Impoliteness Strategies and Impolite Responses to Swearing Utterances at Javanese Slapstick Shows

Rudi Agus Hartanto[1]; Djatmika[2]; F.X. Sawardi[3]

[1]Postgraduate Program, Linguistics, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

[2]Professor, Linguistic Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

[3]Doctoral, Linguistic Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to describe the impoliteness strategies and impolite responses to swearing utterances in the Javanese Cak Percil CS slapstick shows. This type of research is descriptive qualitative research. The research approach used is pragmatic. The data in this study were divided into primary and secondary. Preliminary data is swearing utterances that accommodate the impoliteness strategies and impolite responses, while secondary data is information about speech through context and felicity conditions. The data obtained in this study is the listening method with recording techniques. This study found that impoliteness strategies included bald on records, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. For response found offensive-countering, defensive-countering, accept the face attack, and do not respond.

Keywords: *Slapstick Shows; Swearing Utterances; Impoliteness Strategies; And Impolite Responses*

Introduction

Javanese slapstick shows are a performing art that has grown in the lives of Javanese people. The pattern of this performance is the art of comedy. Flexibility between actors in adapting dramaturgy is also essential in this art. These things have a fundamental role in the intention of entertaining the public. This art is often present at weddings, national holidays, and other important days.

As a folk art, Javanese slapstick production is also very close to people's lives. Cak Percil CS, a bustling group holding performances, is one of the representations. Unsurprisingly, the flexible patterns sometimes present swearing utterances on stage. This has become inherent in the group.

Swearing utterances have a negative connotation in the process of its meaning. Timothy (1999), in the book *Why We Curse*, explains the historical factor that cursing or insulting is a psychological aspect of humans when facing a situation. In research entitled *The Pragmatics of Swearing*, Timothy bersama

Janschewitz (2008) deepened the explanation of pragmatic swearing utterances. This research also reveals that swearing is part of language impoliteness.

Winasih (2010) explained that swearing is an expression of someone who describes displeasure or reactions that arise to something—utterances—received by interlocutors so that it manifests into emotions that represent certain feelings. Wijana and Rohmadi (2018) explained that swearing words display a speaker's feelings for interlocutors. According to Djatmika (2016), the preference for swearing utterances is classified into ten types.

Referring to this, it can be interpreted that swearing utterances use impolite strategies in practice. Culpeper (2005) explains that impoliteness is a communication strategy designed to attack the face of the interlocutors; this is related to the creation of social conflict or disharmony in societal conditions. Furthermore, Culpeper (2010) reiterates the impoliteness strategy in the context of deliberately attacking the interlocutor personally. Then, there is an attack on someone's knowledge by directly threatening their face.

Culpeper (2011) explains that several factors result in the emergence of impoliteness strategies. This is due to one of the reasons for the emotional and personal closeness of a speaker and speech partner. Therefore, it can be understood that language impoliteness strategies are influenced by the presence of power and the desire to dominate a speaker over a speech partner (Culpeper, 2014).

Meanwhile, in its application, apart from how the swearing utterances strategy is used, another thing that happens is the interlocutor's efforts in responding to the swearing utterances that is received. The speech partner has two choices in dealing with this condition: responding back or not doing anything. Furthermore, the forms of response to impoliteness strategies were also explained by Culpeper.

Actions that attack the speaker in the face will certainly get a response. The response to the strategy used by the speaker is likely to be very open and accessible. The interlocutors can accept or face the attack (Culpeper et al., 2003). The choice of response that the interlocutors have is a subjective will.

Hanif et al. (2021) researched illocutors responses to language impoliteness in podcasts. Research findings reveal three types of responses from interlocutors when faced with linguistic impoliteness. There are several representative variations in each response category. The essential elements of differentiation are primarily related to variation. Saffah (2020) researched swear words in films using a pragmatic approach. The research findings show five pragmatic functions in swearing utterances: descriptive, idiomatic, violent, empathetic, and cathartic. Meanwhile, swearing is a speech act as part of a language impolite strategy. The swear words used are sexual activities and taboo words.

Culpeper's (1996) explanation of the impoliteness strategies used in this research include bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock impoliteness, and withhold politeness. Meanwhile, for the interlocutor's response, this research uses the opinion of Culpeper et al. (2003), which includes offensive-countering, defensive-countering, accepting the face attack, and not responding. These two theories will be used to answer the problems in this research, namely impoliteness strategies and interlocutor responses.

Methods

This research is a type of qualitative research that is descriptive. According to Moleong (2010), qualitative research is a research procedure that aims to know a cultural phenomenon. Descriptive models are used to describe data in the form of sentences or narratives. The data collection technique in this research uses observation and close techniques. This technique used because the form of data is a lingual unit in the form of swearing utterances in the Javanese slapstick Cak Percil CS. The listening method

used to observe language that reflects swearing utterances. Meanwhile, the note-taking technique used to record swearing utterances that accommodate impoliteness strategies and the response of the illocutors

The data source in this research is oral. Meanwhile, the data source is speech in the video of the Javanese slapstick performance, Cak Percil CS. Meanwhile, the data in this research are swearing utterances—words, phrases, or sentences—which accommodate impoliteness strategies and illocutors responses based on the context and felicity conditions found in the Javanese slapstick video Cak Percil CS. Data was taken from four videos uploaded to the New Budaya Jawa YouTube channel titled *Cak Percil Cs Terbaru bersama artis korea gak kathokan, Percil Cs Terbaru! cak percil gak kuat di tumpaki mbak elis, Percil Cs Terbaru !! Petuk penyayi merangsang garai kerih !!,* dan *Percil & Shepin Misa terbaru !! Gak kuat nyawang sing MENTHUL – MENTHUL.*

Results and Discussion

The following are the results of the analysis of impoliteness strategies and impolite responses to the four videos. Each part is explained in detail with reference to the context that occurs in the performance and the felicity conditions in the speech. That way, it produces concrete analysis.

Impoliteness Strategies

The impoliteness strategy is a communication strategy designed to attack the face of the interlocutor, this is related to the creation of social conflict or disharmony in social conditions. The following is an analysis table of the impoliteness strategy and the impolite response.

Table 1. Recapitulate of Impoliteness Strategies

No.	Video Title	Impoliteness Strategies	Total
1.	Cak Percil Cs Terbaru bersama artis korea gak kathokan	Bald on records	24
		Snub the others	8
		Dissasociate from the other	3
		Use inappropriate identity markers	5
		Seek disagreement	8
		Scorn	3
		Frighten	2
		Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect	-
2.	Percil Cs Terbaru !! cak percil gak kuat di tumpaki mbak elis	Bald on records	20
		Snub the others	3
		Dissasociate from the other	1
		Use inappropriate identity markers	-
		Seek disagreement	5
		Scorn	4
		Frighten	1
		Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect	2
3.	Percil Cs Terbaru !! Petuk penyayi merangsang garai kerih !!	Bald on records	14
		Snub the others	10
		Dissasociate from the other	3
		Use inappropriate identity markers	-
		Seek disagreement	6
		Scorn	1

		Frighten	-
		Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect	3
4.	Percil & Shepin Misa terbaru !! Gak kuat nyawang sing MENTHUL - MENTHUL	Bald on records	9
		Snub the others	7
		Dissasociate from the other	5
		Use inappropriate identity markers	-
		Seek disagreement	3
		Scorn	2
		Frighten	-
		Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect	-

Bald on Records

Data 1.

Konteks:	This incident occurred when Percil and Kuntet wanted to invite one of the singers who was sitting behind the gamelan players to sing. However, the two of them argued when choosing which singer to invite.
Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Percil notices that Kuntet is showing a confused gesture.
	b. Preparation Conditions: Percil harasses Kuntet from behind.
	c. Sincerity Condition: Percil shows astonishment while cornering Kuntet.
	d. Essential condition: Percil succeeded in cornering Kuntet, with a gesture of hitting Kuntet on the head and cursing him.

Kuntet:	Coba panggil satu ya.
Percil:	Ya satu aja... Oke siap.
Kuntet:	(Kuntet bersiul memanggil sindhen—penyanyi—dari belakang panggung)
Percil:	*Iki åpå? Pêkok! (Percil memukul kepala Kuntet). Penyanyi mbok padhakné jaranan tå, Lé?!*
Kuntet:	O, nggak olèh yå?
Percil:	Ngawur!
	26/VCP1/BOR

In example data 1 (26/VCP1/BOR) the speaker shows a bald on record strategy, namely Percil attacks Kuntet with swearing utterances. In this incident, it appears that the speaker has power over his speech partner. The closeness between the two of them that has developed as Javanese slapstick artists is very palpable, it can be seen how the interlocutors seems to immediately respond to the speaker with questions. The emergence of the strategy used by the speaker also creates a surprise effect which creates humor for the audience. The findings rely on Percil's speech: *Iki åpå? Pêkok! (Percil memukul kepala Kuntet). Penyanyi mbok padhakné jaranan tå, Lé?!* Marking Percil's power in showing bald on records.

Positive Impoliteness

Snub the Others

Data 2

Konteks:	The incident in this story occurred when Hengky went up on stage and Kuntet complimented him on his appearance. However, Percil actually responded to Kuntet's flattery by insulting Hengky's appearance.

Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Percil does not agree with Kuntet's praise of Hengky.
	b. Preparation Condition: Percil immediately responded to Kuntet's flattery.
	c. Sincerity Condition: Percil corrects Kuntet's flattery by insulting Hengky.
	d. Essential condition: Hengky responded as if agreeing with Percil's statement.

Kuntet:	Ini sindhèn....
	Ini sindhèn..
	Kok cantik sekali...Aduh...
Percil:	***Ini bukan sindhèn, Kuntet...***
	Ini penyanyi...
	Tapi asli ba...nci...
Hengky:	Aku banci, Cak Percil.
	Tapi aku nduwé pêl...
Percil:	Uwis!
Hengky:	Pelangi-pelangi, Cak Percil.
	76/VCP2/MG

Based on data 2 (76/VCP2/MG), it was found that the signifier of awearing utterances was a profession with a negative meaning, namely *banci*. Meanwhile, the strategy that thickens the speech is the sub-strategy of positive impoliteness snub the others. The emergence of this strategy was revealed by Percil in response to Kuntet's statement which stated that Hengky was a beautiful singer. Percil then addressed the snub the others strategy to Hengky, saying that the man who played the role of singer was dressed like a woman. Disacceptance expressed in small ways through the positive impoliteness sub-strategy positive snub the others appears as an odd view of the unusualness seen by the speaker.

Disassociate from the Other

Data 3

Konteks:	This story incident occurred when Hengky was singing, but Percil cut it off because he felt there was something wrong with the lyrics Hengky was singing. Percil asked Kuntet where Kuntet's mistake was.
Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Percil stopped Hengky who was singing because he felt there was something wrong with the lyrics being sung.
	b. Preparation Conditions: Percil asks to stop while checking with Hengky whether there is anything wrong with what he heard.
	c. Sincerity Condition: Hengky's answer does not answer Percil's curiosity. Percil denied Hengky's explanation because the Balinese language used was not correct.
	d. Essential condition: After Percil denied Hengky's explanation with Kuntet's support. Hengky was immediately unable to answer the conversation.

Hengky:	Liu munyi ngobral janji....
Percil+Kuntet:	Wawa-wewe-wawa-wewe.
Hengky:	Jêngkang-jêngking mambu tai....
Percil:	Hop sik. Hop sik. Aku péngin wêruh. Ning kupingku kåyå ènèk tai-tainé ngono.
Hengky:	Bali og, Mas. Bali.
Percil:	Tak warahi nèk arêp Bali. Aku ki wong étan.
Hengky:	Liu munyi ngobral janji....
Percil+Kuntet:	Wawa-wewe-wawa-wewe.

Hengky:	Jêngkang-jêngking mambu tai....
Percil:	***Iki lho, goblog! Jêngkang-jêngking bahasa Bali åpå ènèk tå, Tet?***
Kuntet:	Ora ènèk.
Hengky:	(Terdiam)
Kuntet:	Liu itu kamu. Beli itu meli.
	44/VCP1/MY

Based on data 3 (44/VCP1/MY) it can be seen that Percil expressed swearing utterances through *Iki lho, goblog!*. Meanwhile, the positive impoliteness sub-strategy expression Disassociate from the other is conveyed after the swearing utterance through *Jêngkang-jêngking bahasa Bali åpå ènèk tå, Tet?* This strategy emerged after Hengky sang but composed lyrics that did not match the original lyrics. Percil then cut the song they were singing together to deny the lyrics Hengky had composed. The Disassociate from the other strategy took the form of a question submitted to Kuntet. Hengky defended himself that the term used in Balinese was actually not correct.

Use Inappropriate Identity Markers

Data 4

Konteks:	This story event occurred when Percil and Kuntet were trying out their voices before singing another song. At this moment, Kuntet plays Percil because it raises the tone by two octaves. However, Percil protested to Kuntet because he felt that if his singing was cut off in the middle of the song, he would not be worthy of receiving royalties.
Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Kuntet suppresses Percil by raising the octave.
	b. Preparation Condition: Kuntet realizes that Percil will protest against him because his voice is not strong.
	c. Sincerity Condition: After Kuntet forced Percil, Percil actually mentioned something other than what Kuntet said.
	d. Essential condition: Percil mentions royalties if he follows Kuntet to test the sound. It is not appropriate if it is cut in the middle of the song because it is related to the royalties that will be received.

Kuntet:	Coba oktafnya tambah langsung dua. (Kuntet memerintahkan grup campursari untuk menaikkan tinggi nada). Berarti kuat ya? Tambah tinggi tambah kuat?
Percil:	Aku mung sitoki mau munggahé
Kuntet:	Lho katanya kuat, nek dipêdhot-pêdhot.
Percil:	***Yå kuwat, Pak. Ora kåyå awakmu pêdhot ning tengah dalan yå isin no aku. Jaran, jaran! Ngono kuwi nèk amèh nåmpå amplop ki lho wêdi. Goblogmu!***
Kuntet:	Iyå, yå...
Percil:	Åjå dipadhaknå... ngono kuwi lho, Pak!
Kuntet:	Mandhêg, yå?
Percil:	Iyå, mandhêg sik ora langsung, Pak! Ndhak dindhèkné manèh tå?
	25/VCP1/MYG

In data 4 (25/VCP1/MYG) it can be seen that swearing utterances is marked by occurrence *jaran, jaran!* and *goblogmu!* Overall, the swearing utterances is embedded in the positive impoliteness sub-strategy Use inappropriate identity markers: *Yå kuwat, Pak. Ora kåyå awakmu pêdhot ning tengah dalan yå isin no aku. Jaran, jaran! Ngono kuwi nèk amèh nåmpå amplop ki lho wêdi. Goblogmu!* In this speech, Percil alludes to things outside the speech situation which he intends to respond to Kuntet's expression. The presence of the word envelope was Percil's strategy to offend Kuntet, where their conversation occurred while singing a song. Percil reminded Kuntet that this would affect the royalties they received.

Seek Disagreement

Data 5

Konteks:	This incident occurred when Hengky had just entered the stage area. Hengky was immediately greeted by Percil with a hug. During this hug, Percil actually argued with Hengky, who directed the conversation to sensual matters.
Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Percil hugs Hengky.
	b. Preparation Conditions: Percil encounters strangeness when Hengky leads to sensual discussion.
	c. Sincerity Condition: Percil responds with another argument until Hengky diverts to another topic.
	d. Essential condition: Hengky diverts to another topic after receiving an attack from Percil.
Hengky:	Kurang ngisor thithik, Mas...
Percil:	Horok!
Hengky:	Lha awakmu nggrêmêt lho, Mas.
Percil:	Lha kowé tak omongi lho.
Hengky:	Lha mbok êngko lak yå iså tå, Mas.
Percil:	***Bathang wé kok kåyå ngono!***
Hengky:	Aku ki karo warga masyarakat kéné ki wis kênal, Mas.
Percil:	Namanya siapa?
Hengky:	Månggå ditêpangakên nami kulå Lithyana, Mas.
	77/VCP2/BSBD

Based on data 5 (77/VCP2/BSBD) it can be seen that the swearing utterances found was *bathang.* The swearing utterances also accommodates the positive impoliteness sub-strategy seek disagreement: *Bathang wé kok kåyå ngono!* This statement emerged because Percil expressed his annoyance towards Hengky - who had just entered the stage area - who Percil hugged as a form of welcome. However, Hengky actually responded to this with expressions that had a sensual tone. Percil, who was surprised, immediately argued with Hengky, as a form of annoyance with his partner.

Negative Impoliteness

Scorn

Data 6

Konteks:	This speech event occurred in a conversation between Percil and Hengky. The two of them were discussing the person who invited them. However, Hengky continued to provoke Percil

into getting emotional. The provocation launched succeeded in making Percil show his emotions by berating Hengky.

Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Hengky provokes Percil regarding how to invite them by offending the person who is inviting them.
	b. Preparation Conditions: Hengky continues to provoke Percil.
	c. Sincerity Condition: Percil scolds Hengky because inviting people cannot be compared to people who are fishing.
	d. Essential condition: Hengky continues to provoke Percil even though he has received insults directed at him.

Hengky:	Yå ngéné iki lho, Cak Percil, aku sênêng. Kok ora pas?
Percil+Kuntet:	(Menghindari Hengky)
Percil:	***Matané! Matané! Wong kok iså disêndhal, wong koclok!!***
Hengky:	Bêngi iki, Pak Sugiono nyuwun cêritå. Cerita yang luar biasa. Judule: Prapatan Anak Tiri.
Percil:	Ratapan! Kok prapatan. Wong kok cêritå åpå, rumangsaku! Iki ki awakmu sing pênting nêmbang sing apik ki wis cukup.
Hengky:	Iyå, Mas.
	82/VCP2/MCC

In data 6 (82/VCP2/MCC) swearing utterances is accommodated through diction *matane!* and *wong koclok!* Meanwhile, Scorn's negative impoliteness sub-strategy is accommodated in the expression *Matané! Matané! Wong kok iså disêndhal, wong koclok!!* It can be seen in this expression that Percil berated Hengky. This expression occurred when the two of them wanted to create a drama story. However, Hengky actually proposed a theme that was difficult for Percil to imagine. Hengky's position as a supporting actor in the show is also the point where the insulting strategy emerges. Percil's power as the main actor greatly influenced the emergence of this strategy. Indicates that the interlocutor is very cornered and cannot do anything. In this way, the emergence of the negative impoliteness sub-strategy of scorn is influenced by the speaker's power over his speech partner.

Frighten

Data 7

(7)	Konteks:	This speech incident occurred when Percil asked Hengky to sing, but Hengky reasoned that he couldn't if he didn't have anyone to accompany him.
	Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Percil asks Hengky to sing.
		b. Preparation Conditions: Hengky obeys Percil's orders but with conditions.
		c. Sincerity Condition: Stimulating emotions by scaring Hengky when he can't is going to be a problem.
		d. Essential condition: Hengky is willing to follow Percil's request.

Kuntet:	***Kowé nèk ora iså tak bacok!***
Hengky:	Ora, Mas. Aku sing nyanyi, awakmu wong loro sing backing vokal.
Percil:	Siap-siap.
Hengky:	Nadhané, Mas.
Percil:	Iki lho keyboard-é ning kéné. Kuwi kêtipung ora ènèk nadhané.
Hengky:	Ngéné yå: ne-ne-ne-ne-ne Kare Bebek wek-wek-wek.
	42/VCP1/MNT

In data 7 (42/VCP1/MNT) it can be seen that swearing utterances is accommodated in expressions *tak bacok!* Meanwhile, the sub-strategy of negative impoliteness frighten can be seen in the expression *Kowé nèk ora iså tak bacok!* Kuntet conveyed this story to Hengky because the song Hengky sang did not match the lyrics. Swearing with a threatening tone is accommodated in the form of scaring the speaker. It can be seen that the interlocutor shows himself under pressure. The pressure that emerged as a result of this frighten strategy indicated that Kuntet's power was greater than Hengky's.

Explicitly Associate the Other with a Negative Aspect

Data 8

Konteks:	This speech incident occurred when Percil and Kuntet were discussing whether each of them could sing a song well. Even so, the conversation between the two of them actually led to each mentioning the names of other people who were not on stage.
Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Kuntet asked Percil whether his speech partner was able to sing the song in question. b. Preparation Conditions: Kuntet continues to urge Percil by asking whether Percil is capable. c. Sincerity Condition: Kuntet responds to Percil mentioning someone else's name. d. Essential condition: Kuntet answered Percil's statement emotionally and sentimentally in relation to the discussion between the two.

Kuntet:	Åpå?
Percil:	Iså åpå ora?
Kuntet:	Åpå?
Percil:	Ngêntèni awakmu!... héé! Jênêngmu Harsono tå?
Kuntet:	***Matané Mitro kuwi lho... Sésuk sêpuré léwat kéné tak bom! Jangkrikané! Arèk kuwi sênêngané moto, tapi ora moto uwong utåwå awaké dhéwé. Motoni bokongé wong wédok-wédok kuwi.***
Percil:	Kancamu akèh ning kéné, Tet?
Kuntet:	Akeh.
Percil:	Yå ngêrti kancamu nèk bojomu mrongos?!
Kuntet:	... Êruh. 66/VCP2/MOLB

Based on data 8 (66/VCP2/MOLB) it can be seen that swearing utterances is accommodated through words *jangkrikane.* Meanwhile, the negative impoliteness sub-strategy Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect is accommodated through the expression Kuntet: *Matané Mitro kuwi lho... Sésuk sêpuré léwat kéné tak bom! Jangkrikané! Arèk kuwi sênêngané moto, tapi ora moto uwong utåwå awaké dhéwé. Motoni bokongé wong wédok-wédok kuwi.* Thanks to this expression it is known that the name *Mitro* called a bad name. This was linked to the activities of a man who liked to photograph women's buttocks. The activity mentioned by the speaker is a bad activity, because photographing a woman's buttocks is an act that violates the norms of decency where this part of the body is a woman's private domain. Percil also mentioned names *Harsono,* but the intended context is not very clear as to where it is directed. Even so, Percil's statement actually received a very strong response from Kuntet. The other person's name sounded so bad.

Impolite responses

The following is an analytical presentation of the four videos analyzed regarding the impolite responses to the impolite strategy of swearing in the Javanese slapstick performance Cak Percil CS. As for each video, variations in the responses of the interlocutors were found which were based on the opinion of Culpeper et al. (2003).

Table 2. Recapitulate of Impolite responses

No.	Video Title	Impolite responses	Total
	Cak Percil Cs Terbaru bersama artis korea gak kathokan	Offensive-countering	13
		Deffensive-countering	6
		Accept the face attack	22
		Do not respond	12
	Percil Cs Terbaru !! cak percil gak kuat di tumpaki mbak elis	Offensive-countering	5
		Deffensive-countering	7
		Accept the face attack	19
		Do not respond	5
	Percil Cs Terbaru !! Petuk penyayi merangsang garai kerih !!	Offensive-countering	4
		Deffensive-countering	11
		Accept the face attack	13
		Do not respond	9
	Percil & Shepin Misa terbaru !! Gak kuat nyawang sing MENTHUL – MENTHUL	Offensive-countering	4
		Deffensive-countering	1
		Accept the face attack	16
		Do not respond	5

Offensive-Countering

Data 9

Konteks:	The incident in this story occurred when Percil and Kuntet were about to sing the latest song. Both of them did not agree on the song they wanted to sing. Percil commented on Kuntet's behavior. On the other hand, Kuntet explained that the songs Percil sang were not like those sung by other singers.
Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Percil and Kuntet want to sing a song.
	b. Preparation Conditions: Percil proposes a song that is currently popular on social media.
	c. Sincerity Condition: Percil sings the song, but Kuntet actually climbs onto the table.
	d. Essential condition: Kuntet responds by saying that the song Percil sings is wrong.
Percil:	Ini lagu yang terkini. Lagu yang biasa. Pada akhir-akhir ini sering dinyanyikan adik kami yang ada di Banyuwangi, yakni Farel. Iya, Pak Tet?
Kuntet:	Iya.
Percil:	Coba, Pak Tet....
	Mangku Purel.... (Kuntet dan penonton terkejut)

Ayo coba, Pak Tet...
Kuntet: Ning ndhuwur méjå.
Percil: **Goblog! Yå ora ngono, Pak. Kuwi ning Jepang sing ning ndhuwur méjå. Rumangsaku kok.**
Kuntet: *Farel ki lho ora tau nembang Mangku Purel. Ngéné iki lho...*
               11/VCP1/OV-CO

Based on data 9 (11/VCP1/OV-CO), the speaker, in this case Percil, uses the negative impoliteness sub-strategy snub the others through the expression *Goblog! Ya tidak begitu, Pak. Itu di Jepang yang di atas meja. Perasaan kok.* Through this expression, it can be seen that Percil is trying to show his power over Kuntet because he is considered not to know how to express Mangku Purel in practice. However, Kuntet responded with small expressions using offensive-countering through expressions *Farel ini tidak pernah menyanyikan Mangku Purel, Seperti ini lho.* Through this expression, Kuntet counterattacked that the song Percil was actually singing was not the same as that sung by the singer - Farel. In this case, Kuntet counterattacked Percil with facts that were actually not as accurate as Percil's statement.

Deffensive-Countering

Data 10

Konteks: This story incident occurred when Percil and Kuntet were talking about fish. The two of them gave each other guesses until each showed emotional feelings.

Felicity   a. Proportional Condition: Percil and Kuntet play guessing games
Conditions: about fish.
                b. Preparation Condition: Percil suspects that Kuntet's answer will be off the mark.
                c. Sincerity Condition: Percil shows his disapproval of Kuntet's answer.
                d. Essential condition: Kuntet says that he knows all types of fish by heart.

Percil: Åpå?
Kuntet: Iwak.
Percil: Kok iså iwak?
Kuntet: Sebab kasuré têlês. (Lalu memukul Percil dengan botol)
Percil: **Dhiamput! Kalah sak iwak aku. Berarti iwak apal kowé?**
Kuntet: *Apal no... Aku. Takonnå iwak åpå?*
Percil: Kowé iwak åpå waé êruh?
Kuntet: Ha?! Êruh!
Percil: Iwak sing gampang nulung ki åpå jênêngé?
Kuntet: Hè?
               56/VCP2/DV-CO

Based on data 10 (56/VCP2/DV-CO) it can be seen that Percil as a speaker uses the bald on records strategy through expressions *Dhiamput! Kalah sak iwak aku. Berarti iwak apal kowé?* This strategy received a defensive-countering response from Kuntet to respond to Percil's question by defending himself that he knew everything related to fish through the expression *Apal no... Aku. Takonnå iwak åpå?* Also, the presence of Kuntet's response also marks the relationship of power and distance that is built with Percil as a stage partner. The self-defense that is presented negates that the game pattern that is created is a field where the Kuntet is aware of the momentum in forming a response, so that the emergence of a defensive-countering response negates the Kuntet's awareness.

Accept the face Attack

Data 11

Konteks:	This story incident occurred when Percil and Kuntet were playing a guessing game about fish. However, Percil did not accept it because he felt that Kuntet's answer or guess was not relevant to the theme, namely fish.
Felicity Conditions:	a. Proportional Condition: Percil and Kuntet are giving fish-themed guesses.
	b. Preparation Conditions: Percil said that the guess given by Kuntet was not a fish.
	c. Sincerity Condition: Percil conveys the inaccuracy.
	d. Essential condition: Kuntet did not answer explicitly what Percil meant.
Kuntet:	Saiki: plung-plung...
Percil:	**Kuwi dudu iwak, Tet. Ora usah didêlok, kuwi mbokmu ngêndhog kétoké. Piyé tå iki? Bocah thik goblog éram tå iki.**
Kuntet:	*Hêêm...*
Percil:	Ora sah ngomongné iwak. Lha awakmu ora mudhêng iwak ngomongné iwak.
Kuntet:	Lha kowé kuwi!
Percil:	Iki ngko kabèh sing nonton olèh doorprize såkå Pak Sugiono. 62/VCP2/MSM

Based on data 11 (62/VCP2/MSM) it can be seen that Percil as a speaker uses the bald on records strategy through expressions *Kuwi dudu iwak, Tet. Ora usah didêlok, kuwi mbokmu ngêndhog kétoké. Piyé tå iki? Bocah thik goblog éram tå iki.* Even though it concerns family, Kuntet as a speech partner actually responds to facial attacks through expressions *Hêêm...* In this speech incident, Kuntet's response was an expression of annoyance towards Percil's expression. He confirmed that Percil said that the game of guessing about fish led to other problems. The figure of Kuntet's mother becomes Percil's material in attacking Kuntet through diction *mbokmu.* The justification given by Kuntet actually gives more power to the speaker, namely Percil. On this basis, the accept the face response to this speech event provides the speaker with increasingly free space to attack the speaker's partner.

Do Not Respond

Data 12

Konteks:	Peristiwa tutur ini terjadi ketika Percil dan Kuntet sedang membahas mengenai penampilan penonton. Kuntet memermainkan pakaian yang ia kenakan selayaknya penonton yang dibahas.
Felicity Conditions:	a. Kondisi Proporsional: Percil dan Kuntet membahas mengenai penonton yang berada di depan mereka.
	b. Kondisi Persiapan: Percil menunjuk perempuan yang sedang menonton mereka.
	c. Kondisi Ketulusan: Percil menjawab reaksi Kuntet yang melempar topi.
	d. Essential condition: Kuntet tidak menjawab Percil dengan jelas. Ia justru bergumam yang tidak bisa ditangkap maksudnya.
Percil:	Ngénéiki lho nduwé bojo, Tet. Jan tom-tomên aku ngénéiki.
Kuntet:	Cil! (Melempar topi)
Percil:	Åpå?

Kuntet: Pancèn luar biyasa.
Percil: **Alah apé mbok jikuk mêsthi. Bathang èg. Kåyå bathang kowé kuwi suwé-suwé rumangsaku.**
Kuntet: ***Waé-aa-ee-aa (Berbicara tidak jelas)***
Percil: Kéné-kéné...
Kuntet: (memosisikan diri di samping Percil)
Percil: Kowé åjå ngisin-ngisini grup. (Percil mencubit hidung Kuntet)
Kuntet: Mas, sadar diri dong.
             28/VCP1/DNR

Based on data 12 (28/VCP1/DNR) Percil as a speaker uses the direct impoliteness strategy bald on records in conveying expressions *Alah apé mbok jikuk mêsthi. Bathang èg. Kåyå bathang kowé kuwi suwé-suwé rumangsaku.* This expression was addressed by Percil to Kuntet. However, Kuntet actually gave a do not respond response to Percil's statement because he only spoke unclearly *Waé-aa-ee-aa* Even though in the next dialogue the interlocutor continued to receive attacks from the speaker, Kuntet still did not provide a meaningful response to the interlocutor regarding the topic of the speech at hand. Therefore, the position of the speech partner in this speech event clearly does not accommodate the speaker's response space.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis above, the language impoliteness strategy using the bald-on-records strategy is the most dominant. It is caused by the speaker intending to attack the speaker's face with a fast movement. In these conditions, the speaker places his power in influencing impoliteness strategies. The positive impoliteness sub-strategy also occupies the same position as bald on records. The use of swearing utterances in the positive sub-strategy emphasizes oneself by using the power of the speaker, who feels powerful and without distance from the speaker, so that an attack occurs, which has the potential to attack the face of the interlocutor.

Meanwhile, negative impoliteness sub-strategies were also found. The speaker tries to attack something close to the speaker through a negative sub-strategy. With the power of the interlocutor, through this strategy, the tendency is that the speaker attempts to turn off the interlocutor or increase the speaker's emotional tension so that he can attack back. The influence of power in the emergence of this impolite strategy is significant in shaping the strategy's success, giving rise to a trapping situation as a building block for the dramaturgy of the performance.

It was found that the accept the face attack response was the most dominant for impolite responses. In this condition, the impoliteness strategy has succeeded in breaking the interlocutor as a building for humor. Furthermore, the do not respond response can be seen as a form of defending the speaker's face by ignoring the topic brought up by the speaker. Next is offensive-countering; this response describes the speaker trying to attack the speaker in self-defense by attacking the speaker. This self-defense negates that the interlocutor has power over the interlocutor, which illustrates the reluctance to lose. Lastly is defensive-countering; this response uses the speaker's topic to attack the speaker back. As a form of self-defense, the speaker tries to defend his face from the speaker's attacks.

References

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *25*(3), 349–367. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3.

Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *1*(I), 35–72.

Culpeper, J. (2010). Politeness and impoliteness in interaction. *Interpersonal Pragmatics*, *6*, 101.

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impolitenes*. Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J. (2014). *Language and Characterisation: People in Plays and Other Text*. Routledge. http://journal.um-surabaya.ac.id/index.php/JKM/article/view/2203.

Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(10–11), 1545–1579. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2.

Djatmika. (2016). *Mengenal Pragmatik Yuk!?* Pustaka Pelajar.

Hanif, A., Purnanto, D., & Nugroho, M. (2021). Variations of impolite responses in YouTube Podcast videos. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(4), 1695–1715. https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.124.

Moleong, L. J. (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Saffah, M. D. (2020). Swearing in The Wolf of Wall Street : A Pragmatic Study. *Education and Linguistics Research*, *6*(2), 122–138. https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v6i2.18037.

Timothy, J. (1999). Why We Curse. In *Why We Curse*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.91

Timothy, J., & Janschewitz, K. (2008). The pragmatics of swearing. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *4*(2), 267–288. https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2008.013.

Wijana, I. D. P., & Rohmadi, M. (2018). *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik: Kajian Teori dan Analisis*. Yuma Pustaka.

Winasih,T.(2010). *Pisuhan dalam "Basa Suroboyoan" Kajian Sosiolinguistik*. Universitas Sebelas Maret.