satire

Satire is an "artful political critique" that points out folly, hypocrisy, or absurdity. On top of that, for satire to be most effective, an audience must at least be somewhat familiar with the greater context of the satire’s critique(s) and its target (Caufield, 2008). A particular piece of satirical content may be open to several interpretations, depending on the audience members’ predispositions (LaMarre et al., as cited in Peifer & Lee, 2019). Here lies why the audience needs to understand satire fully. Satire can affect audience reactions such as positive and negative affect, learning, and persuasion (Burgers & Brugman, 2022). Given this, it is also essential that the audience be able to understand the greater context of the satire addressed on Annies Baswedan by Kiky Saputri.

The study showed that the selected Lapor Pak! program fulfilled Jones' heuristic structure, and the roasting from Kiky Saputri successfully attracted a lot of attention. Firstly, our research findings align with the idea that political humor has a safe space on television. Politicians realized that because it is only on television, they will appear on satirical shows and actively participate in their satirization (Jones, 2015, p. 35). Similarly, acting as the "roastee," Anies was fully aware that Lapor Pak! was just a comedy show. Even though Lapor Pak! is just a television show, he and his team must have realized that silence is no longer a strength but a weakness for business people and politicians (Jones, 2015, p. 36).

Consequently, Anies would be less likely to show his anger and attack Kiky Saputri when he was being criticized on television because he consciously knew that the segment’s objective was to criticize the guest. Secondly, Anies was less inclined to express his rage because the study argued that if politicians are rude to one another, they will be less likely to trust them. Viewers are reminded that politicians do not always play by the same rules as everyone else when political actors display behavior that deviates from social norms. Norm violations should elicit an adverse response, much like they do when they are experienced in real life (Mutz & Reeves, 2005).

Secondly, Jones (2015) stated in his research that satire had been used to criticize politicians' confusion and ambiguous statements. Aligning with the previous linguistic discussion, another reason for Kiky’s success in roasting Anies Baswedan is that she chose the right heated topic. In October 2021, just several days before the episode was aired on television, Anies made a phenomenal claim by saying that in 2021, the phenomenon of floods and inundation in Jakarta had been overcome within one day. In contrast, it took 3 to 4 days to be solved previously. He also mentioned that rain intensity in Jakarta could be controlled by human beings (Chaterine, 2021; Tim DetikNews, 2021).

The claim is contradictory to the fact that Anies continually came up with strange ideas like (putting water into the ground) and even blaming the floods on the buffer zones, notably Depok and Bogor in West Java, which proves that Anies is not doing anything effective yet to meet Jakarta’s flood relief priority (Arbi, 2021). Interestingly, when Anies accused Bogor of being the cause of the Jakarta floods in 2020, Bogor Regent Ade Yasin invoked the legendary character 'Avatar.' However, as seen in the animation, Ade Yasin indicated that he is not the Avatar who can control the water (al Murtadho, 2020). From here, we can see that Anies and his team confidently claim that he has successfully overcome the flooding issue in Jakarta – and the
statement has been reported on the news. According to Dhiman & Maheshwari (2013), performance appraisal is usually altered to achieve self-serving ends such as reputation and maintaining good relationships (p. 1202). Thus, a successful claim like this is shared on the news to persuading the public’s collective thought, hoping that the public agrees Anies had done a great job.

Hence, the crucial function of comedic response here is to ridicule and challenge the characters and narratives that dominate people’s collective imaginations (Jones, 2015, p.38). Kiky Saputry must have acknowledged the claim from Anies before, and she decided to challenge the narratives that were reported on the news. She wanted to challenge the previous opinion about Anies that had been planted in the public’s mind. She wanted the audience to question the claim by ridiculing the planted narrative about the flooding issue. She also specifically mentioned the character “Avatar” which was previously become an iconic statement from Bogor Regent, Ade Yasin. When Kiky mentioned the character ‘Avatar’, she consciously contradicted Anies, who claimed to be able to control the water resulting from the rain, with Ade Yasin, who previously stated his inability. Thus, this part automatically triggered the audience’s memory of the previous complication between the two regions. The parody used in Kiky Saputri’s satire targets correct issues to challenge the rhetoric of powerful official domination, in this case, the DKI Provincial Government.

Thirdly, even though Kiky Saputri did not use mimesis and she did not parody any of Anies’ behavior, the satirical mockery intensified because every other actor in the cast supported Kiky’s statement by pretending that Anies could make their career and life in danger. The play by Andre and the rest of the cast strengthened the validity of Kiky Saputri’s criticism. The rest of the cast mimicked the paranoia when Indonesia was still the New Order. In contrast with the situation today, during the New Order era, people who expressed their aspirations and critique could be arrested. On top of that, vocal people were abducted and never found again (bbc.com, 2018). Back then, the monopoly of truth was only on the one hand, and the other party was stated and positioned on the side that was always wrong (Djarot, 2006, pp. 105). From here, the application of Jones’s (2015) argument can be seen, which states that the parody allows for an embedded critique (pp. 39). In conclusion, when the rest of the cast mimicked the paranoia during the New Order era, they implicitly wanted to emphasize that the current governor being criticized had the same principle as the government during the New Order era.

Fourthly, satire invites citizens to 'speak back' to the characters who occupy the television screen, mocking or playing with them on social media platforms (Jones, 2015). Thus, when the video is shared on YouTube, it can be seen how the citizens use the comment section to speak back to the criticized politician. The findings above showed that the audiences’ responses in the comment section prove the theory proposed by Jones. Nowadays, citizens have increasingly taken to social media venues for their own creative and playful engagements with politics. Both of the following remarks from social media users demonstrate how the public utilized social media participation in criticizing the politician. To put it another way, satire invites citizens to 'speak back' to the characters who occupy the television screen, mocking or playing with them on social media platforms (Jones, 2015, pp. 41). In this case, Kiky Saputri’s roasting invites citizens to speak up about their opinion toward Anies Baswedan.

On top of that, satire and parody are appealing as public and frequently used discourse in this time and place for two reasons. Firstly, the emergence of liberal ironists is a new wave of citizens that emerged in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The roasting Anies Baswedan by Kiky Saputri can be delivered well on TV. People are not angry about it because they have understood that there is no absolute or universal truth. People nowadays have accepted that the truth changes with the advent of new events and discoveries. In this episode, the producers ask Kiky Saputri to roast Anies Baswedan. From the viewpoint of an Ahok supporter, Kiky Saputri’s
criticism can be interpreted as a call for political reform. However, from the viewpoint of Anies Baswedan’s supporters, they view the roasting segment as *candaan* - a joke, a purely amusing element for the program. By the end of the day, everyone knew that if Kiky was asked to roast Ahok, she would also be critical of him. Secondly, people currently appreciate irony and satire because they understand that toying with or playing with something already existing is better than simply protesting directly (Jones, 2015, pp. 42-43). When Kiky Saputri delivers the roasting on TV, the audience sees her as intelligent and wise. The audiences have understood that critics today can also be delivered intelligently, in contrast to the usual way of protesting. The fact that the Indonesian audience perceived the roasting segment as a clever joke becomes significant because it shows that they know that satire can be utilized for purposes other than simply making fun of others. As a result, in this instance, Kiky Saputri – as a satirist, has been regarded as a reliable source and is qualified to represent the audience’s opinion (Lichtenstein & Nitsch, 2023)

5. Conclusion

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that roasting comedy has a specific pattern. First, the roaster starts the *setup* by making the audience think that the roastee fits the pragmatic presupposition. Then, once the audience is directed to the pragmatic presupposition, the roaster shares the punchline by contradicting the built argument prior. The generic formula is that the roaster looks like they are complimenting the roastee, but the roaster is criticizing the roastee. Likewise, in this roasting segment, Kiky Saputri always complimented Anies Baswedan before she finally criticized his performance as a governor.

Furthermore, the audience can accept the criticism above because the issue was shared on TV. Following Jones’ theory, television becomes the most suitable medium for broadcasting the critique from the roaster as television provides the right stage for the politician to involve in his *mockery*. In *Lapor Pak* program, less likely Anies Baswedan would be offended if he realized he was participating in a television program. What is more, it should be noted that as long as the critique hits the right issue and is shared in a suitable production play, the satire will be accepted by the audience. Then, one should be aware of the interconnectedness of television and social media. In other words, the critique shared on television has the potential to become viral due to the massive progress of social media and technology. Lastly, satire must be performed at the right time. Kiky Saputri’s roasting of Anies Baswedan attracts much attention because the *Lapor Pak!* program fulfilled Jones’ heuristic structure.
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