

# A Pragmatic Analysis of Communication Strategies Employed by English Educational Content Creator on TikTok

Mochammad Yuda Prastagha\*<sup>1</sup>, Siti Aisyah<sup>2</sup>, Yuliyanto Sabat<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Universitas PGRI Delta Sidoarjo, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

\*Correspondence: ✉\*[siti.aisyah.yes@gmail.com](mailto:siti.aisyah.yes@gmail.com)

---

## Abstract

*TikTok-based English as TikTok-based English learning micro-lessons is increasingly popular, yet pragmatic analysis of creators' communication strategies remains limited. This study examines speech acts, politeness strategies, and conversational implicature in English educational TikTok videos by @nathan\_suparman. Using Yule's (1996) framework, a qualitative descriptive content analysis was conducted on 42 utterances drawn from four purposively selected skit/roleplay videos posted between January and November 2025. The videos were transcribed multimodally, capturing verbal turns as well as salient gestures and on-screen captions. The findings indicate that representative speech acts predominate to deliver explanations, examples, and rules, while directives and expressive support correction, audience prompting, and humor. Bald-on-record politeness is the most frequent strategy, consistent with the platform's fast-paced instructional style. Conversational implicature is largely particularized; wordplay and staged misunderstandings invite viewers to infer intended meanings beyond literal wording and may strengthen engagement. These results highlight how direct instruction combined with pragmatic play can support comprehensible and motivating TikTok English educational content.*

## Article History

Received: 26-Jan-2026

Revised : 08-Feb-2026

Accepted: 15-Feb-2026

## Keywords:

Digital pragmatics,  
Conversational implicature,  
Politeness strategies, Speech  
acts, TikTok

---

© 2026 Mochammad Yuda Prastagha, Siti Aisyah, Yuliyanto Sabat

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

---

## INTRODUCTION

Language is necessary for human connection, intellectual expression, information exchange, and relationship development in today's environment. Revita11 et al., (2023) said that it is impossible to separate the act of thinking from language skills since language serves as a medium for both thought and communication. Humans think through linguistic symbols. It's supported the claim that Language is important for communication. Speakers can use communication tactics to make sure the listener understands the main goal in a way that aligns with the intended intention. Pragmatic awareness affects the

way speakers choose communication strategies to assure listener comprehension and preserve effective interpersonal relationships (Dipta et al., 2024). According to the statement of Taguchi & Kádár, (2025) In order to accomplish particular communicative goals, pragmatics examines the way meaning is created, comprehended, and co-constructed among speakers in and across social situations. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that focuses on linguistic forms and the meaning they produce in a social context. The Basis for comprehending how language is utilized in actual contexts is pragmatics. As stated by Widyawanti et al., (2024) the emphasis is on the speaker's intended meaning and how the message is understood depending on the communication context rather than syntax or word meaning. Pragmatics assists in understanding the purpose and effectiveness of communication in interpersonal relationships through ideas in line with Kamsinah et al., (2024) said pragmatic strategies including implicature and contextual cues play an essential role in enabling effective message conveyance in digital intercourses.

Social media in this era of globalization and lightning-fast technical advancement, many of people utilize Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, YouTube, and TikTok as direct or indirect communication tools. Nevertheless, the ability to publish videos gamakes this social networking platform quite popular in Indonesia. The public in Indonesia uses TikTok media extensively for business, creative and education (Bulele, 2020). Given all of the aforementioned benefits, it is hardly surprising that TikTok is a popular social media site among Indonesians and can aid students in their learning (Luisandrith & Yanuartuti, 2020).

Several studies have examined the use of TikTok in English language learning. (Xiuwen & Razali, 2021) researched *"An Overview of the Utilization of TikTok to Improve Oral English Communication Competence among EFL Undergraduate Students"* investigated the use of TikTok as an additional resource for learning English, with an emphasis on students' communication and participation. This suggests that English instructional TikTok content lacks pragmatic-focused analysis. Rininggayuh et al., (2024) In their research *"The Effectiveness of TikTok as a Media for Enhancing English Speaking Skills: A Systematic Literature Review"* conducted a review study on TikTok's efficacy as a teaching tool for English. The study, which used a qualitative methodology, discovered that TikTok-based educational materials boost students' enthusiasm in learning English and promote active engagement. However, both studies did not look at the pragmatic parts of communication, such as speech actions, politeness practices, or implicature utilized by content authors, instead focusing

on educational effects and learners' impressions.

Although previous studies report that TikTok can enhance learners' motivation, participation, and speaking performance in EFL contexts (e.g., Xiuwen & Razali, 2021; Rininggayuh et al., 2024), they rarely explain how creators linguistically and pragmatically design short videos to achieve clarity and engagement at the same time. Therefore, the research gap addressed in this study lies in the limited pragmatic-focused investigation of English educational TikTok discourse, especially in skit-based micro-lessons where humor, correction, and audience alignment occur rapidly. This study is novel in (1) applying Yule's (1996) integrated pragmatics framework to a single influential English educational TikTok creator, (2) analyzing speech acts, politeness, and implicature in the same dataset to capture their interactional functions, and (3) incorporating multimodal cues (gestures and on-screen captions) as part of pragmatic meaning-making in short-form video pedagogy. In particular, pragmatic features such as speech acts, politeness strategies, and implicature are often mentioned only implicitly or not analyzed systematically communication strategies used by English language educational content creators (Fatima & Sa'i, 2025). Also, the use of social media such as Instagram and TikTok helps foster interest in learning English through interactive and creative content (Fachrunnisa et al., 2024).

Pragmatics examines how speakers use linguistic forms to achieve communicative purposes in context (Yule, 1996). In this study, three pragmatic constructs are emphasized. First, speech act theory treats utterances as actions performed through language. Within Yule, (1996) presentation of Searle's taxonomy, representatives commit the speaker to the truth of a proposition, directives attempt to get the hearer to do something, commissive express commitment to future action, expressive convey psychological states, and declarations change social reality when produced under appropriate authority. Second, politeness strategies address how speakers manage face and reduce the risk of face-threatening acts. Following Brown and Levinson as discussed by Yule, bald-on-record strategies deliver messages directly with minimal mitigation, positive politeness builds solidarity and approval, negative politeness respects autonomy and minimizes imposition, and off-record strategies convey meaning indirectly, allowing plausible deniability. Third, implicature refers to meaning inferred beyond literal wording (Grice, 1975). Conversational implicature emerges when speakers appear to flout conversational maxims, prompting listeners to infer intended meaning. George Yule distinguishes generalized implicature, which is relatively context-

independent, from particularized implicature, which depends heavily on specific contextual assumptions. These three constructs are especially relevant for TikTok because short-form educational discourse often relies on direct explanation, rapid interactional cues, and humor-based inference to sustain attention and facilitate understanding.

This study's primary descriptive goal is to examine and categorize the various communication techniques that TikTok content creator specifically employ to create English language learning material, content creators implement a variety of strategies in their English learning materials, including the use of communicative language teaching, information gap tasks, feedback methods, and the selection of topics that are in alignment with communicative strategies (Pandia & Sibarani, 2024). Using qualitative descriptive content analysis, the study analyzes 42 utterances from four skit/roleplay videos. The objectives of this study are to (1) identify dominant speech acts, (2) identify politeness strategies, and (3) identify the use of conversational implicature in TikTok-based English instruction by @nathan\_suparman.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach with content analysis to examine pragmatic communication strategies in TikTok-based English instruction. This research using qualitative descriptive research to explores the rich textures of human experience and viewpoint, capturing contexts and nuances frequently lost in numerical translation, by providing a thorough overview and practical ways to navigate its numerous dimensions (Lim Weng Marc, 2025). The population comprised English educational videos posted on the TikTok account @nathan\_suparman during January–November 2025. Purposive sampling was applied to select four videos with the length of 1 to 3 Minutes that met the following criteria: (1) the video explicitly focused on grammar or vocabulary instruction, (2) the video used a skit/roleplay format that created interactional context for pragmatic interpretation, and (3) the video demonstrated relatively high audience engagement (views, likes, comments, and shares) compared to other uploads in the same period. The selected videos were downloaded and archived for analysis, and each video was transcribed using a multimodal procedure.

In addition to verbal utterances, the transcription included salient non-verbal cues (e.g., facial expressions, pointing, object handling) and on-screen captions because these cues contribute to pragmatic meaning in short-form video discourse. The unit of analysis was an “utterance,” defined as a single

spoken turn or clause functioning as one pragmatic action in the interaction; across the four videos, 42 utterances were extracted and labeled sequentially (U1-U42).

Data were analyzed using Yule's (1996) pragmatics framework. First, each utterance was coded for speech act type (representative, directive, expressive, commissive, or declaration) following Searle's taxonomy as presented in Yule book of Pragmatics (1996). Second, politeness strategies were coded using Brown and Levinson's model as discussed by Yule, (1996), including bald-on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record strategies; utterances without face-management relevance were marked as "not applicable" to avoid forced classification. Third, implicature was analyzed based on Grice's (1975) conversational implicature and Yule's distinction between generalized and particularized implicature. To enhance validity and reliability, a coding manual (operational definitions, decision rules, and examples) was developed prior to full coding, and the researcher conducted two coding cycles with a time gap to check consistency; disagreements were resolved by returning to the codebook and the video context. In addition, a peer reviewer was asked to audit a subset of the coded data and category justifications to minimize subjective bias. An audit trail (data sheets, memos, and coding revisions) was maintained to support transparency. Methodological limitations include the small corpus (four videos) and the focus on a single creator, which allows in-depth analysis but limits broad generalization; moreover, engagement metrics were used only as a selection guide and do not directly measure learning outcomes.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **RESULT**

The results of the pragmatic analysis of four well-known English educational content from TikTok are provided in this chapter. Three primary pragmatic elements from George Yule Theory on the book "Pragmatics" and "The Study of Language". As confirmed by Alsmari, (2024) study, pragmatic engagement is highly dependent on learner motivation, implying that producers of English language learning materials need to design content that not only explains pragmatic concepts clearly, but also maintains the motivation and interest of the audience to achieve engagement with content that is interesting and peppered with effective humor. All the finding that Author researched are provided below and labelled with U1 to U42.

Table 1. Utterance Classification Observation Sheet

No	Utterance	Classification
Video 1		
1	U1: "Oh, I'm sorry, bro. Sorry."	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Positive Politeness Implicature: Particularized
2	U2: "Yo, I have an interview today." (Sarcastic expression)	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Off record Implicature: Generalized
3	U3: "What time?"	Speech Act: Directive Politeness: Negative Politeness Implicature: Particularized
4	U4: "On 9 o'clock."	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: particularized
5	U5: "Oh, tolol yang bener itu, at 9 o'clock."	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: particularized
6	U6: "Biar gampang kita pake diagram segitiga terbalik."	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Positive Politeness Implicature: generalized
7	U7: "Pake In untuk periode yang lama seperti tahun atau bulan"	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: generalized
8	U8: "Pake On untuk periode yang agak pendek seperti hari dan tanggal"	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: generalized
9	U9: "Pake At untuk yang paling pendek msialnya jam"	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: generalized
Video 2		
1	U10: "Loh? I'm sorry sir, I'm sorry."	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Negative politeness Implicature: particularized
2	U11: "Heh, level Bahasa Inggris mu masih A1 loh"	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: particularized
3	U12: "Rayap besi sok inggris!"	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Positive politeness Implicature: particularized
4	U13: "Nah, itu level A2"	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: particularized
5	U14: "Aku bisa lebih tinggi, I'm terribly sorry for what I did."	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Negative politeness Implicature: particularized
6	U15: "Huh, gitu aja sombong. I'm"	Speech Act: Directive

Mochammad Yuda Prastagha, Siti Aisyah, Yuliyanto Sabat  
*A Pragmatic Analysis of Communication Strategies ...*

	sincerely apologize for my mistake.”	Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: particularized
7	U16: “Nah ini level b2.”	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: particularized
8	U17: “Please accept my deepest and heartfelt apologies for my actions.”	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Negative politeness Implicature: particularized
9	U18: “Woah langsung C2, ada yang bisa lebih tinggi. Eh kamu...kamu bisa bikin C4 ngak?”	Speech Act: Directive Politeness: Off- record Implicature: particularized
10	U19: “Bisa.” (Jokes about bomb)	Speech Act: Commissive Politeness: Off-record Implicature: particularized
11	U20: “Nah, boleh didengarkan ke teman temannya?”	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Negative politeness Implicature: particularized
Video 3		
1	U21: “Akhirnya sudah, So.”	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: generalized
2	U22: “Eh... sudah so?”	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Positive Politeness Implicature: particularized
3	U23: “So kan artinya jadi, inilah kandangnya sudah So.”	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: generalized
4	U24: “Tolol, buat kalian yang belum tahu so itu kata sambung”	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: particularized
5	U25: “Contoh: The chickens are hungry. So I feed them.”	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: particularized
6	U26: “So juga bisa untuk adverb... Contoh: I am so mad.”	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: particularized
7	U27: “So bisa juga jadi pronoun... I don't think so.”	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: particularized
8	U28: “So do you understand?”	Speech Act: Directive Politeness: Positive Politeness Implicature: particularized
Video 4		
1	U29: “Good Night” (shoots lamp)	Speech Act: Declaration Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: Generalized
2	U30: “Bro, I’m studying, I still need light.”	Speech Act: Directive Politeness: Negative politeness Implicature: Particularized
3	U31: “Ah, nih tak kasih yang ringan.” (throws wallet)	Speech Act: Declaration Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: Particularized
4	U32: “Loh, maksudnya apa ini?”	Speech Act: Expressive

		Politeness: - Implicature: Particularized
5	U33: "Light kan artinya ringan."	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: Generalized
6	U34: "This is heavy (shows book)"	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: Particularized
7	U35: "This is light (shows wallet)"	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: Particularized
8	U36: "Tolol, light gak cuma berarti ringan tapi juga cahaya."	Speech Act: Expressive Politeness: Bald on Record Implicature: Particularized
9	U37: "I need light artinya aku butuh cahaya."	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: Generalized
10	U38: "Light juga bisa berarti lampu, kayak Turn on the light, please."	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: Particularized
11	U39: "Korek api Bahasa Inggrisnya lighter..."	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: Particularized
12	U40: "lighter ini bisa digunakan untuk menyalakan lilin, yang artinya light the candle."	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: - Implicature: Particularized
13	U41: "Coba Bahasa Inggrisnya menyalakan lampu dengan korek api ringan, tanpa cahaya."	Speech Act: Directive Politeness: Positive Politeness Implicature: Generalized
14	U42: "Light a light with a light lighter, without a light."	Speech Act: Representative Politeness: Positive Politeness Implicature: Generalized

Overall, utilize expressive and representatives' speech acts frequently, the results show that the author heavily rely on bald-on-record politeness strategies and produce a large number of instances of particularized conversational implicature, particularly those resulting from wordplay, miscommunication, and mismatched context. These pragmatic attributes collectively provide a distinctive pedagogical approach emblematic of TikTok's short-form educational material.

Table 2. Summary and Utterance of Pragmatic Findings Across Four Videos

No	Pragmatic Component	Types Identified	Frequency / Dominance
1	Speech Acts	Directive, Expressive, Representative, Commissive, Declaration	Representatives (23), Expressive (10), Directive (6), Declaration (2), Commissive (1)
2	Politeness	Bald on Record, Positive	Bald on Record (15), Positive (7),

No	Pragmatic Component	Types Identified	Frequency / Dominance
	<b>Strategies</b>	Politeness, Negative Politeness, Off-record	Negative (6), Off-Record (3), Blank (11)
3	<b>Conversational Implicature</b>	Generalized & particularized	Particularized (31), Generalized (11)

### *Speech acts*

Representative speech acts are most prevalent throughout the four videos. This prevalence suggests the instructional focus of the material, where content creators must direct viewers toward accurate linguistic usage. Expressive and Directive speech acts are also common, especially in humorous or corrective exchanges, demonstrating that emotional expression and clarification are important aspects of the @nathan\_suparman creators' communication approach.

#### **Representative**

First, Representatives is the most frequently used by the Creator, with twenty-three utterances in four videos. And below are examples of the use of speech acts: representatives in utterances. **U25:** *“Contoh the chickens are hungry. So, I feed them.”* Speaker indicates the correct use of the word “so” in a sentence. **U34:** *“This is heavy”* Speaker explains that Heavy is heavy in terms of weight by throwing a book.

This is the foundation of communication's information exchange. The first utterance contains Speaker explaining the correct use of the word “So” in a sentence with the pragmatic function. The second example shows Speaker explaining the word “heavy” by throwing a book at other speaker, even though he misunderstood because the context here is about the word “light,” which does not always mean weight but can also mean brightness.

#### **Expressive**

Second, as can be seen, expressive speech acts are most frequently used by the Creator, with tenth utterances in four videos. Below are examples of the use of speech acts: Expressive in utterances. **U20:** *“Nah, boleh didengarkan ke teman-temannya”* The first speaker asks whether other speaker can demonstrate the C4 level it referring to, even though this speaker misunderstands and think it was a bomb. **U17:** *“Please accept my deepest and heartfelt apologies for my actions.”* Speaker attempts to reach a “C2” level apology with extreme formality.

The first example shows that the speaker is asking speaker four to

show how to make C4 level of word structure to the other speaker. Pragmatic function used in this utterance is Non-Verbal Challenge. Meanwhile, the second example shows Speaker 1 constructing a C2-level sentence because they had previously argued with Speaker 3 about who was better at constructing sentences.

### **Directive**

Third, although it ranks third, Directive is used quite frequently, with Six utterances, not far behind expressive and representative, below is a list of examples of the use of speech acts: Directive in utterances. **U18:** *“Woh, langsung C2. Ada yang bisa lebih tinggi, Eh kamu...kamu bisa bikin C4 ngak?”* Speaker asked is there someone better than another speaker. Speaker saw guy passing by and asked to make a sentence structure at the C4 level. **U30:** *“Bro, I’m studying, I still need light.”* Speaker is studying and saying that still needs a lamp to study.

The first utterance, speaker challenges the others to see if anyone can go higher than C2, and asks passersby if he can make a sentence at the C4 level in the language structure. Meanwhile, the second utterance shows that the speaker is studying, but the other person humorously turns off the light with a gun and shoots the lamp.

### **Declaration**

Fourth, this is the second last type Declaration. there are only two utterances of this type in the four videos, which is far fewer than the previous three types. The following is an example of the use of speech acts: Declaration in utterance. **U31:** *“Ah, nih tak kasih yang ringan!”* Speaker throw a wallet to other a light object, which is a wallet.

Declaration since the words themselves create the action, declarations are the most potent speech acts. This demonstrates how, when stated by an authorized individual in a proper setting, language has the power to both create and describe reality. This statement shows that speaker threw the wallet at another speaker because the speaker thought that “light” meant “lightweight,” while the other speaker meant “light” in the context of bright light.

### **Commissive**

Lastly, this is the last category Commissive. there is only one utterances of this type in the four videos. The following data is an example of the use of speech acts: Commissive in utterance **U19:** *“bisa”* (Jokes about bomb). Speaker said that could make C4 even though the speaker

misunderstood and thought it was a bomb.

This utterance explains dark humor. Speaker says that he can make C4, but the C4 referred to by speaker is different from that referred to by another speaker. Commissive not really connected with all the data in this research.

### *Politeness Strategies*

The results show that the most common politeness strategy used in the videos is bald-on-record politeness. The fast-paced and humorous character of TikTok material is consistent with this direct, unadulterated style of communication, which is particularly evident in moments of humor, criticism, and instant correction. Both positive and negative politeness strategies are employed less frequently, typically in situations where the speakers want to establish rapport, apologize, or demonstrate reverence. Only a few statements use off-record tactics, which are usually connected to indirect taunting or sarcasm. Also, there are 11 Utterances Blank that does not fit into any category.

#### **Bald on Record**

Bald on Record is the most frequently used by the Creator in the Politeness strategies, with fifteenth utterances in four videos. It can be seen below the examples of the use of Bald on Record in utterances **U8**: "*Pakai On untuk periode yang agak pendek seperti hari dan tanggal*" Speaker explaining the correct grammar for sentences with quite short periods of time. **U12**: "*Heh, level Bahasa Inggris mu masih A1 loh*" Speaker mocked other because his English level was only equivalent to A1.

Bald on Record, after being studied, is used in direct criticism, aggressive humor, and quick justification. Bald On Record is a high-risk, high-reward strategy this tactic, despite its "rude" appearance, works best in circumstances where efficiency, speed, and clarity are more crucial than maintaining face. Understanding the situation and knowing when being straightforward is appropriate and when it is seen a social transgression are crucial. Although the first utterance shows speaker explaining grammar in a sentence with a relatively short time period using "On" to indicate the time frame.

#### **Positive Politeness**

Second after Bald on Record is Positive Politeness, which is the second most frequently used in the Creator's content, with only seven utterances in

four videos. It also can be seen at the following examples of the use of Positive Politeness in an utterance **U12**: "*Rayap besi sok inggris!*" Insulting other Speaker, for pretending to speak English even though their language skills are poor, and then showing off their superiority **U28** "*So, do you understand?*" First speaker asks whether the viewers of the video understand.

Positive politeness in society that place a strong emphasis on interpersonal warmth and collective harmony, this tactic works incredibly well. This utterance describes speaker mocking the other speaker because of their low language level, then showing a higher example, which is "I'm really sorry," to show the A2 language level. The pragmatic function is sarcastic mockery. Meanwhile, the second utterance shows whether the viewers understand the video creator's explanation.

### **Negative Politeness**

Negative politeness has six expressions in this category and is used in the Creator's content. It can also be seen in the following examples of the use of negative politeness in an **U10**: "*Loh? I'm sorry sir, I'm sorry.*" Accidental throw, speaker thinks there is no one in that place.

Negative politeness is the tactic of giving space and respect is known as negative politeness mostly used as apologies, request for attention. This tactic is especially crucial in professional contexts, cross-cultural communication, and formal settings where sustaining cordial connections without coming across as overbearing is crucial. It is the skill of "asking in a way that makes it easy for people to say no," to put it another way. This utterance shows speaker accidentally throwing an iron bar at someone else and apologizing for his unconsciousness.

### **Off-Record**

The last category is off-the-record, which only has three utterances included in this section. In the following are examples of statements included in this category. **U2**: "*Yo, I have an interview today.*" Showing the speaker shirt that is accidentally splashed with water.

Off-the-record is often used for sarcasm and subtle insults, although in this utterance it is used for indirect speech, because the speaker indirectly blames the person who spilled coffee on his shirt by concealing the meaning of the sentence. The skill of speaking without actually "speaking" is known as off-record it is the highest level of pragmatic sophistication, when contextual information and shared intelligence are used to conceal meaning

behind words.

### **Implicature**

In this data, the researcher chose to focus on Conversational Implicature because almost all of the data analyzed consisted of conversations between various speakers and was more relevant to conversational implicature, the analysis shows a clear dominance of particularized conversational implicature, which arises from highly specific contextual cues such as wordplay, misunderstandings of English vocabulary, and humorous exaggeration. These implicatures happen when an utterance's literal meaning deviates from its intended meaning, leading listeners to deduce meaning beyond what is stated explicitly. On the other hand, generalized implicature is less common and usually found in broad instructional remarks or simple grammar explanations. When taken as a whole, these results show that pragmatic techniques in TikTok English language learning content mostly rely on directness, contextual comedy, and audience involvement through pragmatic playfulness.

### **Particularized**

The Particularized Conversational Implicature category describes the specific context used for conversation. There are thirty-one utterances suitable for this category out of the four videos. **U24:** *"Tolol, buat kalian yang belum tau, so itu kata penyambung kalimat sebab akibat"* Speaker was angry because other said that "over" was "So" and justified it. **U40:** *"Lighter bisa digunakan untuk menyalakan lilin, yang artinya light the candle."* S2 explains that a lighter is used to light a candle, which becomes "Light the candle."

The function of Particularized Implicature is often found used in this research about Misinterpretation of words (light/so), sarcasm, humorous context. Particularized Conversational implicature is a type of implicature that only occurs in particular circumstances and cannot be comprehended without an understanding of those contexts. The context, the relationship between the speaker and the listener, and the particular context of the discussion all influence this implicature. These two remarks make it clear that the speaker is defending a misinterpretation of the utterances.

### **Generalized**

Generalized Conversational Implicature categorizes sentences that can stand alone without specific context within a sentence. There are 11 utterances that fit this version of Implicature. Below are examples of utterances from Generalized Conversational Implicature. **U7:** *"Pake In*

*untuk periode yang lama seperti tahun dan bulan.*" Speaker explaining the correct grammar for sentences with long periods of time. **U23:** *"So kan artinya jadi, inilah kandangnya sudah So."* Speaker said that the word "So" means over.

This category is frequently used to general explanation of grammar and example sentences. A conversational implicature that naturally results from specific word choices or structures and can be comprehended without the need for a particular context is known as a generalized conversational implicature.

## DISCUSSION

Across the four skit-based videos, representative speech acts appeared most frequently, indicating that the creator's primary instructional work is to explain forms, provide examples, and correct meanings in a concise manner. (Makoti, 2021; Sadikov, 2022) Information is conveyed by representative speech acts, which are related to the speaker's dedication to the accuracy of their claims. The author regularly provides grammatical principles, illustrates word meaning contrasts (such as light and so), and provides linguistic clarification all of which call for forceful forms. Indicating that the creator's primary instructional work is to explain forms, provide examples, and correct meanings in a concise manner. This dominance is consistent with the function of representatives as commitments to propositions and explanations in instructional discourse (Yule, 1996). In the analyzed data, representatives often framed grammar rules and lexical contrasts (e.g., clarifying connectors such as so or contrasting meanings such as light in "brightness" versus "weight"), which suggests that short-form language teaching on TikTok depends on rapid propositional clarity. This finding aligns with studies that emphasize TikTok's potential to support EFL learning through brief, focused explanations that maintain attention (Xiuwen & Razali, 2021; Rininggayuh et al., 2024). However, rather than attributing learning success directly, the present data specifically show how instructional clarity is pragmatically constructed through representative acts in micro-lessons. Directives and

expressive were commonly used alongside representatives, especially in corrective and comedic exchanges. Directives served to prompt responses, challenge other speakers in the skit, or direct attention to the correct form, matching Yule's (1996) description of directives as attempts to get the hearer to do something. Expressive marked stance (surprise, frustration, exaggerated apology) and contributed to an entertaining tone that may help sustain viewer attention. Importantly, these acts do not simply "add humor"; they function as interactional devices that frame correction as socially acceptable and attention-worthy within TikTok's informal pedagogical setting. This is to be expected as commissive include pledges or commitments, speech functions that are rarely required in hilarious micro-lessons, and declarations require institutional authority.

In terms of politeness, bald-on-record strategies appeared most frequently, particularly during immediate correction, mock assessment, or punchline delivery. This pattern suggests that in fast-paced short videos, efficiency and clarity can be prioritized over mitigation, which is consistent with Brown and Levinson's account of bald-on-record use under conditions of urgency or efficiency as discussed in Yule, (1996). Positive and negative politeness occurred less often and tended to appear in apology or rapport-building moments, indicating selective facework when the skit temporarily shifts from instruction to relationship management. Rather than claiming that directness is "always effective," the present results show that directness is a recurring pragmatic choice in this creator's style and appears compatible with the platform's expectations for concise delivery. Off-record tactics are employed in sarcastic or indirectly critical situations. Utterances were coded as 'not applicable' when no facework or face-threatening act was identifiable (e.g., purely explanatory statements). mutual comprehension between presenters and audience members. However, politeness is a communicative practice that is quite frequent in human languages and cultures, referenced in Hartini et al., (2024). Additionally, it has been claimed that politeness is a universal feature of human society. Languages typically create their own codes of etiquette.

Finally, implicature in the dataset was predominantly particularized: humor frequently emerged from staged misunderstandings, lexical ambiguity, and contextual mismatch, requiring viewers to infer intended meaning beyond literal wording (Grice, 1975). In other words, the skit format invites pragmatic inference as part of the learning experience, since the "wrong" interpretation becomes a trigger for the "right" explanation.

This supports the view that inferred meaning, contextual cues, and pragmatic play can be central resources in digital interaction (Kamsinah et al., 2024). The contribution of this study is not to generalize learning outcomes, but to demonstrate the pragmatic mechanisms through which TikTok micro-lessons can simultaneously deliver instruction and maintain engagement through inference-driven humor. The pragmatic link between language aspects becomes much more significant in literary texts specific implicatures to deliver language lessons in a way that is short, funny, and memorable (Nodirovich, 2025). The purpose of the Results and Discussion is to state your findings and make interpretations and/or opinions, explain the implications of your findings, and make suggestions for future research. Its main function is to answer the questions posed in the Introduction, explain how the results support the answers and, how the answers fit in with existing knowledge on the topic.

## CONCLUSION

This study contributes to digital pragmatics by showing how pragmatic resources operate pedagogically in TikTok-based EFL micro-lessons. Rather than treating humor as an accessory, the findings indicate that skit-based instruction can integrate representative explanation, selective facework, and inference-driven humor to construct clarity and engagement within short time constraints. Theoretically, the study extends Yule's (1996) pragmatics framework to short-form educational video discourse by illustrating how speech acts, politeness strategies, and implicature interact as a coordinated communication strategy in a multimodal environment. Practically, the results suggest that educators and content creators can design more effective TikTok lessons by (1) prioritizing representative acts for clear rules and contrasts, (2) using direct correction strategically when timing and clarity matter, and (3) leveraging particularized implicature through controlled ambiguity and staged misunderstanding to trigger audience inference and retention. Future research should compare multiple creators or genres and incorporate audience-response data (e.g., comment analysis or learner tasks) to test how these pragmatic patterns relate to comprehension and learning outcomes beyond engagement.

## REFERENCES

Alsmari, N. (2024). Pragmatic competence in EFL: The impact of multimodality on

- interpreting conversational implicatures. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, 25(3), 66–81.  
<https://callej.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92>
- Bulele, Y. N. (2020). Analisis fenomena sosial media dan kaum milenial: studi kasus tiktok. *Conference on Business, Social Sciences and Innovation Technology*, 1(1), 565–572. <https://journal.uib.ac.id/index.php/cbssit/article/view/1463>
- Dipta, D., Virgiyanti, D. F., Fachriza, A., & Nuraini, E. I. (2024). The Significance of Pragmatics: A Case in Social Communication Context. *Journal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 22(2), 102–116.  
<https://ejurnal.teknokrat.ac.id/index.php/teknosastik/article/view/4336>
- Fachrunnisa, N., Aisyah, S., Astri, Z., Ramadhani, F., Batari, A. C., Malik, N. A. F., Nisa, K., Amir, B., & Anugrah, N. (2024). Sosialisasi Penggunaan Media Sosial Instagram dan Tiktok dalam Memupuk Minat Belajar Bahasa Inggris Siswa. *NUMBAY: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 2(2), 109–116.  
<https://doi.org/10.53491/numbay.v2i2.1355>
- Fatima, S., & Sa'i, M. (2025). Strategi Komunikasi dengan Pendekatan Audience-Centered dalam Meningkatkan Efektivitas Pesan pada Sharing Session Bingkis Ramadhan di Pamekasan, Madura. *Jejak Digital: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 1(4), 1215–1228. <https://doi.org/10.63822/bmx7ba23>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*, 3, 43–58. New York, NY: Academic Press. [https://books.google.co.id/books?id=QqtAbk-bs34C&pg=PA22&hl=id&source=gbs\\_toc\\_r&cad=1#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.id/books?id=QqtAbk-bs34C&pg=PA22&hl=id&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=1#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Hartini, W., Febryanto, M., Rahayu, I., & Sapari, G. G. (2024). The politeness strategies in English classroom interaction. *ARTISHTIC*, 1(1).  
<https://ejournal.universitasmadiri.ac.id/index.php/artishtic/article/view/58>
- Kamsinah, N. K., Natsir, N. N., & Aliah, N. N. (2024). Pragmatic analysis in digital Communication: A case study of language use on social media. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce, and Management*, 1(4), 375–383.  
<https://doi.org/10.62951/ijecm.v1i4.259>
- Lim, W. M. (2025). What is qualitative research? An overview and guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(2), 199–229.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2024.06.007>
- Luisandrith, D. R., & Yanuartuti, S. (2020). Interdisiplin: Pembelajaran Seni Tari Melalui Aplikasi Tik Tok Untuk Meningkatkan Kreativitas Anak. *Jurnal Seni Tari*, 9(2), 175–180. Doi 10.15294/jst.v9i2.42085
- Makoti, V. (2021). An Analysis of Assertive Speech Acts in Post Handshake Speeches of President Uhuru Kenyatta and the Former Prime Minister Raila Odinga in Kenya. *Sumerianz Journal of Education, Linguistics and Literature*.  
<https://doi.org/10.47752/sjell.44.98.105>
- Nodirovich, B. Z. (2025). THE PRAGMATIC RELATIONSHIP OF ELEMENTS IN THE APPLIED ELEMENTS EXPRESSED IN A LITERARY TEXT. *The Conference Hub*, 74–77.  
<https://theconferencehub.com/index.php/tch/article/view/225>
- Pandia, B. S., & Sibarani, B. (2024). Techniques Used in the Content of Tiktok

- Videos as English Learning Media. *Edu Cendikia: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 4(03), 940–951. <https://doi.org/10.47709/educendikia.v4i03.4959>
- Revita11, Y., Marsidin, S., & Sulastri, S. (2023). *Peran bahasa dalam penerapan ilmu pengetahuan*. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v5i2.949>
- Rininggayuh, E., Dewi, I. A. S., & Isnaeni, L. N. W. (2024). The Effectiveness of TikTok as A Media for Enhancing English Speaking Skills: A Systematic Literature Review. *Proceedings Series on Social Sciences & Humanities*, 18, 124–133. <https://doi.org/10.30595/pssh.v18i.1247>
- Taguchi, N., & Kádár, D. Z. (2025). Pragmatics: An overview. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–8). Wiley. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Daniel-Kadar/publication/370022814\\_Pragmatics\\_An\\_Overview/links/64523aa297449a0e1a75f110/Pragmatics-An-Overview.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Daniel-Kadar/publication/370022814_Pragmatics_An_Overview/links/64523aa297449a0e1a75f110/Pragmatics-An-Overview.pdf)
- Sadikov, E. T. (2022). Novel teaching technologies of pragmatic speech acts. *Eurasian Scientific Herald*, 4, 19–22. Retrieved from <https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/esh/article/view/392>
- Widyawanti, A. L., Aisyah, S., & Prasetyo, Y. (2024). Illocutionary speech acts in the short movie “The Translator”: Pragmatic study. *JELITA: Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature*, 5(1), 144–165. <https://doi.org/10.56185/jelita.v5i1.541>
- Xiuwen, Z., & Razali, A. B. (2021). An overview of the utilization of TikTok to improve oral English communication competence among EFL undergraduate students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 9(7), 1439–1451. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2021.090710>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from [https://books.google.co.id/books/about/Pragmatics.html?id=E2SA8ao0yMAC&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.co.id/books/about/Pragmatics.html?id=E2SA8ao0yMAC&redir_esc=y)