



Negative Impoliteness in “Ellen DeGeneres” Talk Show: Pragmatic Approach

Wendy¹, Ambalegin²

*¹Pb191210063@upbatam.ac.id,²ambalegin@puterabatam.ac.id

¹*Sastra Inggris, Universitas Putera Batam, Batam, Indonesia*

²*Sastra Inggris, Universitas Putera Batam, Batam, Indonesia*

Received: 2022-10-20 Accepted: 2022-12-31

DOI: 10.24256/ideas.v10i2.3065

Abstract

This research is using pragmatic study to observe the types of negative impoliteness based on the talk show "Ellen DeGeneres" hosted by Ellen DeGeneres. The function of this research was to find out the types of negative impoliteness that occurred in the talk show. Then, the utterances were discovered and collected by taking the theory of Culpeper (2011) to the data source. The object for this research was the negative impoliteness. The data source uttered by both speaker and hearer from the talk show "Ellen DeGeneres". To provide the research aftermath, the research design used was the descriptive qualitative. The method of collecting data technique was using the nonparticipator observation Sugiyono (2010). Why technic of collecting data in this research as follow. Firstly, the researchers watched the interview on the "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show. Secondly, the researchers read the transcript and search the context for analysis. Finally, the researchers found out all the issues related to the impoliteness from the negative politeness in the "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show. The method of analysis the data was categorization proposed by Sugiyono (2010) method was completed by analyzing "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show. There were 20 negative impoliteness utterances uttered by both speaker and hearer in the talk show and the researchers analyzed it all. The types of negative impoliteness uttered by both speaker and hearer were 5 affective, 3 coercive, and 12 entertaining.

Keywords: negative impoliteness; pragmatics; talk show; utterances

Introduction

There are kinds of methods in speech communities that were widely introduced. Along with a lot of politeness but there was also some impoliteness. Impoliteness could be found in any utterances whether spoken or written. Mainly because a person was attacking another face. As the result, causing irrelevant way of negative cases of study.

The researchers of this present study found the issue in talk show from one of the platforms that present utterances. American talk show entitled "The Ellen DeGeneres Show" had the issue of negative politeness. It was found in the utterance. "How was the party, I was not invited". Ellen confirmed that she did not get an invitation from Dakota. As the speaker tried to ask an awkward question to the hearer, below:

Speaker (S): **"How was the party? I was not invited."**

Hearer (H): "Actually, no. That is not the truth Ellen, you were invited." [0:08-0:14]

Speaker asked about a party that the hearer held before but she did not get the invitation. The hearer explained the truth. The hearer's responses were illustrative ways of observing the negative politeness. She responded with a reference to the speaker's question about whether or not she did invite her out. "How was the party?" was the pickup line utterance. Speaker's utterances prompted mocking hearer. Hence, there was research fundamental for this issue.

The previous research of negative politeness theorized by Makasiahe & Suryani (2020) had been done by lots of researchers. Julius & Ambalegin (2021) discussed negative politeness done in the utterances of "The Imitation Game" movie. The discussion following the problem was stated informatively and it provided information as data validation.

Julius & Ambalegin (2021) investigated the use of negative politeness in "The Imitation Game" movie. The data were utterances in the movie which were examined by applying the theory of Makasiahe & Suryani (2020). The results are particularized negative impoliteness was discovered as the most basic type. In addition, negative politeness becomes the most dominant type that could be produced by the characters.

The previous and present research used the theory of Makasiahe & Suryani (2020). The researchers used the theory to classify the types of negative politeness in the data source. The similarities were in the topic because the previous research also use to analyze negative politeness. The differences were in the data source because this present research used the "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show. Therefore, this research aimed at finding out the negative politeness in "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show.

Method

The research is descriptive qualitative research. According to Creswell & Creswell (2018), the meaning of qualitative research is to do a certain and comprehensive understanding of the issue in society. Therefore, the impoliteness

from the negative politeness in the "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show was conducted as the data source. In the collecting data process, this research took the observational method by Sudaryanto (2015). The method of analysis the data was categorization proposed by Sugiyono (2010) method was completed by analyzing "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show. Besides, this research is using nonparticipator technique in that nobody is involved in the data source.

For the research, the researchers analyzed the types of negative impoliteness by the utterances that occurred when the interview was held. The purpose why the qualitative method is applied is because this research was conducted into time lapse and could be easier to get the source by both speaker and hearer utterances. In addition, this study is the function to understand the meaning behind utterances. There are steps for collecting data. Firstly, the researchers watched the interview on the "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show. Secondly, the researchers read the transcript and search the context for analysis. Finally, the researchers found out all issues related to impoliteness from the negative politeness in the "Ellen DeGeneres" talk show.

Results

This research shows that negative impoliteness occurred in the talk show. There were 20 negative impoliteness utterances uttered by both speaker and hearer in the talk show and the researchers analyzed it all. The types of negative impoliteness uttered by both speaker and hearer were affective, coercive, and entertaining. The types of negative impoliteness were 5 affective, 3 coercive, and 12 entertaining. The total negative impoliteness has appeared in table 1.

Table 1 The types of negative impoliteness uttered by both speaker and hearer in Ellen DeGeneres talk show

Types	Utterances	Total
Affective	- "How was the party? I was not invited"	5
	- "Last time I was on the show, last year, you gave me a bunch of [BLEEP] about not inviting you. But I didn't even know you wanted to be invited."	
	- "Ask everybody. Ask Jonathan, your producer. Who says you were?"	
	- "I mean, it could've ruined the whole shoot."	
	- "[BLEEP]"	
Coercive	- "Well, who wouldn't want to be invited to a party?"	3
	- "This time you invited me?"	

- Entertaining
- "I don't think so."
 - "Of course I like you. You knew I liked you." 12
 - "You've been on the show many times, and don't I show like?"
 - "Are you sure?"
 - "Why didn't I go"
 - "I had that thing."
 - "A bunch of funny stuff. She's my favorite comedian. Other than you. Bye."
 - "I was out of town."
 - "She explained it."
 - "She did a whole bit."
 - "What's a lie that you recently told?"
 - "So we don't know if that's true. Maybe he was just saying that."
 - "Yeah, duh."
-

Data 1

The first example is taken from the conversation between Ellen and Dakota during an interview about party invitations.

Ellen: "**How was the party? I was not invited.**"

Dakota: "Actually, no. That is not the truth Ellen, you were invited." [0:08-0:14]

The function of the impoliteness strategy employed by Ellen is **affective impoliteness**. She wants to release his resentment toward Dakota. Since Dakota and Ellen do not get along well, Ellen has a particular interest in attacking Dakota's face. In the example, Ellen attacks Dakota's face by asking her about the party invitation and making Dakota looks bad in front of the viewers.

Data 2

There is an event where the hearer tries to shade the speaker when the speaker complains about the party invitation.

Hearer: "**Last time I was on the show, last year, you gave me a bunch of [BLEEP] about not inviting you. But I didn't even know you wanted to be invited.**"

Speaker: "Well, who wouldn't want to be invited to a party?" [0:16-0:23]

Hearer said that she already participated in her show almost a year ago, but she

did try to defend herself by saying that they speak. Hearer tries hard to shade and degrade the speaker by using **affective impoliteness**.

Data 3

An example of coercive impoliteness is taken from a conversation between Ellen and Dakota. Dakota wants to be nice to Ellen in the interview.

Dakota: "But I didn't even know you wanted to be invited."

Ellen: "**Well, who wouldn't want to be invited to a party?**" [0:21-0:23]

Ellen seems unconcerned with Dakota's offer to redeem herself. Instead, she sarcastically asks Dakota by saying "Well, who wouldn't want to be invited to a party?". Furthermore, she wants to show Dakota that although Dakota is the one who has the problem here, Ellen is the one who can control the whole situation. Thus, Ellen has more authority in this interview. Therefore, **coercive impoliteness** occurred in this event.

Data 4

The time when the speaker could not be degrading or insulted, the hearer added more words to pursue her intention.

Hearer: "Cause I didn't even know you-, Well, I didn't even know you liked me."

Speaker: "**Of course I like you. You knew I liked you.**" [0:24-0:30]

Hearer exactly knew what she did to the speaker. Although the speaker did not respond to any bad outcome and showed as nothing happen. Here, the researcher knows that the speaker is clever and good at manipulating. From this utterance, the speaker used **entertaining impoliteness**.

Data 5

Then the interview continues into the part where the speaker wants everybody to know that she is not an evil person.

Speaker: "**You've been on the show many times, and don't I show like?**"

Hearer: "Yeah, you do." [0:32-0:36]

This time the speaker tries to degrade the hearer by making her feel bad. From the past event, the researcher also obtains new information that the speaker did invite her to her show last year or even many times. The speaker was using **entertaining impoliteness** here.

Data 6

There is the occurrence the hearer was defeated and yet still wants to defend herself.

Hearer: "But I did invite you, and you didn't come."

Speaker: "**This time you invited me?**" [0:38-0:40]

The speaker is asking the hearer again to reassure that whether did she get the party invitation or not. It is truly confusing when there is such a situational condition where nobody knows the actual event. The speaker was using **coercive impoliteness** to defend herself.

Data 7

The event shows that both speaker and the hearer try to defend their argument.

Speaker: "**Are you sure?**"

Hearer: "Yeah" [0:42-0:43]

From these utterances, the researcher found that the speaker tries to make the hearer guilty again. When the live interview occurred, there were so many audiences laughing at what the speaker said toward the hearer. The type of impoliteness is **entertaining impoliteness**.

Data 8

Whenever the hearer made a statement that she did try to send the party invitation to the speaker always interrupted by the speaker.

Hearer: "How do you know-"

Speaker: "**I don't think so.**" [0:43-0:44]

The speaker is taking full control of this kind of interview session. She even did not give any chance to the hearer to speak for herself. Not even the truth, the speaker is trying to diss out the hearer. This type of impoliteness is **coercive impoliteness**.

Data 9

Little did she know there is a chance where the hearer has evidence to prove herself.

Hearer: "**Ask everybody. Ask Jonathan, your producer. Who says you were?**"

Speaker: "OK, I was invited?" [0:45-0:52]

The speaker still could not accept that the fact the hearer did send an invitation to her. The hearer even tries to prove herself by asking everybody and the speaker producer. The purpose is to help and maintain that she did not lie even at once. Again, this utterance is **affective impoliteness**.

Data 10

The issue of entertaining impoliteness can be found in context. Speaker is finally able to exploit the target when the hearer is still in confusion.

Speaker: "**Why didn't I go.**"

Hearer: "I don't know." [0:53-0:55]

Speaker took off record impoliteness strategy as she teases hearer in the show. She was using entertaining impoliteness by making the hearer her object of entertainment. Speaker knew it was annoying yet amusing that she is the only one who understands the real surrounding. Thus, she performs **entertaining impoliteness** even though she is the only one who gets entertained with it.

Data 11

Then the speaker's producer also tries to recall that the speaker was invited but she did not go to the party.

Producer: "You were out of town."

Speaker: "**I had that thing.**" [0:58-0:59]

From the speaker's response that took her a little while to prove the hearer's innocence. She was humiliated and now the speaker still tries to make fun of her. This is **entertaining impoliteness** evidence.

Data 12

After the truth had been broadcasted, they even continue to pursue another topic still about the hearer's party. There was a comedian that also got the invitation.

Speaker: "What did she do?"

Hearer: "**A bunch of funny stuff. She's my favorite comedian. Other than you. Bye.**" [1:20-1:31]

Here, the hearer finally took an opportunity to step forward without missing her chance to shade the speaker. The ability of the hearer could be seen as smooth as a feather. Although the speaker was stunned to speak. The hearer did apply **entertaining impoliteness** and ended with everyone's laughter.

Data 13

Even though the hearer succeeded, not far from the time the speaker immediately redeem herself again by restating that the fact she did introduce the comedian to the show at her birthday party.

Speaker: "Oh, why? No"

Hearer: "**I was out of town.**" [2:01-2:06]

This time, the hearer agreed with the speaker that she knew the comedian by attending her birthday party but it seems like there is a little plot twist about the situation that produced laughter. The hearer also did not attend fully when the birthday party was being held. It ended the hearer was using **entertaining impoliteness**.

Data 14

They were still talking about the performance of the comedian. The fact that the hearer did not attend fully the speaker's birthday party to watch the comedian's performance was asked by the speaker.

Speaker: "Well, how would- why would she do that if you didn't know what she had done?"

Hearer: "**She explained it.**" [2:16-2:19]

The researcher found the footage that the hearer was so done with the speaker's attitude. The speaker could also know what happened to the performance. Instead, she asked the hearer to explain herself. Certainly, this is **entertaining impoliteness**.

Data 15

In the interview also there was a scene where the speaker and hearer both had an agreement.

Speaker: "But that's what she did at the party?"

Hearer: "**She did a whole bit.**" [2:23-2:25]

Although it is uncomfortable expression has been shown on the hearer's face. The answer from the hearer was to prove that she knew about the performance of her favorite comedian being asked by the speaker. However, it turns out that the speaker agreed with her. This applied an **entertaining impoliteness**.

Data 16

Meanwhile, the speaker turns about to talk about the hearer's movie that she played with another actor that got arrested during filming.

Speaker: "**I mean, it could've ruined the whole shoot.**"

Hearer: "It was kind of sad." [3:37-3:41]

The speaker tries to continue her interview with the hearer. By asking how did the movie happen before it was released. The speaker has done a lot of interviews but she still has no idea what could the other hearer feels. This show that the speaker was using intense **affective impoliteness**.

Data 17

The interview also showed the flashback piece clip from the actor's interview. When he was asked by the speaker about the best onscreen kiss.

Actor: "[BLEEP]."

Speaker: "Very important. This is the most important question." [4:50-4:52]

The speaker is good at asking uncomfortable questions. She did think that she owns the interview without asking or collaborating with her hearer at first. All the situation there was very awkward. She did succeed to make him apply **affective impoliteness**.

Data 18

When the speaker continues her interview with the actor. Yet again, she strikes another uncomfortable question.

Speaker: "**What's a lie that you recently told?**"

Actor: "I just told one just now." [5:00-5:02]

The actor is trying to hold his patience in this interview. The speaker thought that was fun and people would like to know about that. But it messed up when the researcher also found the clue when she was trying to mend the rating of her show. This is an **entertaining impoliteness**.

Data 19

Back again now to the interview with the hearer after the clip was stopped.

Speaker: "**So we don't know if that's true. Maybe he was just saying that.**"

Hearer: "Classic." [5:06-5:08]

The speaker tried to make fun of the hearer with those clips. The hearer might not know about the truth from the actor's feelings. It is uncomfortable to say a thing that is being asked immediately on an interview show. Thus, this is **entertaining impoliteness**.

Data 20

The speaker did not end it there, she resumes her interview by asking more uncomfortable questions.

Speaker: "But he said that it was your first kiss, so-"

Hearer: "**Yeah, duh.**" [5:09-5:13]

At the end of the response was an irritating moment that led the speaker toward the hearer to respond. The explanation for the whole kind of situation for them to be displayed in this interview. Hearer could rather feel torn apart or not it depends. This is also **entertaining impoliteness** which brings out the result of the responder.

Discussion

Pragmatics

Yule (2010, p. 127) stated pragmatics is the learning of the speaker about the real meaning and how to deliver it. The speaker must understand to use a lot of shared perspectives and different commitments when they try to communicate. The main function of language is not only for linguistics but also for social interaction purposes. If the speaker cannot bring politeness to social interaction may give bad feedback to their partner for understanding. Social conflict becomes one of the bad outcomes.

“Give me that chair!” Yule (2010)

The main point of the benefit of politeness is that education regarding politeness and impoliteness communication is required to bring positivity as result. To know a more comprehensive way about the polite and impolite, the researcher has to immerse the linguistics itself. Pragmatics is the one field of linguistics that verifies politeness and impoliteness. Learning politeness and impoliteness are important not only for the relation of social life but also for school and family. The issue of impoliteness often happened in the school and family as mentioned above.

Face

According to Yule (2014, p. 132), the face, in pragmatics, is somebody's self-image. This is the temperamental and friendly sense that everybody has and expects the rest to admit and reach their attention. Politeness can be identified as being awakening and knowing a person. If you try to say something that considers intimidating to a person, that means a face-intimidation act.

The condition of the face can be identified as a good social grade as a person easily redeem for themselves by the word others think they have taken while a common contact. The face is a view of self-portray in conditions of accepted social requirements an image that other people might share, while others created a positive side for their profession or religion by creating a positive side for themselves Culpeper (2011).

I walked into my male flatmate's room just before going out.

Matt: “you're not going out in that are you?”

Me: “[**embarrassingly**] yer, shut up you! [**in a joke-like way**].” Culpeper (2011)

Impoliteness

Culpeper (2011) mentioned impoliteness is “the use of strategies designed to attack face and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony”. Culpeper said that something related to impoliteness, “impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates a face-attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2)” Culpeper (2011).

For Culpeper (2011), sarcasm or mock politeness is an extra way for someone else. The face intimidating behaviors have occurred represented dishonest politeness way, and still popped up kind of sarcasm. Sarcasm is the function of only one or more sub-ways which are a hypocrite and tolerate but have a negative main purpose. Based on Culpeper (2011), the difference between sarcasm and mock

politeness made the track of impoliteness when a violation is said indirectly by way of implicative and could be eliminated.

A: "Do you know anything about yo-yos?"

B: **"That's mean." Culpeper (2011)**

Negative impoliteness is one kind of impoliteness. This kind of impoliteness abuses their prospect which is also entertainment sense Culpeper (2011). Combined with all impoliteness types, a common victim is always needed. It is incidental that while impoliteness means abusing people or making them feel uncomfortable, it can also be amusing. It is different from other learning with pragmatics which has a true speaker and hearer, impoliteness can be managed in the same way for both the over-hearing audiences and it can amuse the audience Culpeper (2011).

As stated by (Silva, 2013), three types of impoliteness are coercive impoliteness, affective impoliteness, and entertaining impoliteness. Impoliteness is specifically classified into three different types as follows.

1. Affective impoliteness

Affective impoliteness is the victim shows intensified feelings, like rage, that involve the victim being conscientious leading the speaker to generate negative emotional circumstances Culpeper (2011). There is one kind of common impoliteness humiliation that has been produced by one speaker that deploys affective impoliteness in utterance, also deploying rhetorical extension pattern which is particular of impoliteness occasion.

"You don't even have the **brains**. or the **decency**. as a human **being**." **Culpeper (2011)**

2. Coercive impoliteness

Coercive impoliteness demands a recompositing of respect among the speaker and the victim when the speaker obtains a lot of advantages and even recent advantages strengthen or secure Culpeper (2011). The advantages of applying offensive words are raising dignity and standards could be reaffirmed, the speaker may obtain several statuses in their circle, and the superior circle may have a social aim when having unacceptable emotions even their needs.

Carr: **"Does the researcher understand really good English here?"**

Hadis: "Yes, sir. I'm sorry." **Culpeper (2011)**

3. Entertaining impoliteness

Entertaining impoliteness is to mock the target or take advantage of a target of impoliteness which pursues entertainment in their aftermath Culpeper (2011). As the result of entertaining impoliteness, the person who always makes fun of others is the reason why there are so many impoliteness outcomes. The person who is getting insulted is often shown as the victim of impoliteness.

M: **"(recounting a conversation she'd had) I was talking with H today and she said it was so lucky that her daughter had a rich fiancé whose family would ' pay for the wedding so she wouldn't have to. I said that we'd be okay because you're never going to get married. (laughs)"**

Me: “(annoyed) you’ll see, I’ll get married to A (a friend) when we’re old and crusty.” Culpeper (2011)

Conclusion

Negative impoliteness usually shows up in utterances to raise the tension between the speaker toward the hearer. In other meaning, the speaker tends to use negative impoliteness because of the special purpose in the agenda that occurred in the event. In addition, Ellen DeGeneres's interview can classify 3 types of negative impoliteness affective, coercive, and entertaining impoliteness. The speaker uttered the type of negative impoliteness.

There are a lot of utterances that can be found for the types of negative impoliteness. Indeed, it is common to find types of negative impoliteness in the utterances of both the speaker and the hearer. There are also uttered negative impoliteness because of the way the speaker uses the term negative impoliteness. In the end, there is a lot of useful negative impoliteness feedback in this analysis that can be analyzed by both speaker and hearer to complete further studies or researches about negative impoliteness.

Acknowledgement

The researcher thanks Drs. Gaguk Rudianto, M.Pd. (Universitas Putera Batam) for providing knowledge and suggestions for improvement in this research. The researcher thanks reviewers’ boards for giving assistance and comments on the manuscript. This research was supported by IAIN Palopo in the progress of research publication.

References

- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- 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](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 Language Behaviour Culture*, 1(1), 35–72. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offense*. Cambridge University Press.
- Julius, J., & Ambalegin, A. (2021). Negative politeness strategies used by main character in “The Imitation Game” movie. *IdeBahasa*, 3(2), 81–92. <https://doi.org/10.37296/idebahasa.v3i2.62>
- Makasiahe, A. K., & Suryani, M. S. (2020). Negative politeness strategies in “Big Hero 6” movie. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 8(1), 353–361. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v8i1.1403>
- Silva, D. N. (2013). Review of Culpeper (2011): Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 1(2), 257–266.

Wendy, Gaguk Rudianto

Negative Impoliteness in "Ellen DeGeneres" Talk Show: Pragmatic Approach

<https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.1.2.06sil>

Sudaryanto, S. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Sanata Dharma University Press.

Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Penerbit Alfabeta Bandung.

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. (2014). *The Study of Language* (5th ed.). Cambridge University Press.