



---

**RESEARCH PAPER**

## A Comparative Analysis of Humor as a Strategy for Public Engagement: Analyzing Types of Humor in Political Speeches and Talk Shows

<sup>1</sup>Aiman Imran\*, <sup>2</sup>Samra Gul and <sup>3</sup>Gul Aizaz

1. Scholar, Department of English Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KP, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of English Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KP, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Department of English Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KP, Pakistan

---

**\*Corresponding Author** | [aimanimranci@gmail.com](mailto:aimanimranci@gmail.com)

---

**ABSTRACT**

This study aims to explore the use of humor in political speeches and talk shows. Humor is a strategic communication tool which is used both as a persuasive device and a rhetorical shield which allows politicians to address criticism indirectly and to maintain audience engagement. The study explores the different types of humor including affiliative humor, self-enhancing humor, aggressive humor and self-defeating humor and how these humor functions differently in different situations. The methodology used for this research is qualitative research methodology and discourse analysis which explores humor usage and allows for in-depth exploration of how political figures employ humor as a persuasive and face-saving strategy. Using a discourse analysis framework, this study classifies humor styles and also evaluates their impact on political messaging and public perception. The findings provide a more detailed understanding of humor types and usage of humor. Further studies could also dwell insights into audience reception analysis and can also address the humor analysis in political discourse using a multidisciplinary or multimodal approach.

---

**KEYWORDS** Strategic Communication Tool, Media Appearances, Rhetorical Functions, Discourse Analysis, Persuasion

---

**Introduction**

Within a public setting political discourse refers to the deliberate and structured communication of political ideas, arguments and beliefs which has a significant role in influencing decision-making processes, shaping public opinion and also in reflecting the dynamics of power within society. It is observed in debates, interviews, speeches and in media programs where commentators and politicians engage in discussions on issues like social, economic, political and governance issues. One of the most prominent platforms for political discourse is TV talk shows which provides a stage for both politicians and public figures to share their views in influential setting, blending both information and entertainment and make it an effective medium for reaching a diverse audience. Studies have suggested that humor is used both as a persuasive device and a rhetorical shield which allows politicians to address criticism indirectly and to maintain audience management (Meyer, 2000). Some studies also suggests that humor is used as a persuasive strategy that frames political arguments and to influence public perception. Hummer (1994) states that humor has the power in shaping political discourse by reinforcing ideologies and also to change public opinion without any overt confrontation.

In modern democracies, the framing of political discourses, media impacts voter attitudes and perceptions. Fairclough(1995) said that discourse in media has a pivotal role for both contesting and conveying power. The conversational style of TV talk shows enables political discourse to be more relatable and accessible but sometimes increases potential for both conflict and face-threatening acts. Given the public scrutiny and high visibility provided to such shows the participants must carefully manage their language and also behaviour for preserving their reputation and credibility. This dynamic makes the study of face-saving strategies relevant in political discourse. Face-saving refers to the efforts of individuals which they made in order to protect their social image and also to avoid embarrassment during any interpersonal communication. The term was used by Goffman's (1967) work as "The positive social value which a person effectively claims for themselves from the lines that people assumes they have already taken during a specific contact"(p. 5). Criticism and confrontation are common in political discourse but preserving an individual's face for maintaining public trust and credibility is essential. Most of the politicians, TV hosts and guests use different linguistics and rhetorical strategies to protect their public image, and specifically in those situations where their competence or authority is challenged.

Face threatening acts known as (FTAs) damages the face of either speaker or hearer or both. In political talk shows, it occurs when public figures are asked challenging questions, either they are criticized for their policies or accused for misconduct. The politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) shows some strategies for maintaining face threatening acts such as the use of indirect language, hedging or humor. More specifically humor is a powerful tool for defusing tension and to protect an individual's face without directly addressing the threat. Green humor is considered an important communicative strategy that serves different functions such as persuading, entertaining and mitigating conflicts. Humor is used to soften criticism in political discourse to highlight absurdities making complicated issues more relatable. The use of humor satire, irony and wit enhances the persuasive power of speakers while engaging audience in more memorable manner. There are some comedians like John Oliver and John Stewart who have gained influence by the use of humor to critique political policies and events, demonstrating that humor shapes public discourse. The ability of humor to create a nuanced understanding between speaker and listeners enhances the effectiveness of humor as a rhetorical device.

There are several reasons due to which politicians use humor. They use humor for face-saving and damage control and for audience engagement and relatability, for criticizing opponents indirectly and for persuasion and influence. When politicians face any controversies they employ humor, deflecting their negative attention and maintaining their credibility. Goffman (1967), who introduced the concept of face saving states "humor allows public personalities to manage their image and reputation by turning potential embarrassment into more lighthearted moments". Political leaders also use satire, irony and sarcasm to critique the opponents without appearing aggressive and hostile. Meyer(2000) highlighted the relational functions of humor that humor can either unify or divide the audiences depending on the intent of context. In any political discourse humor which aligns with the beliefs of individuals fosters solidarity while the humor which aimed at opponents reinforces divisions. Thus in political communication this dual nature of humor makes it a complex and valuable tool which further reduces hostility and creating a sense of camaraderie and also serve as a weapon to undermine opponents.

Due to the rise of infotainment in political discourse the use of humor on TV talk shows is very important. Politicians use humor as a source of enhancing their relatability, credibility and softening their public image and also connect with the audience outside

traditional news programs. So humor provides insights into the rhetorical strategies that influences both political image management and also public discourse. Baum (2005), "soft news" platforms includes late night comedy shows which is considered as a powerful arena for political communication. The appearances of politicians on such platforms enhances their appeal specifically using humor to present themselves more relatable and personable. Talk shows provides a more conversational and accessible format for politicians and media personalities to express their opinions, and share ideas and debate policies and also engage with the public in real-time (Muzaffar, et. al., 2019). So humor is considered as a compelling tool in entertaining and mitigating conflict. When used effectively and correctly it enhances the relatability and charm of speakers while at the same time disarming opponents, so humor is a source to balance both entertainment and serious political discourse.

Politicians frequently use humor as a strategic and rhetoric tool in speeches and talk shows, it's specific functions, patterns and effects remain unexplored in any political discourse analysis. Humor is used as a mean of persuasion, criticism or audience connections, the types of humor that is employed and the rhetorical functions of humor vary significantly among different leaders and contexts. This study fills the gap in understanding that how and why political figures employ specific types of humor, the impacts that it has on public perception and how it further shapes the political narratives. By systematically analyzing political discourse through the lens of humor, this research aims to uncover humor usage and its role in political communication.

## **Literature Review**

Political discussion involves humor both for engagement and as an appeal. This has been well studied in the context of political talk shows and speeches, how humor works, and demonstrates a variety of forms and strategic uses. Political figures and talk show hosts often use 'affiliative humor' for example to foster camaraderie with the audiences, establish relatability and create a more welcoming atmosphere. Affiliative humor is particularly suitable for offsetting audience resistance to political arguing, because it creates a feeling of shared identity and appreciation of others' sensibility (Meyer, 2015). Affiliation humor is frequently mixed into comedic sensibility employed by Jon Stewart and John Oliver to create a seemingly common ground as they attempt to tackle hard political issues even while keeping audiences interested. Much the same, political leaders use affiliative humor into their speeches in order appear more approachable thus strengthening their public image as charismatic and likeable figures (Holm, 2020). Additionally, this is connected to higher political trust as people associate lighthearted humor in politicians as more authentic and relatable.

On the other hand, self enhancing humor is a coping mechanism for politicians and talk show's hosts who are trying to response to criticism and keep cool while they are in high pressure situation. Self enhancing humor is commonly used by politicians to minimize harms stemming from the negative press or the controversial statement to avoid losing control over the public perception (Kuipers, 2019). Barack Obama, for example, made use of self-enhancing humor in press conferences and public speeches to rebut political attacks, converting criticisms to moments of lightheartedness that served to dignify his image as a confident and self assured leader (Jones, 2021). Talk show's hosts utilize this type of humor to provide a surface of professionalism in tackling politically charged topics, while implementing humor to lessen the effect of criticisms (Baym, 2010). This harmonizes with research on humor's psychological benefits including with research to humor as a function of self enhancement (Martin et al., 2003) and its relation to resilience and stress reduction in high stakes political arenas.

Another common form of political humor is aggressive, used to calm opponents, expose hypocrisy, and sometimes can divide the ideological tribes. Aggressive humor does not serve to enhance self or foster connection as affiliative or self-enhancing humor do, instead, it is employed as a rhetorical weapon in an attack against authority, as a means to attack adversaries, and as a mean to frame political discourse in confrontational terms. The use of extremist humor by late-night talk show hosts like Stephen Colbert and Trevor Noah to critique political offenders is commonplace since, they exaggerate, ironize, and sarcasize to reinforce notions of corruption (Baym, 2017). Particularly this form of humor is effective to mobilize politically engaging audience who shares the same opinion (Holbert et al., 2011). While, however, aggressive humor can also be polarizing and deepen negative stereotypes toward their political opponents (Becker & Haller, 2021). Foremost, leaders in politics carry out hostile humour against rivals, a strategy employed by Donald Trump, who often used ironic nicknames and sarcastic remarks during his speeches to exclude critics and demonstrate power (Ott & Dickinson, 2019). Aggressive humor can be energizing for supporters and will help in improving political engagement, however, it can alienate undecided voters and exacerbate the trend towards a toxic political environment in which debates on the issue are substituted with mockery and personal attacks (Iyengar and Krupenkin, 2018).

Self defeating humor, in which individuals use themselves as a subject for humor in order to gain approval or to de tense it, is another strategic role in political communication. This is a kind of humor that makes politicians appear as being humble, self aware, relatable at the same time in their moments of public scrutiny (Martin et al. 2003). In the case of former UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson, self deprecating humor was often used to minimize criticisms of his personality, where Johnson explained that he was a kindly and bumbling person, rather than a strategic politician (Charteris-Black, 2019). In the same way, political talk show hosts employ self-defeating humor in order to keep their audience engaged during controversial topics and to make themselves more approachable and entertaining (Gray et al., 2009). Yet, self defeating humor can also serve as a double edged sword; although excessive self ridicial can undermine a speaker's credibility as it could make the speaker seem not prepared or weak on serious political discuss (Kuipers, 2015). In some cases, politicians employ such self-defeating humour as a deflection tactic in order to avoid accounting for serious problems by letting the seriousness go and instead trying to turn them into comedic situations (Lockyer & Pickering, 2008). Thus, humor can become a paradox where likability is increased but competence and leadership ability are decreased at the same time. Consequently, self-defeating humor can serve as a useful tactic to humanize public figures, but it will be effective only to the degree it is perceived as such and in conjunction with the integration of substantive political messaging.

A recent study was conducted about the use of humor in digital campaigns of two Finnish parliamentary elections. They turned their gaze towards how candidates exploited different forms of humor to allure voters through social media sites (Muzaffar, et. al., 2020). However, humor had a variety of functions campaign. Light Hearted and Self Deprecating Humor made candidates humanized and approachable to voters. Satirical and ironic humor was used to break down the flaws in policy and criticize the shortcomings of the opponents and try to sway public opinion. Humorous content was employed to marshal the candidate's base, prompting for political participation and promoting the dissemination of for the campaign. As a message to promote political messages and improve the political communication, the research suggests incorporating the strategic use of humor in digital communication.

In recent years, there have been studies in how humor shapes the participation in politics, how it affects the cognitive processing, emotional reactions and social interactions.

Political humor is a cognitive shortcut that makes a complex or technical political issue more digestible for the general public. They employ elements of satire, like satire news shows, such as *The Daily Show* and *Last Week Tonight with John Oliver*, which use humor to unwind policy talks, taxation systems and administrative procedures in a pleasant however instructive method. Humor helps people understand and retain political information, especially those with lower political knowledge (Young and Hoffman, 2021). But humor can also lend political content more accessibility, but it can also ease up the complicated debates into simplified one, making the audience immerse into political issues in a superficial way. That means it raises questions about whether or not political humor is actually informing the public or is simply continuing to give the public entertaining stories that promote a certain side, and not the other. Social media has become a place for political humor, where its negative and positive impacts have increased even more. Political humor also meshes well with the power of the 'platforms' like Twitter, TikTok, and YouTube in that it can be spread all over the world instantaneously, allowing comedians as well as influencers and even normal users to create and share satirical memes that mock political figures and mandates (Tandoc et al., 2022). On one hand, this democratization of political humor has led to politically discussions becoming more accessible and engaging in the public discourse by enabling different voices to practically shape people's perspectives on public matter. However, the social media is an algorithm driven thing, and due to that, we have ideological echo chambers, we see people just consuming humor that will reinforce their already existing belief system. The exposure to selective information may reinforce negative impressions of political opponents, while preventing people to take in another view (Warner et al., 2023). Besides, there is also an acceleration in the speed of spreading humorous content online which heightens the risk of misinformation and satire misinterpretation (where satirical content is taken for granted factual reporting), confusion, and misconceptions about politics.

## **Material and Methods**

This study adopts a qualitative research method, analyzing role of humor in political discourse on TV talk shows and speeches. Humor is a complex linguistic and social phenomena, so qualitative approach enables for in-depth exploration of how politicians employ humor as a possessive and face-saving strategy. Furthermore discourse analysis is also applied, examining selected talk shows and political speeches. Through detailed content analysis the study classify and then identify humor types such as affiliative, self-enhancing, self-defeating and aggressive humor and then examines humor impacts on public perceptions and political credibility. Creswell(2013) states that qualitative research is well suited for studying social behaviors and communication strategies, providing a rich descriptions of human interactions rather than just relying on numerical measurements. Similarly Silverman(2011) stated that qualitative methods particularly discourse analysis allows researchers to explore the deep meanings behind language use which also include humor, its persuasion and social influences.

## **Data collection method**

The primary data which is used for this research is collected directly from political speeches and YouTube videos of political talk shows. The videos selected is based on relevance which ensures that they proritizes prominent politicians who employ humor when they are adversing any controversial or sensitive topic. Secondary data is collected from different research papers, books, journals which provides a more nuanced understanding about humor usage .

## **Theoretical Framework**

This research is basically rooted in Goffman's (1967) Face theory which states that how individuals maintain their self image (face) in any type of political interactions. According to Goffman people employ humor in order to maintain their public image also to avoid embarrassment. Thus politicians often employ humor in a face-saving strategy in order to negate criticism, divert narratives and also to appear more retable to audience. More specifically it influences public perceptions, shapes any political discourse and serves as a strategic communication tool.

## **Results and Discussion**

The study explores humor usage as a face-saving strategy and persuasive strategy in political discourse, specifically in television talk shows and also in political speeches. Qualitative research method and discourse analysis is employed to this study, examining that how politicians use types of humor in order to shape public perception, to manage controversies, and also to enhance their credibility. This study mainly prioritizes humor usage, its types including affiliative, aggressive, self-enhancing and self-defeating humor, the rhetorical impact of humor which offers a more nuanced understanding of effectiveness of humor in shaping and influencing public perception.

### **Affiliative Humor in Political Communication**

According to Meyer (2015), affiliative humor well suited for offsetting audience resistance to political arguing, because it creates a feeling of shared identity and appreciation of other's sensibility. Political leaders use this type of humor to create a positive atmosphere and to share a light-hearted anecdotes or jokes which resonates with a diverse audience. Take here an example of US President Ronald Reagan. During a 1984 presidential debate, when he was addressing concerns about his age, he replied with a witty remark that, "I will not make age an issue of this campaign. I am not going to exploit, for political purposes, my opponents youth and inexperience". At the age of 73, he faced concerns about his age and also it's potential impact on his performance. This witty remark diffused the age issue, enduring him to audiences which showcase his wit and reliability and effectively turned potential vulnerability into a great moment of strength. The laughter and applause of audience showed that the joke was resonates very well and also enhanced Reagan's likability while disarming his critics regarding age issue.

### **Humor in Crisis Management by Jacinda Ardern**

Similarly affiliative humor was used by New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern in order to engage with the constituents. During a 2020 interview on "The Late Show" with Stephen Colbert, she recounted her experience in humorous way about an earthquake that occurred during a live television interview. She said, "We are fine, I am not under any hanging lights, I look I am in a structurally sound place". Jacinda Ardern used affiliative humor in her statement during an unexpected earthquake. She indicated a witty remark about her surroundings instead of expressing any fear or concern which reveals that she was in a structurally sound place and she was not under any hanging lights. In this way she diffused potential anxiety and gain control over that moment. She humanize her image. In response Stephen Colbert responded with amusement and continued the lighthearted tone and kept the conversation engaged.

### **Justin Trudeau's Use of Playfulness to Connect with audiences**

Affiliative humor was also used by Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau during a 2016 appearance on "The Ellen DeGeneres Show". He showed his playful side by

participating in a dance challenge. This was an act to make a social bond with the audience, presenting himself as approachable and relatable person. He willingly participated in a fun which was a non-political activity, aligning with comedic entertaining style of Ellen which demonstrates sense of ease and authenticity. This decision to join a dance challenge was a strategic move to humanize his public image and appealing to international and broad audiences by reinforcing his reputation as a modern and charismatic leader.

### **Self-Enhancing Humor and the Resilience Through Laughter**

Self-Enhancing humor is commonly used by politicians to minimize harms stemming from the negative press or the controversial statement to avoid losing its control over the public perception (Kuipers, 2019). It is served as a copying mechanism because it allows individuals to maintain a positive outlook in challenging circumstances. Take an example of Barack Obama. In his speech at the 2011 White House Correspondent's dinner he joked about his birth certificate controversy saying that, "I am releasing my official birth video... Now I warn you, no one has seen this footage in 50 years". He introduced this mock "birth video" to audience when turned out to be a clip from animated movie "The Lion King". He also said, I want to make clear to the Fox News table : That was a joke. That was not my real birth video". He demonstrated resilience and the ability to rise above criticism, and reinforces his composure under pressure and make light the situation when he faced controversy surrounding his birth certificate, he addressed the issue with levity.

### **Framing Setbacks as Opportunities by Boris Johnson**

Similarly, British Prime Minister Boris Johnson, a well known politician for his humorous approach. He used self-enhancing humor in order to navigate political challenges in his life. In a 2013 interview, he said, "My friends, as I have discovered myself, there are no disasters, only opportunities. And, indeed, opportunities for fresh disasters". He used this humor by framing setbacks as inevitable and also as opportunities for more and new mistakes and challenges. He diffused the negativity which is associated with failure. He by using self-enhancing humor connected himself to audience by making light of difficulties rather than merely weighed down by them. As it is a coping mechanism, allowing individuals to maintain a positive perspective in challenging and difficult situations. He reflected well-known public persona. He diffused potential criticism and acknowledged difficulties in such a way that invited amusement rather than just judgement.

### **Redirecting Criticism with Charm by John F. Kennedy**

In the same way Former U. S. President John Kennedy was famous for his quick wit and ability, using humor to deflect criticism. In 1962, during a Press Conference when he was asked about his supposed lack of experience, Kennedy replied, "I am the man who accompanied Jacqueline Kennedy to Paris, and I have enjoyed it". In response John Kennedy use self-enhancing humor by turning a potential criticism into an opportunity in order to show his confidence, charm and wit. When he was asked about his supposed lack of experience, he made a light-hearted remark and did not respond defensively and stated that he was merely "the man who accompanied Jacqueline Kennedy to Paris". His statement redirected attention from critique while at the same time elevating his wife's public appeal. Kennedy demonstrated self-assurance in order to navigate political scrutiny with grace. In response press and audience responded with laughter and shifted the tone of the conference in his favour.

## **Aggressive Humor as A Political Weapon**

Aggressive humor does not serve to enhance self or foster connection as affiliative or self-enhancing humor do, instead it is employed as a rhetorical weapon in an attack against authority, as a mean to attack adversaries, and as a mean to frame political discourse in confrontational terms (Tsakona and Popa, 2011). It involves ridiculing or mocking others, and is used in political contexts to criticize many opponents. This type of humor was used by President Donald Trump from a 2017 episode of "The Late Night with Stephen Colbert", in which the host commented on then, "you are not the POTUS, you are BLOTUS. You talk like a sign-language gorilla that got hit in the head". This type of humor was used which aimed to highlight flaws or perceive incompetence. He called Donald Trump BLOTUS—a play on POTUS (President of the United States) which suggests blabbering. The comparison he used here with gorilla exaggerated Donald Trump's mannerisms by portraying him incoherent which suggests that his speech was clumsy. Colbert's use of this type of humor serves multiple purposes. Firstly, it was used to reinforce his role as a sharp political satirist by appealing to a liberal-leaning audience. Secondly, the humor used acted as a form of comedic resistance which highlights perceived absurdities in Trump's leadership style. Finally it created an atmosphere for viewers which allows them to channel frustration with laughter. Aggressive humor was used by Colbert as effective tool to maintain his identity and image and as a space for sharp political commentary and comedic critique.

## **Winston Churchill: Dominance Through Wit**

Similarly aggressive humor was used by former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill who was renowned for his witty remarks. During a famous exchange Lady Astor said to Churchill that, "if you were my husband, I would have poison your tea". Churchill replied, "Madam if you were my wife, I would have drink it". Winston Churchill's use of aggressive humor which was seen in his famous exchange with lady Astor was used for multiple purposes. Firstly, it was a reflection of his wit which was served as a tool for maintaining dominance in his conversation, and it was a way to calm his opponents with humor rather than with hostility. Churchill was known for his strong rhetoric and leadership style during Second World War, he often employed humor as both as a defensive and offensive strategy while making him able to negate criticism and entertain his audience and also to diffuse tension with clever wordplay. He also used this humorous remark in order to assert dominance and opponents.

## **Self-Defeating Humor :Using Humility to Disarm Critics**

Self defeating humor, in which individuals use themselves as a subject for humor in order to gain approval or to de tense it is another strategic role in political communication. This is a kind of humor that makes politicians appear as being humble, self aware, relatable at the same time in their moments of public scrutiny (Martin et al. 2003). During 2008 presidential campaign Senator John McCain's appearance on "Saturday Night Live", in which he joked about his financial struggle and said, "I have been trying to save money. As you may have noticed, I am wearing a bunch of old campaign buttons". When he was facing concern about his campaign's financial limitations, McCain participated in such a sketch where he addressed the issue by revealing mock, "McCain Fine Gold" jewelry on a home shopping network. He was joking about the need to fund his campaign by unconventional means. His aim was to connect with voters on personal level by laughing at his own situation and diffused potential criticism related to his campaign's financial status.



### **Self-awareness through Self-Defeating Humor by George W. Bush**

Self-defeating was also used by former US President George W. Bush in his speech 2001 Radio and television Correspondent's Association dinner during which he joked about his verbal slip-ups and said, "My mom always said, if you are not going to say something nice, don't say anything at all". Here he highlighted his own mistake regarding his public speaking errors. It was an actual gaffe which he made in his speech. This type of humor is used when a speaker makes fun of himself. Sometimes they acknowledge their own mistakes or weakness in more lightened way. He instead of ignoring his past verbal missteps, brought them up himself and quoted his own gaffe. At that time he was mocked for his clumsy way of speaking. Firstly, he build a serious sounding piece of advice from his mother, then he cut it with an example by making joke. The joke worked well at that time because audience didn't expect the second part. The audience, journalist and media figures laughed and applauded. He likely earned goodwill from the press from even those who wrote critical of him. He took control of the joke before others could use it against him by acknowledging the gaffe himself and allowing him to connect with audience by presenting himself as approachable and self-awareness. The press dinners mainly consists of journalists and media figures, are traditionally filled with lighthearted jokes and satire. Bush's ability played well in that setting by using self-defeating humor.

### **Embracing Criticism with Humor by Abraham Lincoln**

It was used by former US President Abraham Lincoln. During a debate, when he was accused for being two-faced, he responded, "If I had two faces, would I be wearing this one"? The use of Self-defeating humor by Abraham Lincoln was seen in his response when he was accused of being two-faced. It was s strategy used by him to diffuse criticism and to show his humility. He turned the attack into a joke, by making fun of himself which made the situation difficult for all his opponents to press the insult further. He took control over the conversation which showed that he can acknowledge his own flaws without being defensive. It was a tactic used by Abraham that strengthened his reputation as a clever and wise leader. He also used it to diffuse potential criticisms regarding his looks.

### **Conclusion**

It is concluded that humor is considered as a powerful tool in any political discourse which enables political figures in order to persuade, defend or to engage with audiences while preserving their public image. The study has explored and explained in detail the types of humor including affiliative, self-enhancing, aggressive and self-defeating humor which serves different functions in political talk shows and also public speeches. Political figures strategically use of humor diffuses tension, shifts narratives and also have role in maintaining credibility while they are having any controversial moment. By using face-saving strategy, political leaders can appear more relatable, deflect criticism and also to reduce hostility without directly engaging in any conflict. The qualitative method which is used in this research offers a valuable insight into how humor shapes public perception and also political narratives. The analysis provided a more deeper understanding that humor is not merely used as an entertainment but alps a deliberate communicative strategy which is used to influence audiences and all to maintain political authority. Finally, humor remains an essential component of political rhetoric which influences both political figures and public in shaping political conversations.

**Recommendations**

Future researchers can further explore that how linguistics and cultural variations can influence the perceptions of humor in political speeches and talk shows in different regions. Further studies could also dwell insights into audience reception analysis in order to understand that how different demographics interpret and respond to political humor which contributes to a nuanced understanding of its role in shaping public opinion. Future researchers can also address the humor analysis in political discourse using a multidisciplinary or multimodal approach. Moreover, expanding sets to include different politicians, cultures and the language they use will also help to highlight broader patterns and cultural differences in humor usage. A multimodal analysis includes gestures, facial expressions and tone along with speech which clarifies the ways in which humor is conveyed and perceived. Surveys, focus groups, and social media analysis in audience reception studies shows that how various demographics interpret and respond to political humor which provides different perspectives on persuasive effects of humor. Finally, expert interviews comparative studies across different social media platforms which includes speeches, debates, political talk shows and digital spaces foreground the adaptability and strategic development of humor usage in different regions and contexts.

## References

- Baumgartner, J., & Morris, J. S. (Eds.). (2012). *Laughing matters: Humor and American politics in the media age*. Routledge.
- Baym, G. (2010). *From Cronkite to Colbert: The evolution of broadcast news*. Oxford University Press.
- Baym, G. (2017). Political satire and the shifting dynamics of humor. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 3947-3965.
- Bos, L., & Schneider, H. (2021). The role of satire in political socialization: Effects on knowledge, attitudes, and engagement. *International Journal of Communication*, 15, 2310-2328.
- Becker, A. B., & Haller, B. A. (2021). Partisan humor and political polarization: Examining the role of satire in shaping attitudes. *Journal of Communication*, 71(4), 563-585.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Davies, C. (2020). *Jokes and their relation to power in Russia*. Routledge.
- Gray, J., Jones, J. P., & Thompson, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Satire TV: Politics and comedy in the post-network era*. nyu Press.
- Landreville, K. D., Holbert, R. L., & LaMarre, H. L. (2010). The influence of late-night TV comedy viewing on political talk: A moderated-mediation model. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 15(4), 482-498.
- Holm, N. (2017). *Humour as politics: The political aesthetics of contemporary comedy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hariman, R. (2008). *Political satire and public culture*. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 11(3), 373-409.
- Iyengar, S., & Krupenkin, M. (2018). *The strengthening of partisan affect*. *Political Psychology*, 39(S1), 201-218.
- Jones, J. P. (2021). Satirical news and the shaping of public opinion. *Journal of Political Communication*, 38(3), 289-306.
- Kuipers, G. (2015). *Good humor, bad taste: A sociology of the joke*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Lockyer, S., & Pickering, M. (2008). *Beyond a joke: The limits of humor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- McClennen, S. A. (2012). *Colbert's America: Satire and democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, R. A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(1), 48-75.
- Meyer, J. C. (2015). Humor as a double-edged sword: *The impact on political persuasion*. *Communication Studies*, 66(3), 287-304.

- Muzaffar, M., Chohdhry, S., & Afzal, N. (2019). Social Media and Political Awareness in Pakistan: A Case Study of Youth, *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 3 (II), 1-13
- Muzaffar, M., Yaseen, Z. & Safdar, S. (2020). Role of Social Media in Political Campaigns in Pakistan: A Case of Study of 2018 Elections, *Journal of Political Studies*, 27 (2), 141-151
- Ott, B. L., & Dickinson, G. (2019). *The Twitter presidency: Donald J. Trump and the politics of White Rage*. Routledge.
- Sorensen, M. J. (2016). *Humor as a serious strategy of social movement activism*. Springer.
- Tandoc, E. C., Lim, Z. W., & Ling, R. (2018). Defining "fake news." *Digital Journalism*, 6(2), 137-153.
- Tandoc, E. C., Lim, Z. W., & Ling, R. (2022). Social media humor and political misinformation: The risks of satirical content in the digital age. *Digital Journalism*, 10(4), 589-607.
- Warner, B. R., Cohen, E., & McKinney, M. S. (2023). Political humor and public engagement: Examining the effects of satire on civic participation. *Journal of Political Communication*, 40(2), 312-330.
- Young, D. G., & Hoffman, L. H. (2021). Political satire, cynicism, and engagement: Investigating the paradox of comedic news consumption. *International Journal of Communication*, 15, 2763-2782.