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Abstract

The objectives of this descriptive qualitative study were to discover: (1) the types of attacks in televised debate program and to describe how the addressee respond to the attacks. The data were obtained from the downloaded episodes and then were transcribed. The data were comedians' utterances in ILK Comedy Program from the topics of Bullying. The data were identified, analyzed and categorized based on Culpeper's (2011). The findings of the study showed that: 1) there were 39 expressions (43.4%) for attacks on quality face, 23 expressions (25.5 %) for attacks on social identity face, 12 expressions (13.3 %) for attacks on equity rights, and 16 expression (17.8 %) for attacks on association rights, and the types of response which consist of 18 expressions (20 %) for no response, 21 expressions (23.3 %) for accepting the attacks, 39 expressions (43.4 %) for countering defensively, and 12 expressions (13.3 %) for countering offensively. Therefore, the most dominant type of responses to the attacks are accepting the attacks and countering defensively. Meanwhile, the least is countering offensively. 2) Over 16 categories created, there were 16 categories found in the data. They are (1) attacks on quality face – no response, (2) attacks on quality face – accepting response, (3) attacks on quality face – countering defensively, (4) attacks on quality face – countering offensively, (5) attacks on social identity face – no response, (6) attacks on social identity face – accepting response, (7) attacks on social identity face – countering defensively, (8) attacks on social identity face – countering offensively, (9) attacks on equity rights – no response, (10) attacks on equity rights – accepting response, (11) attacks on equity rights – countering defensively, (12) attacks on equity rights – countering offensively, (13) attacks on association rights – no response, (14) attacks on association rights – accepting response, (15) attacks on association rights – countering defensively, and (16) attacks on association rights – countering offensively. Overall, the data showed that impoliteness was used as effective communication strategy to entertain the audience; therefore, it is expected that related parties such as television producers and comedians, notice the effect of the impoliteness use to the society as well as the need of parental guide for the show.
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I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

When we interact with other people either face to face, via phone, or an e-mail, there are certain rules that concern social interaction and keep to be maintained. Politeness is one such rule. In English, for instance, the word 'please' is usually added to all kinds of requests. When one is talking to a person they do not know well, it is appropriate to address them as Mr or Mrs Smith instead of John or Anne. The conditional form in a request could you turn on the TV, please? It is always more polite than the indicative form in can you turn on the TV, please? By being polite we establish good social relationships with other people, which help us in creating friendships, getting jobs, and simply giving a good impression of ourselves.

Nowadays, however, in terms of entertainment business, the value of politeness has declined and created impoliteness during the communication. The performers, especially comedians, tend to mock their partners in order to entertain people. To exemplify, a comedian mocked his partner by attacking her body shape, “Bu Tike inidulupernah bersaing, Pak! Bersaing dengan Bis Malam!” The listener, in this case, instead of feeling threatened or offended, responded it by laughing which...
supports the theory of what Culpeper (2005) called as entertaining impoliteness; here, the primary target of the speech event is not the addressee of the rude language, but rather a third-party audience that finds the politenesseven humorous.

Culpeper (2005) mentioned in his theory that there are four maps to attack someone’s face, namely attacks on quality face, social identity face, equity rights and association rights. The hearer may respond by not responding, accepting the impoliteness or countering it and the counter may be defensive or offensive. On literary discourse, the study about this had ever been conducted by Abbas (2012) which analyzed Montgomery’s novel, Anne of Green Gables. The results showed that the most frequent attack was occurred to the quality face which responded with an offensive counter by the addressee.

In relation to that, it is very interesting to investigate what kinds of attacks and the responses occurred in a TV program due to its function as what Culpeper categorizes as entertainment impoliteness. Therefore, this present study is aimed to examine the types of attacks occurred in one of the episodes of a televised debate program (Indonesia Lawak Klub) and the listener’s response toward the attack. The result of the study later on is expected to reveal the meanings toward the attacks and the responses.

Nevertheless, the opposite phenomenon of politeness, impoliteness, is something that has not gained nearly as much scholarly attention as politeness has, although it has become more and more frequent in today’s social interaction.

1.2 The Problems of the Study
In relation to the background of the study presented above, the problems of the study are formulated as in the following.
1. What types of attacks are found in televised debate program?
2. How would the addressee respond to the attacks?

1.3 The Objectives of the Study
In line with the problems of the study, the objectives are to:
1. find out the types of attacks in televised debate program
2. describe how the addressee respond to the attacks

1.4 The Scope of the Study
Linguistic impoliteness can be used as one of the strategies to create humor and this phenomenon has benefited the comedians appearing on television. Rather than seeking for qualified materials to create laughter, the comedians tend to use the impolite utterances which are somehow simpler to enact and more efficient to reach the goal. It has become a trend that comedian in almost every show on television, without any hesitation tend to use the shortcut (as to mock the other comedians) to provoke an effective laughter. Due to its influence on various television programs, this study is limited to the discussion of impoliteness appeared in Indonesia Lawak Klub show. The main aspects to be observed are the types of attacks appeared when participants contribute an opinion in the forum and the participants’ responses to the types of attacks.

1.5 The Significance of the Study
The findings of the study are expected to be useful theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the research findings are useful for: a) linguists to enrich their knowledge of the application of the impoliteness theory as specifically about how impoliteness can be used to face-attack hearers as well as entertaining the audiences; b) other researchers to get information of what types of attacks and responses occur in a comedy program. Practically, the findings of this research are expected to be useful as a reference for lecturers, teachers and students which help to lead toward how to deal with impoliteness involved types of attacks and responses should be seen as a controlled and managed phenomenon, and why it occurs in entertainment, especially comedy.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Impoliteness
Culpeper (1996) utilizes Brown and Levinson’s model as a departure for his seminal article on impoliteness. Terming impoliteness “the parasite of politeness” (ibid.: 355), Culpeper conceives of impoliteness as the use of intentionally face threatening acts. Culpeper lays out five super strategies that speakers use to make impolite utterances:
1. Bald on record impoliteness: performing the FTA (Face Threatening Act) in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way even when face considerations are relevant.
2. Positive Impoliteness: strategies designed to damage the addressee’s positive face wants.
3. Negative Impoliteness: strategies designed to damage the addressee’s negative face wants.
4. Sarcasm or mock politeness: performing the FTA with politeness strategies that are obviously insincere.
5. Withhold politeness: Not performing politeness work where it is expected. Specifically, Culpeper (2005: 38) defines impoliteness as those occasions when “(1) the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2).” To account for the aspect of politeness, Culpeper (1996) proposes an impoliteness framework which is parallel but opposite to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of politeness to account for some contexts where ‘impoliteness activity’ is not a marginal activity but an essential part of the communicative process.

There are two accounts that need to be considered when discussing impoliteness. First, close friends are more likely to have close identity of face wants (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 64) and sometimes ‘intimacy’ is taken to mean ‘affect’, therefore expect less concern for face when the relationship is one of dislike (Culpeper, 1996: 355). Second, a characteristic feature of impoliteness in ‘equal relationships’, where they lack default mechanism by which one participant achieves the upper hand, is its tendency to escalate where an insult can easily lead to a counter-insult and when it becomes the best way to save face in the light of verbal attack is to counter attack (Harris et al., 1986).

2.2 The Functions Of Impoliteness
Culpeper in Murni (2013) delineates several functional categories of impoliteness and illustrates each with a detailed analysis of a natural text. The first function is called affective impoliteness. This involves the targeted display of heightened emotion, typically anger, with the implication that the target is to blame for producing that negative emotional state. Culpeper demonstrates linguistic characteristics of affective impoliteness in a publicly available recording of actor Alec Baldwin’s offensive phone message to his daughter. He notes that although this type may primarily be impulsive due to a bubbling over of negative emotions, it is still used strategically and within the bounds of certain social norms. The second type is coercive impoliteness, in which Speaker attempts to increase his or her power over Hearer by means of socially unacceptable speech patterns. This is exemplified by a transcript of a dialogue in which an American police officer abuses his power over an Ethiopian immigrant taxi driver. The third type Culpeper calls entertaining impoliteness; here, the primary target of the speech event is not the addressee of the rude language, but rather a third-party audience that finds the impoliteness event humorous. The example provided is a highly creative disgruntled letter to a cable company circulated on the Web to produce laughs. Culpeper also discusses institutional impoliteness, which is guided not by Speaker’s personal desire to offend Hearer, but by Speaker acting to promote the interests of the dominant group behind the institution in which the speech event occurs. Two examples are provided: 1) the verbal abuse that a drill sergeant spews on army recruits in order to mortify their sense of self and reshape them as obedient soldiers (a type of coercive impoliteness); 2) rude hosts on so-called exploitative TV game and chat shows, whose goal is to please the viewing public (a type of entertaining impoliteness). The third function is what believed to be applied in the televised show analyzed in this study

2.3 Types of attacks
In 2005, Culpeper moves away from Brown and Levinson (1987) in terms of replacing the negative/positive dichotomy but he does not explicitly revise his model in terms of Spencer-Oatey’s (2002) concept of ‘rapport management’. The reason behind this is that a single strategy may represent attacks on more than one of the two components of rapport management: face and social rights. Accordingly, Culpeper (2005) proposes the following attacks (Cashman, 2006: 228), though he does not explicitly carry out this re-mapping task (Cashman, 2006: 223): attacks on quality face, attacks on social identity face, attacks on equity rights, and attacks on association rights. Strategies to attack all the above aspects of face are the same as in Culpeper (1996). Culpeper et al. (2003:1563) map out the strategies available to a hearer and as shown in Figure (1) below:

![Figure 1: Summary of the provisional strategies with Spencer-Oatey's (2002) concept of rapport-management.](image)

After an occurrence of impoliteness, an interlocutor may or may not respond. A response may accept the impoliteness or counter it and the counter may be defensive or...
offensive. Offensive strategies are intended to match or escalate while defensive strategies include direct contradiction, abrogation, opt out on record, insincere agreement and ignore the attack. In short, responding to impoliteness can be done in one of the following ways:
1. Not responding
2. Accepting impoliteness
3. Countering defensively
4. Countering offensively

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
3.1 Research Design
The study is a descriptive research design because the answers of the problems of the study are provided by explainin and descirning in detail the impoliteness especially types of attacks in the utterances of ILK Comedy program, the responses of the comedian.
This research design is used to fulfill the criteria of descriptive adequacy and explanatory adequacy based on Culpeper’s (1996) theory by collecting the data, transcribing the utterances used by the participants in the video of ILK comedy program, identifying, categorizing, making pattern and concluding comedian’s types of attacks, and their responses toward the attacks.

3.2 The Source of the Data
The data which will be analyzed in this study consist of qualitative data. The data is the transcript of one of episodes of Indonesia Lawak Klub broadcasted by Trans7. This program was chosen for its popularity in debating phenomenal and up-to-date issues in a humorous way. The format of the show is to position the comedians in Indonesia in the discussion forum and discuss a current issue. The comedians are collaborated in discussing a problem and attempt to provide solutions with an entertaining version. In the duration of 60 minutes, Denny Chandra which becomes the moderator will invite 8-10 comedian or entertainer known in Indonesia for a panelist. In addition to listening to comments from the guests, community members are invited to get involved by submitting their opinions are aired through VT, and at the end of the show, the summary of the minutes of the discussion was delivered. During the process of discussion, the comedians may utter statements that are considered impolite and those utterances will be the data analyzed in the research. The title of episode selected was “Bullying” and broadcasted in March 4th, 2015. This episode was randomly chosen of all ILK episodes.

3.3 Technique of Data Analysis
The study identified instances of struggle over the value of linguistic politeness and determine the categories that they were put into. The data of this research will be analyzed by using Miles and Huberman’s technique, they are: data collection, data reduction, data display, and data verification/conclusion.
To analyze the data, Miles and Huberman’s (1994) technique was employed which consisted of three steps namely 1) data reduction, 2) data display, and 3) conclusion drawing or verification as could be seen in these following steps:
a. The names of the comedians involved in the episodes were coded. The transcribed data are put into the table. The utterances which met the two indicators: considered as attack utterances and provoking laughter were listed. The utterances which did not correspond to these indicators were considered as irrelevant data and sorted out.
b. The data were put into table based on the attacks occurrence from the beginning of utterance is triggered to conflict resolution.
c. The grouped data was categorized based on Culpeper’s theory of the forms of the type of attacks and the responses in answering the problem.
d. The findings were displayed into an easily understood explanation.
e. Conclusions of the data were drawn and verified through studying the theories.

IV. FINDINGS
4.1 Data Analysis
The data in this study were the transcripts of the recorded which had been gathered from the conversation among the participants in Indonesia Lawak Club (ILK). The data were analyzed by applying Miles and Huberman’s (1984) analysis model namely 1) data reduction, 2) data display, and 3) conclusion drawing or verification. The data in this chapter were reduced based on Culpeper’s (2011) theory.
4.1.1 Types of Attacks
There were 4 types of attacks expressed by the in ILK Comedy Program. They were (1) attacks on quality face, (2) attacks on social identity face, (3) attacks on equity rights, and (4) attacks on association rights. It can be summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Types of Attacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Attacks on Social Identity Face 23 25.6
3. Attacks on Equity Rights 12 13.3
4. Attacks on Association Rights 16 17.7

Total 90 100

The table above described the types of attacks consist of 90 attacks in which there were 39 expressions (43.4%) for attacks on quality face, 23 expressions (25.5 %) for attacks on social identity face, 12 expressions (13.3 %) for attacks on equity rights, and 16 expression (17.8 %) for attacks on association rights.

The following points would provide the analysis of the types of attacks found in the data.

a. Attacks on Quality Face

This category is the most frequent one found in the data acquiring 43.4% of all 90 utterances. Culpeper et.al (2003: 1563) map out that attacks on quality face is seen as a desire to be evaluated positively in terms of personal quality. In this case, the way to attack by using the impoliteness strategies, for instance, attack the other’s appearance and ability/ work directly.

The following data showed that the participant expressed attacks on quality face. It can be seen below.

AK : Bolehsayapakaintukucimukamuka.

K : Lo gabisacucimukadisini. Lo kalomaucucimuka di carwash.

b. Attacks on Social Identity Face

Of the videos analyzed, there were 23 expressions (25.5 %) of attacks on social identity face found. The attacks on social identity face is seen as desire acknowledgement of our social identities or roles. It can be attacked by using the impoliteness strategies by condescending, scorning, and ridiculing (Culpeper et.al: 2003).

The following expressions represent this type found in the data below.


Based on the data above, it can be seen that the speaker (DC) uttered the attack to K. The utterances of “Andasebetulnyangertigadengangonkonsep bully ini, kanAndakomengtatordisini” used by DC to K showed that DC produced the attacks on social identity face in which he condescended K as if K did not have any understanding about bullying.

c. Attacks on Equity Rights

Attacks on equity rights is believed that we are entitled to be treated fairly by others. It can be showing by applying the impoliteness strategies; frighten/ threaten hinder or block the other physically or linguistically; challenge the other, and impose on the other (Culpeper: 2003).

The expression of attacks on equity rights can be exemplified in the following excerpt.

(1) FT : Interupsi! Bolehtapisaat break gimana, Pak?

IB : Enakaja lo! Gaada yang dengar dong!

(2) AK : Harusnyayasepertiitu. DC : Lahkenapa?


DC : Haha. BagaimanamencurutOhang?

By the data above, the utterances of “Bolehtapisaat break gimana” in the first data and “Kalaukita break dulu” in the second data can be categorized in types of attack on equity.
rights because the speaker expressed it for purposes to block the other so that the hearer did not get the challenge to speak up. As data 1, IB offered that he wanted to sing a song. In this case, the other hearer (FT) blocked him so that IB did not do it by expressing “Boleh tapisaat break gimana” as if FT gave a permission but in the break time. This case also happened in the data 2 where DC also said “Kalau kita break dulu” which showed that he blocked O when O tried to answer DC’s question to him. Therefore, 2 data above can be categorized in attacks on equity rights.

d. Attacks on Association Rights

Having analyzed the data, there were 16 expression (17.8%) which shows that the speaker attacked on the association rights. Attacks on association rights is believed that we are entitled to associate with the others in accordance with the type of relationship. This type can be showed by applying the impoliteness strategies also, for instance, ignore or snub the other and disassociate from the other. (Culpeper: 2003).

The occurrence of attacks on associate association rights can be seen in the following data.

IB : AndapermahgaskihkeAmerika? Dari tadingomonginAmerika terus!
CL : SemuaAmerikapermahsayadatangi, kecuali Nevada.
DC : Oke, sekarangkitakenotulen, Pak Mamansilahkan.

By the data above, it can be seen that the speaker DC attacked the hearer (CL) by saying “Oke, sekarangkitakenotulen, Pak Mamansilahkan”. It can be categorized in type of attack on association rights because when IB tried to ask CL about his experience in America and in this case CL tried to answer IB’s questions, DC ignored CL’s utterances. This case as if DC did not want to hear the explanation from CL. This fact can be said that DC attacked CL directly by ignoring him. Therefore, it can be categorized in types of attacks on association rights.

4.1.2 The Types of Responses

In this study, there are 4 types of responses found in Indonesia Lawak Klub (ILK). They are no response, accepting the attacks, countering defensively, and countering offensively. These types can be found through the analyzing of the Indonesia Lawak Klub (ILK)’s video. It can be seen in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types of Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Accepting the Attacks</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Countering Defensively</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Countering Offensively</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above described that the types of response which consist of 18 expressions (20 %) for no response, 21 expressions (23.3 %) for accepting the attacks, 39 expressions (43.4 %) for countering defensively, and 12 expressions (13.3 %) for countering offensively. Therefore, the most dominant type of responses to the attacks are accepting the attacks and countering defensively. Meanwhile, the least is countering offensively.

By using this way, this study would give some patterns of responses used by the participant in Indonesia Lawak Klub (ILK) would be summarized in the following.

4.1.3 The Pattern of Responses

Based on the data, it was found out that there were four types of attacks occurred, namely attacks on social identity face, equity rights, association rights and quality face as the most dominant attack (over 43.4 %). Over 16 categories created, there were 16 categories found in the data. They are (1) attacks on quality face – no response, (2) attacks on quality face – accepting response, (3) attacks on quality face – countering defensively, (4) attacks on quality face – countering offensively, (5) attacks on social identity face – no response, (6) attacks on social identity face – accepting response, (7) attacks on social identity face – countering defensively, (8) attacks on social identity face – countering offensively, (9) attacks on equity rights – no response, (10) attacks on equity rights – accepting response, (11) attacks on equity rights – countering defensively, (12) attacks on equity rights – countering offensively, (13) attacks on association rights – no response, (14) attacks on association rights – accepting response, (15) attacks on association rights – countering defensively, and (16) attacks on association rights – countering offensively. The following table would provide the explanation.
of each category found in the debate of Indonesia Lawak Klub (ILK) Programme.

Table 4.3 The explanation of each category of attacks and responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses Attacks</th>
<th>Socio</th>
<th>Quality Face</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Assocation</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(30.4)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting Response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(28.3%)</td>
<td>(13.1)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countering Defensively</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(46.1%)</td>
<td>(34.8)</td>
<td>(41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countering Offensively</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(43.4%)</td>
<td>(25.5)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following part of the paper would discuss in detail the performance of each category in the data based on its dominancy.

(1) Attacks on Quality Face – No Response

After analyzing the data, there were 5 expressions (12.8%) for the pattern of attacks on quality face and no response. Based on the observation of the video recorded, mostly this category happened for several reasons, (1) the hearer seemed to take the attack as something which was part of the script and therefore took no attention to the attack and (2) the hearer didn’t have the chance to encounter any responses since the attack was responded by other speakers. Two these reasons could be seen in this following data.

AK : Bolehsayapakaintukucimukanya.
   Terkaitdengan bully ini…
K : Lo gabisacucimuakadisini. Lo kalomaucucimukada carwash.
TL : Kotorbangetya, Debugitu.
K : Kencengtauraiya!
   Biarturunabunya!
DC : Masak di carwash!
   Andakalomandigabisapakehandunya
   kya? HaruspakeKaneboya?
AK : Bolehsayamelanjujuan? Sebenarnya bully
   inimenyuburkankekerasan..

From the data above, we could see that AK even didn’t have a chance to respond the attack since it was responded by the other speakers even they encountered another attack. AK then proceeded his arguments and simply ignored the attack.

(2) Attacks on Quality Face – Accepting Response

This category is in the third place that the hearers would simply accept any attacks of the speakers and even laughed at them. This category totally represented the entertainment impoliteness that the goal of the attacks was basically to entertain the viewers. The following data would show the situation in the forum.

DC : SayakalomelihatAndaini, kalodariperawakannya,
pastiAndakorban bully ini. GakmungkinkorbanbuleAndaini!
A : Gakmungkin, Pak.

Based on the data, we could see that the hearer agreed to the attack of the host. The other sample could be seen in the following.

DC : … Ini Josh Groban, cuma yang nyanyigrobak.
IB : Haha…

Instead of getting angry or planning any responses, IB just laughed when the host said that he looked like a cart.

(3) Attacks on Quality Face – Countering Defensively

This category occurred 18 times in the forum that the hearer defended his argument by responding defensively, mostly occurred to a specific hearer, CL. It can be seen in the following data that CL created jokes by responding with a defensive counter.

DC : Andamengajarkanhal yang siagaya.
CL : TapiNiakansayaungkapsemuaitu, Bahwasemaitugakadahubunga
   nya.

(4) Attacks on Quality Face – Countering Offensively

On this category, there were 5 occurrences in the data. The following data would show that the hearer didn’t accept that his ability related to the field that he played was questioned and therefore accused the speaker to be unacknowledged about it.

DC : Salam Lemper! Oke, AndadisinsiebagapengamatasMahas
   iswadanSatwa Liar.Iniganyambunya? Mahasiswadansatwa liar!
CL : Inibukangknyambung! Andasaja yang
(5) Attacks on Social Identity Face – No Response
As mentioned above, there were several reasons why the hearer chose not to respond to any of the attacks. The hearer would simply continue the his argument. It can be seen in the following data.

K : Udahdeh, gausahngomong! Segalaanaktetangga lo bawa! Ini lo maunyeritain bully apamaunimbang?
DC : Masa lo gasadar 5 tahunkaloituaktetangga?
K : Kalosehariduaharimasihwajar. 5 tahun! Dimanabijimata lo!
CL : Sebentar. Anaksayalepasdaripengawasansaya 5 tahunitu …

(6) Attacks on Social Identity Face – Accepting Response
This category had the same occurrence with the previous, once in the forum that especially to O, whenever attacked would accept the response and not counter any responses. It can be seen in the following, the host would attack O and O would mimic his acceptance.

DC : Sekarang sayaakan bertanyapada Oha. Ah, tapitidakpenentinglahbertanya pada Ohang.
O : Iya Pak.

(7) Attacks on Social Identity Face – Countering Defensively
This category occurred in the exact number as the previous one that the hearer whenever was being attacked either as quality face above or social identity face would respond defensively as the following data would show.

IB : Andainsudahmembully! Sayagaksukadenganganacarainikalau Babakmembully-bully dia!
DC : Sayatidakmembully Pak!

(8) Attacks on Social Identity Face – Countering Offensively
Mostly this category appeared whenever the host threatened the faces of the panelists over their roles in the forum. As we know that these roles were all scripted and the host seemed to question their knowledge of the roles. The following data would show them.

K : Andamerendahkansaya!
By the utterance, we could see that K didn’t accept the attack and countered offensively by saying that the host had underestimated his knowledge and role in the forum. This kind of situation occurred several times in the forum.

(9) Attacks on Equity Rights – No Response
This category occurred for a small percentage, only 3 times during the forum. Attack on equity rights occurred only to one of the panelists, O. The atmosphere of the forum showed that O was set to be one who was underestimated during the forum. It can be seen in the following excerpt.

DC : Haha. Bagaimanamenenurut Ohang?
O : Menurut saya Pak…
DC : Kalaikutita break dulu.
O : …

(10) Attacks on Equity Rights – Accepting Response
As it is mentioned above, the attacks on equity rights only occurred to O, which was in this situation accepted the attack as shown in this following data.

K : Heh, pikiransumur! Lo gakusahikutnyamur! Inipembicaraansangattinggisekali.
O : Yasayatahu.

(11) Attacks on Equity Rights – Countering Defensively
This category occurred in 5 times during the forum. Based on the observation of the video recorded, mostly this category happened for reason, for instance the hearer seemed to give a contradiction to the attacks. It can be seen in the following example in which IB tried to show his contradiction when FT said “Bolehtapisaat break gimana” and IB responded by saying “Enakaja lo! Gaada yang dengar dong!”.

FT : Interupsi! Bolehtapisaat break gimana, Pak?
IB : Enakaja lo! Gaada yang dengar dong!

(12) Attacks on Equity Rights – Countering Offensively
This category occurred for a small percentage, only 1 time during the forum. Based on the observation of the video recorded, we can see that the speaker tried to attack the hearer by hindering the other. It can be seen in the example below that K tried to block O by saying “Makanya lo gakusahikutnyamur. Lo dudukajadisitu” which showed that O did not intervene in their speaking. The fact, O
responded K by countering defensively by saying “Ha, itu dia. Cabekrittingituadalahsesuatu” which showed O attacked K directly by applying the impoliteness strategies, by condescending, and it involved in the countering defensively responses. The utterances can be seen below.

K : Makanya lo gakusahikutnyampur. Lo dudukajadisitu.
O : Ha, itu dia. Cabekrittingituadalahsesuatu.

(13) Attacks on Association Rights – No Response
This pattern is created because there were 3 times data found in which the speaker attacked on association rights by showing his ignore or snub to the other. Besides that, he also showed his attacking by disassociating from the other. Yet, the hearer did not respond him. This case is caused the hearer did not have any chance to speak up. It can be seen from the utterances below in which DC attacked O by disassociate O’s face by covering it with cloth and this case is supported by IB, but O didnot respond them, he chose to keep silent in responding them, as seen in the following utterances below.

DC : Kamu yang sabar. Dah tutupdululah hang sementaraya (cover the face with cloth).
IB : Yeyyy!
O : ....

(14) Attacks on Association Rights – Accepting Response
This pattern occurred because the speaker attacked on association rights by ignoring or snubbing the other, and disassociating from the other.

K : Eh, kitangomongin bully. Kenapaserabi solo dibahas?
DC : Serabi Solo kebesaran, Pak. As seen in the data, when K said “Eh, kitangomongin bully. Kenapaserabi solo dibahas?” meant disassociate a topic about serabi in their discussion. As we know from the video, it did not be discussed in the forum. And DC accepted the attacks from K.

(15) Attacks on Association Rights – Countering Defensively
The counter strategy was applied to all kinds of potential face damage intential incidental and accidental. In opting to counter a perceived act, the participants might opt for a defensive stance in which defensive strategy was a strategy defended their own face. How one responds could lead to a pairing effect. An attacks on association rights might be met with an impolite defence as a counter, to provide an attacks on association rights-defensive pairing. In this case, besides no response and accept the attacks, the participants in the forum also could try to counter the attacks in responding the attacks. Therefore, attacks on association rights-countering defensively pairings was one of the pattern in responding the attacks. The pattern occurred can be seen in the following excerpt.

K : Eh, lo ngapainbawa-bawa gue?
CL : Lah, terussayabawasiapakalo gabawa-bawakamu?

As seen in the data, K attacked CL by saying “Eh, lo ngapainbawa-bawague?” meant K wanted to disassociate him to the other. Then, CL seek disagreement and showed his contradiction directly when K attacked him. He defended himself directly.

(16) Attacks on Association Rights – Countering Offensively
An impolite offence may be met with an attacks on association rights as a counter, to provide an attacks on association rights-offensive pairings. The Attacks on association rights pairing involve offensive strategies primarily countering face attack with face attack. Therefore, attacks on association rights-countering offensively was the pattern occurred reply to reply continously or finally in that attacks. There were some reasons why the hearer offended the attacks. The first reason was the social or power positions. Most of the participants countered offensively were in the same social or power positions. Secondly, the offensive counter should not end in peace resolution; it could result in a standoff. For the occurrence can be seen below.

DC : Kembali di IL.K. Mengatasimasalahtanpasolus i.SebelumsayabertanyapadaC akLontong, agar supayasemuanymenjaditaring.Cobakitaadasedikittra nsmigrasiya, coba Akbar...


4.2 Discussion
The findings of this study are in line with the study of Abbas on linguistic impoliteness in literary discourse the most dominant attack was on the quality face. In the previous study, such negative aspects of appearance put the novel’s main character, Anne’s ‘quality face’ and her
self-esteem in danger because ‘quality face
is concerned with the value that we effectively
claim for ourselves in terms of such
personal qualities as these, and so is closely
associated with our sense of personal self-
estee'm’ (Spencer-Oatey, 2002: 540). It would
also occur on the show that it seemed easier to
the speakers to attack the appearances of the
other speakers or their abilities in performing
arguments.

However, in this study, the most dominant
response was the category of ‘countering
defensively’ of the hearer. This is contrary to
the previous study, that the analysis has shown
the verbal and non-verbal resources used to
realize a variety of strategies used to
respond with offensive counter as the most
dominant one. It may be due to the function of
impoliteness in these two media are different.
In this study, the function of impoliteness is to
entertain the viewers that even when they
responded offensively, it was not serious
response and it effectively created laugh among
the audience.

V. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 CONCLUSION

Culpeper’s (1996) model of
impoliteness, initially introduced as a parallel
to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of
politeness and later amended in subsequent
publications (Culpeper et al. 2003 and Culpeper
2005), proved useful in classifying the
impoliteness strategies indifferent discourse
types in general. This present study revealed
that in the TV show such as ILK where all
comedians are scripted to be the expertise of
various fields, it was found out that there were
attacks on the speakers’ face related to the
quality, social identity and equity rights. The
comedians in order to create laughter, may
respond the attacks variously starting from not
responding or accepting it, to plan defensive
and offensive counters. This study revealed that
over 16 categories created, the most dominant
category of attack would be addressed to the
qualities of the speakers with no responses
from them. The findings suggested that the
study of impoliteness, which gain less attention
that politeness is interested to be conducted
through further researches especially those
which occurred on TV shows.
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