

IMPOLITENESS IN COMEDY MOVIES



**Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for Getting Bachelor Degree of Education
in English Department**

**By
Siti Alfina Fitri Wulandari
A320140185**

**DEPARTMENT ENGLISH EDUCATION
SCHOOL OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA**

2018

APPROVAL
IMPOLITENESS IN COMEDY MOVIES


PUBLICATION ARTICLE

by:

Siti Alfina Fitri Wulandari

A320140185

Approved to be examined by
Consultant,



Drs. Agus Wijayanto, M. A. Ph.D

NIDN. 0609096801

ACCEPTANCE

IMPOLITENESS IN COMEDY MOVIES
PUBLICATION ARTICLE

By:

SITI ALFINA FITRI WULANDARI

A320140185

Accepted and Approved by the Board of Examiners

School of Teacher Training and Education

Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta

On June, 2018

The Board of Examiners:

1. Agus Wijayanto, Ph.D
(Chair Person)
2. Drs. Siti Zuhriah, M.Hum
(Member I)
3. Dr. Malikatul Laila, M.Hum
(Member II)


(.....)

(.....)

(.....)



Dean,

Prof. Dr. Harun Joko Prayitno, M.Hum.

NIP. 19650428 199303 1 001

TESTIMONY

Herewith, I testify that in this proposal of publication article there is no plagiarism of the previous study literary work which has been raised to obtain bachelor degree of university, nor there are opinions or masterpieces which have been written or published by others, except those in which writing are referred in the manuscript and mentioned in the literary review and bibliography.

If later, the results of this study are proven as plagiarism, I will be fully responsible and willing to accept sanction in accordance with applicable regulations.

Surakarta, June 8th 2018

The Researcher



Siti Alfina Fitri Wulandari

A320140185

1. INTRODUCTION

Unlike politeness, impoliteness gives bad effect to other people in social terms. According to Culpeper (2011:22) impoliteness involves mental attitude held by a participant and comprised of negative evaluative beliefs about particular behaviors in particular social context, and the activation of that attitude by those particular social in context behaviors. According to Culpeper (2011:23) negative attitude toward specific behaviors occurring in specific context is called impoliteness.

There has been some research that studied about impoliteness, for example Hartono (2014), Shofyah (2015), Lacky (2015), Primadianti (2015), Laitenen's (2010), Sara Abdul Wahid and Prof. Dr. Zeydan K. Omar (2010), Mills (2005), Culpeper (1996, 2010, 2011), Culpeper, Bousfield and Wichmann (2003), Elgamany (2017), and Wijayanto et al. (2017; 2018). The researchers focused on impoliteness strategies, response, function, etc. They also have different data some examples are from L2 learners, movie, script and TV-series. The present research focuses on impoliteness strategies and response in Comedy movies.

Comedy movie is genre of movie that can make the audience laugh and happy because in this genre the main emphasis is on humor. The present research analyses three Comedy movies namely *Harold and Kumar Go to White Castle*, *Ted*, and *Expelled*. The Comedy movie was produced in America and this movie is interesting to be studied. The first movie, that is, *Harold and Kumar* tells a friendship story of characters from Korea and India, they are so funny. Second, *Ted* tells about a friendship between a bear that can talk with human and John who is his best friend. Third, *Expelled* tells about Felix as the main character who is stupid and lazy student on the campus.

Harold and Kumar Go to White Castle movie in this study is interesting to watch. This is because the story is so funny telling the friendship of two men who have known each other for a long time, they are Harold and Kumar. Harold is a descendant of Asian people while Kumar is Indian people. The conversations between Harold and Kumar involve many impoliteness words like *fucking*, *shit*, etc. This is one example of impoliteness used by the characters:

Harold: Are those my scissors? Oh my God! Trim my nose hair with those!

Kumar: Dude, I've been cutting my ass hair with them for the past six months.

Harold: *GET THE HELL OUT OF MY ROOM!*

The excerpt above shows that Harold used bald on record impoliteness, as he was angry at Kumar who uses his scissors. He directly attacks Kumar's face by saying "*Get the hell out of my room!*".

2. METHOD

The researcher used descriptive qualitative research to analyze the data. According to Bogdan and Tylor (in Moleong, 2003:3), qualitative research is a research that produces the descriptive data in form written and oral word from people's behavior. This research used qualitative research because the researcher would describe about impoliteness strategies and response of impoliteness in *Comedy* movie. The object of this research was impoliteness strategies of utterances among the character of *Comedy* movies. The data in this research were in form of utterances spoken by the characters of *Comedy* movies (Harold and Kumar Go to White Castle, Ted, and Expelled). Documentation method was used to obtain the research data. Documentation is technique, which uses a written source to get the data. This study used expert judgment to validate the data. The data of impoliteness were analyzed based on Culpeper (1996).

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Strategies of Impoliteness in Comedy Movies

The total number of impoliteness strategies in *Comedy* movies is 61 data. This study just found three strategies of impoliteness of Culpeper (1996), including bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. Positive impoliteness had the highest frequency (67,21%). The second high was bald on record impoliteness (18,09%). The third was negative impoliteness (14,75%). The characters never used off-record and withhold politeness strategies in their utterances.

Each type of impoliteness has specific realization. The first strategy is bald on record impoliteness that has three forms of realization that is the use of clear, direct, and unambiguous utterances. Second, positive impoliteness has ten

strategies including ignore and snub the other, exclude the other from an activity, disassociating from the other, disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, calling the other name, use obscure or secretive language, make the other feel uncomfortable, seek disagreement, utilizing taboo word, and using inappropriate identity marker. Third, negative impoliteness consists of four strategies such as frighten, condescending, scorning, ridiculing, and associating the other with negative aspect explicitly.

There are ten strategies in positive impoliteness but not all the strategies used by characters. Only seventh strategies occur in the *Comedy* movies: (1) utilizing taboo word (44,26%), (2) calling the other name (11,47%), (3) disassociating from the other (3,37%), (4) using inappropriate identity marker (3,37%), (5) ignore, snub the other (1,63%), (6) make the other feel uncomfortable (1,63%), and (7) seek disagreement (1,63%).

Bald on record impoliteness is the second high. Negative impoliteness occurs just in 14,75%. From this strategy, the characters used four strategies of negative impoliteness namely frightening, condescending, scorning, ridiculing, and invading the other space. The most dominant strategy used by character is condescending, scorning, ridiculing. However, associating the other with negative aspect explicitly did not appears in *Comedy* movies.

3.2 Response to Impoliteness

There were four kinds of responses of impoliteness such as accepting the face attack, offensive countering, defensive countering and no response. Response that was often used by every characters in the movie was defensive countering (39,4%) that was the highest responses. The second high was no response (22,95%). The third high was accepting the face attack (19,27%) and the last high was offensive countering (18,3%).

Defensive countering was the most dominant response used by characters in *Comedy* movies (39,4%). This response was used to respond to taboo word strategy. This response often occurred as the characters try to defend themselves and explain rather than to give counter attack. In addition, defensive countering was not only used to respond taboo word strategy but also to respond to the

characters who attacked speakers with other strategies such as seeking disagreement, calling the other name, invading the other space, bald on record, condescending, scorning, and ridiculing.

No response was the second-high response to impoliteness that was used by the characters (22,95%). This response often occurred to respond to bald on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness. Sometimes, characters choose to give no response when they got face attack because they felt down or did not want to extend the problem. Accepting the face attack was the third high response (19,27%). This strategy was commonly used when a recipient got attacks using bald on record strategy, calling the other name, utilizing taboo word, condescending, scorning, ridiculing, and frighten. The characters choose to accept because they tended to ignore and accept than defend or counter the speakers.

The last response was offensive countering as the fewest response (18,3%). This response was often used to reply to an attacker who used taboo words. From some of the strategies used, utilizing taboo word was the most dominant response that received offensive countering. Using offensive countering means that the recipient provided a counterattack to speakers who already attacked him using impoliteness strategies.

There were some relationships between impoliteness strategies and response of impoliteness. If the impoliteness was bald on record, the responses were accepting the face attack, defensive countering, offensive countering, and no response. If it was positive impoliteness, the responses were accepting the face attack, defensive countering, offensive countering, and no response. If it was negative impoliteness, the responses were accepting the face attack, defensive countering, offensive countering, and no response. Off record and withhold politeness were not found. The result of the analysis in this study concluded that each type strategies in impoliteness has relationship with impoliteness responses.

The aims of this present study are to identify the impoliteness strategies used by each character in Comedy movies and to describe response of impoliteness. This study used Culpeper (1996) theory to analyze impoliteness.

The result of this study showed that the characters used only three strategies. In line with the earlier studies (e.g., Hartono, 2014; Shofyah, 2015) this study found impoliteness could occur in different social status, age or gender. Speakers used impoliteness to show their dislike and express angry to the recipients. However, in this study, impoliteness was not only used to attack someone but it was used as a strategy to induce jokes.

Bousfield (2008) stated that recipient could give four responses such as accepting face attack, counter face attack that consist of offensive strategies and defensive strategies, no response that also used in this study. In this study, the characters often used counter face attack rather than the others. Sometimes the recipients not only accepted but also countered the face attack. However, many recipients seldom gave response to the speaker's impoliteness. However, If the recipients did not like the speakers who attacked them, they would counterattack, even though the impoliteness was used only for creating jokes.

4. CONCLUSION

The first objective of this research is to identify the impoliteness strategies in *Comedy* movies. After collecting the data and analyzing the data from five strategies of impoliteness, this study just found three impoliteness strategies, namely bald on record, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. Off-record and withhold politeness are not found. Positive impoliteness becomes the most dominant strategies used by the characters in the *Comedy* movies. The second objective of this research is to describe responses of impoliteness in *Comedy* movies. Three responses were found: accepting the face attack, countering face attack, no response. Counter face attack consisted of two strategies namely offensive strategies and defensive strategies. The most dominant response used by the characters was counter face attack especially defensive countering. and the fewest strategy was offensive countering.

There were some relationships between impoliteness strategies and response of impoliteness. Bald on record impoliteness was commonly responded with accepting the face attack, defensive countering, offensive countering, and no response. Positive impoliteness was responded with accepting the face attack,

defensive countering, offensive countering, and no response. Negative impoliteness was responded with accepting the face attack, defensive countering, offensive countering, and no response.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Culpeper, J. (1996). "Towards and Anatomy of Impoliteness". *Journal of Pragmatic*, 25, pp. 249-367.

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J. (2011). 'It's not what you said, it's how you said it': Prosody and Impoliteness. Berlin.

Culpeper, J. (2011). Politeness and Impoliteness. Berlin: Lancaster University.UK: Lancaster university.

Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalised impoliteness formulae. UK: Lancaster University.

Jannejadi, M., Bordber, A., Bordidieh, A., & Banari, R. (2015). "The Analysis of Impoliteness in Family Discourse: Verbal Interaction Iranian Couples". *International Journal for Teacher of English*, 5, pp. 19-41.

Litinen, M. 2010. The Use of Impoliteness Strategies in the American TV-Series House M.D. Bachelor's Thesis. Jyvaskyla: English Study Program, Department of Languages University of Jyvaskila.

Lucky, B. J. (2015). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in British TV-Series Sherlock*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.

Mills, S. (2005). *Gender and Impoliteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Omar, K. Z., & Wahid, A. S. H. (2010). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Home of Harold Pinter's Plays*. Ambar University.

Primadianti, N. (2015). "A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Paranorman Movie". *Thesis*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.

Wijayanto, A, Prasetyarini, A, & Hikmat, M.H. (2017). Impoliteness in EFL: Foreign Language Learners' Complaining Behaviors Across Social Distance and Status Levels. *Sage Open*.

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/2158244017732816>

Wijayanto, A, Hikmat, M.H, & Prasetyarini, A. (2018). Impoliteness in EFL Complaints: Exploring its Intentions and Motivating Factors. *Lingua Cultura* 12(1):97-104