Impoliteness in Jeremy Clarkson's humor in the tv series *Top Gear*

Elkholy[1]; Nizam Ahsani[2]
English Department, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia
English Literature Department, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia

Corresponding author: nizam.ahsani@pbi.uad.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to observe impoliteness strategies employed by Jeremy Clarkson in his humor in the TV Series Top Gear with the intention to unveil which strategy he utilized most and elucidate the reason upon the most and least occurring impoliteness strategies. The present research utilizes Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness super strategies as the main framework to identify, analyze, and elaborate the research data. Other theories related to impoliteness such as face-threatening act and politeness was also utilized to assist the analysis process. The result of the research revealed that negative impoliteness strategy was the most commonly used strategy through which Jeremy Clarkson delivers his humor. Contrary to the withhold politeness strategy which accounted for the least occurring strategy. The explanation upon the result to be the way they are could be referred back to Jeremy Clarkson's main intentions of uttering impolite remarks—in an effort to amuse the audience and keep the show entertaining.

I. INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is a linguistic study dealing primarily with the subject of the implied meaning behind utterances. Where the similar study of semantics deal with the literal meaning behind utterances, disregarding the context entirely and only concerned with the meaning of words as they are in the dictionary, the study of pragmatics heightens the role of contextual background and places chief significance on it as it also serves as a helping hand to determine the implication of utterances' meanings (Cutting 2002). Pragmatic analysis concerns with the

discrepancy between the literal meaning of a speaker's utterance and the intended meaning/hidden message that those speakers try to convey through their words—how a big part of what is unsaid constitutes the majority of what is communicated (Yule 1996). Hence, different fields and theories like speech act theory, conversational analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, politeness and impoliteness is also dealt in the study of pragmatics as they all involve the study of human communication and its meaning in certain circumstances (Baker and Ellece 2011).

The study mentioned previously is of great relevance when we are discussing language as a means of communication, more specifically language in practice—regarding how it is used by its speakers and hearers, namely, in our focus, the act of inferring and interpreting of the intended meaning (Yule 1996). This is due to how speakers themselves are never fully complying to the expected norm when it comes to producing utterances in a given verbal exchange. Factors influencing this phenomenon include contextual backgound comprised of who, where, when, under what circumstances, and the degree of closeness among the interlocutors in an oral or written exchange (Yule 1996).

In the discussion of speakers not/complying to the conventionalized norms when they are speaking, it is only appropriate to discuss a branch of pragmatics study called politeness. Politeness deals with how speakers of a language ought to have a solid sense of awareness of the rules favoring the realization of smooth communication. Politeness is introduced as any behavior that attempts to protect the face of the addressee. Therefore, politeness is basic to the production of social order, and a precondition of human cooperation, so that any theory which provides an understanding of this phenomenon at the same time goes to the foundations of human social life (Brown and Levinson 1987). Thus, implementing the principles of politenes is of chief significance to ensure communication runs smoothly and avoid causing offence to other parties.

However, reality revealed that not all speakers of a language abide to this expected behavior. Many language users tend to violate the rule of politeness and employ certain degree of *impolite* manner in their communication practice with varying intentions. First, they may employ impoliteness from having a motivation to damage the others' face (Bousfield 2008). Second, it may come as one's effort to release anger or annoyance. Third, they may employ impoliteness as an approach to deliver amusement for the sake of entertainment. And fourth, they may do it as an effort to gain power through language (Brown and Levinson 1987). Thus, impoliteness is defined as, adapting Brown and Levinson's (1987) notion of politeness theory, "communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony".

In the event where politeness is not realized by the speakers, the 'face' of the hearers is at stake—with the potential of it being damaged or threatened by the locution. Therefore the notion of face is central in the discussion of impoliteness. 'Face' itself is defined as "something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction" (Brown and Levinson 1987). Brown also added that it is generally of both parties' interest to maintain the face through cooperative behaviors. However, in the case of impoliteness, the face is intentionlly threatened or attacked. This phenomenon is termed face-threatening act (FTA) and can be directed to damage the

hearers' positive face wants (the need to be accepted and even liked by others) and negative face wants (the need to be unimpeded and have freedom of action) (Brown and Levinson 1987; Culpeper 1996).

Many researches have been conducted on the topic of impoliteness investigated in various contexts. (Hafisa and Hanidar 2020) investigated impoliteness strategies in Trevor Noah's *Afraid of the Dark* Stand-up comedy—similar to my research as it analyzes impoliteness as means of entertainment. The result of that research revealed a similarity to my research regarding the mostly and scarcely implemented impoliteness strategies performed by the respective subjects in their effort to entertain the audience. (Al-Majdawi and Abbas 2018) also conducted research on impoliteness found in British social interviews. The author proposed three stages impolite behaviours undergo, namely *Pre impoliteness stage* (utilizing Grice's (1975) theory of cooperative principle as the framework of analysis), *Impoliteness stage* (utilizing Culpeper's (1996) model of Impoliteness Strategies as the framework to identify and classify the impolite acts, and lastly, Vuchinich's (1990) types of conflict termination used to be the breakdown of the *Post impoliteness stage*. So it can be seen here that there are various pragmatical studies that can be incorporated to assist the analysis of impoliteness (Sari& Tur, 2019).

Regarding the object of research that my study focuses on, namely BBC UK's TV Serial *Top Gear*, it is very appropriate to be examined using pragmatics study particularly the branch of impoliteness. This is due to the genre, what is typically being communicated, and the overall nuance of this show. *Top Gear* is a British motoring show first aired in 2002 as a relaunched product of the original released in 1997 with the same name. This show depicts various scenes related to the review, critics, news, and roumors of anything related to cars and the motoring industry through the perspective of the hosts' nationality. Presented by Jeremy Clarkson, Richard Hammond, and James May, an episode is typically divided into segments including review of newly released cars, "the news", "a star in a reasonably priced car", and a challenge featuring various motor vehicles. The hosts of this show frequently employ impolite remarks in their jokes and crtiticize each other and other poeple/group contemptuously as an effort to keep the audience entertained. This, however, has resulted the show to be very sarcastic and impertinently audacious causing controversies upon many people, but has also successfully entertained many audiences reflected by its popularity.

Jeremy Clarkson, who is central to this research's focus, is undoubtedly the most discourteous between the three hosts regarding their frequency of uttering impolite remarks. It is also due to this reason that the present research has been conducted as it is of my great interest to discover the types of impoliteness strategies Jeremy Clarkson employs and consequently enables the analysis to be made regarding his purpose of doing so. Furthermore, although many research investigating the usage of impoliteness found in various subjects have been conducted, little-to-non has been the case to Jeremy Clarkson. It is an area that I believe has to be addressed as Jeremy Clarkson up to the present time is still presenting TV shows, namely *The Grand Tour* and *Clarkson's Farm*. And although one can argue it is not the same as *Top Gear*, Jeremy Clarkson still maintains his character's self and present his show in the way he desires, as it has become his trademark.

Therefore, the intentions of this research could be synthezised into the following research questions; (1) Through which impoliteness strategy does Jeremy Clarkson most often employ his humor?; and (2) What is the motive/reason behind Jeremy Clarkson utilizing impoliteness strategies in delivering his humor?

This research adopted Jonathan Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness strategies as the main framework to identify, analyze, and interpret the research data. Culpeper in his research entitled Towards an anatomy of impoliteness (1996) investigated strategies that are designed to attack face, termed impoliteness, with the premise that little research has been done on the subject—contrary to the opposite study of politeness of which it is based upon. He also added that there has been no study that focus comprehensively on impoliteness in an attempt to improve our understanding of its operation and its theoretical basis (Culpeper 1996).

Culpeper constructed his impoliteness model in opposite relation to Brown and Levinson's (1989) previous study of politeness strategies. Through examining Brown and Levinson's proposed politeness supersrategies, Culpeper then constructed impoliteness superstrategies which denote the opposite function—as means to attack face. He divided the superstrategies into five, namely:

Bald on record impoliteness—a strategy where the FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized. Speakers employ this strategy to deliver impolite utterances that are purposely intended to damage the hearer's face. It is done in a way that is obvious (i.e uttering offensive remarks on the hearers such as "you idiot") to damage their face at an instant without the need for inference.

Positive impoliteness—the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. Culpeper (1996) also proposed few output strategies through which it can be exercised, namely (1) ignore, snub the other, (2) exclude the other from an activity, (3) disassociate from the other, (4) be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, (5) use inappropriate identity markers, (6) use obscure or secretive language, (7) seek disagreement (8) make the other feel uncomfortable, (9) use taboo words, (10) call the other names.

Negative impoliteness—the use of strategies designed to attack the addressee's negative face wants. Speakers in this case deliver impolite remarks through the use of communicative implications that are less direct than bold on record and requires inference to extract the real meaning of the impolite remark. Culpeper (1996) also proposed output strategies through which it can be realized, namely (1) frighten, (2) condescend, scorn or ridicule, (3) invade the other's space, (4) explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect, and (5) put the other's indebtedness on record.

Sarcasm or mock politeness—this strategy is described by Culpeper as a strategy where the FTA is achieved through the usage of politeness strategies that are obviously insencere, and thus remain surface realizations. According to Culpeper, based on Leech's (1983) conception of irony, this results the impoliteness act to be indirect, through an implicature, and requires the hearers to infer to get the real meaning of the politeness work.

Withhold politeness—is described by Culpeper as the absence of politeness work where it is expected. An example of this strategy would be failing to thank somebody for a present.

There are three functions of impoliteness as proposed by Culpeper (2011) namely, affective, coercive and entertaining impoliteness. As the field of impoliteness analysis for this research is on humor, it will be focused on impoliteness as means of entertainment. For this purpose, impoliteness, as elaborated by Culpeper, involves exploitative entertainment – it involves entertainment at the expense of the target of the impoliteness. Whether that target is aware or it's even a 'real' target is not of chief significance. The fundamental matter is that others are able to understand the probable impoliteness effects for the target, which is where the entertainment lies (Culpeper 2011).

II. METHODOLOGY

The object of investigation in this present research was Jeremy Clarkson's impolite humor in the TV Series *Top Gear*. The data were in the form of utterances that contain some degree of impoliteness—utilizing Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness strategies to identify the occurring instances of impoliteness throughout the show. Although this show was presented by two other co-hosts who also explicitly exercise impolite utterances numerous times as well, this research remained focused on identifying impolite utterances done specifically by Jeremy Clarkson. The data were also further narrowed to impolite utterances which were specifically in the form of humor—utterances that had the communicative purpose to cause laughter and amusement to the hearer or in this case audience.

Data were from season 18 with the premise that it was a good representative of the show as it was released towards the end of the overall season line-up and therefore receives better popularity than the early ones. Season 18 consisted of seven episodes, all of which worked out to an average of 1 hour and 1 minute duration for each episode and a total of 7 hours, 10 minutes, and 19 seconds for the entire season. A sufficient amount to recognize the nuance and the nature of the show, given context was of chief importance in analyzing impoliteness as humor.

Regarding the method of data collection, the researcher first watched every episode of series 18 of *Top Gear* in order, which could be accessed legally through BBC iPlayer, while simultaneously noting down utterances that had the possibility to comply to both criteria (impolite and humor) in regard to the contextual background. In this step, the researcher also utilized the transcript of the show which can be accessed freely from https://subslikescript.com/series/Top_Gear-1628033. Those data were then analyzed and validated by utilizing Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness strategies. Secondly, the data were organized and tabulated—classifying them into their respective types. Thirdly, the researcher calculated the frequency of occurrence of each impoliteness strategies by equating them into percentages which allowed for a comparison between the strategies to be made. Fourthly, the researcher re-analyzed the overall collected data based on Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness strategies to ensure its validity.

Two data from each of the strategies would then be extracted to become a representation for further elaboration and discussion (Tur, 2019; Fitria & Tur, 2019). The total of ten data would be elaborated further by providing its respective context, time stamp, and explanation

of why it was classified in their respective strategies. Last of all, the researcher drew a conclusion based on the findings and made a deduction upon the reason why different strategies had different frequencies (Tur, 2022) relating it to the nature of the show and what was typically being communicated by the hosts, and the purpose of them (Jeremy Clarkson) and his motivation of uttering impolite remarked in *Top Gear*.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The result of this research revealed that Jeremy Clarkson uttered 131 impolite remarks throughout season 18, utilizing all five types of impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996). The distribution of the research data is as follows:

Table 1: The distribution and frequency of Jeremy Clarkson's impoliteness strategies in series 18

No.	Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Bold on Record	21	16.03%
2.	Positive Impoliteness	9	6.87%
3.	Negative Impoliteness	52	39.69%
4.	Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	45	34.35%
5.	Withhold Politeness	4	3.05%
	Total	131	100 %

The distribution of data frequency revealed that negative impoliteness is the strategy he used most accounting for 39.69% of the whole data with 52 occurences throughout the series. This is followed by sarcasm or mock politeness (34.35%), bold on record impoliteness (16%), positive impoliteness (6.8%), and withhold politeness with the lowest frequency (3%). The elaboration of each strategies are discussed below:

Bold on Record Impoliteness

Episode 1 (00:07:33-00:07:40)

This excerpt shows how Jeremy was explaining to the audience how the Lamborghini Aventador is worth its steep price tag because it is a dream car. He used an analogy of a dream vacation to make his point before deciding to directly insult the place Tahiti.

1. JC: I mean, yes, this is the most expensive car here. A quarter of a million pounds.

2. JC: But who cares? It's a dream car.

3. JC: You don't dream about going to Filey or Bridlington. You dream about going to Tahiti.

4. JC: **Actually, Tahiti's terrible. I went there once. It was full of Americans looking at dolphins.**

Episode 4 (00:45:11-00:45:26)

Richard hammond arrived, joining the two boys in his home-made mobility scooter.

1. JC (VO): At this point the peace of the morning was shattered by the arrival of the local boy.

2. JM: That is him making that noise, isn't it? He looks like an idiot.

3. JC: **He is an idiot. He's built a half-track.**

4. RH: Gentlemen, hello!

In these two excerpts, Jeremy Clarkson performed the face threatening act in a direct and unambiguous way. First he stated that Tahiti is 'terrible', a direct insult to the people of Tahiti and those who have good association with the place. This was followed by the reason 'It was full of Americans looking at dolphins', a further insult to the American tourist/in general as he condescended and mocked them and they were the reason Tahiti was 'terrible'. The second case is also a bold on record impoliteness as Jeremy directed the FTA in a concise way by the use of the pejorative word 'idiot' to his colleague. This resulted the audience to be amused by how direct and abrupt Jeremy's jokes are.

Positive Impoliteness

Episode 7 (00:30:42-00:30:53)

The special guest for this episode is Saul Hudson nicknamed as Slash, who is a famous guitarist throughout the world from the band Guns N' Roses. Jeremy Clarkson invited him to come up on stage.

1. RH: You should be made to hand back that honorary doctorate you've got.

2. RH: You should. Now we know more about...

3. JC: **Hammond, Hammond, we don't have time for any more arguing about Monopoly because I need a Slash, and luckily, we've got one.**

4. JC: He's over there!

Episode 7 (00:43:39-00:43:50)

The three boys were spectating the rally cross event they were about to participate when Jeremy Clarkson discussed his past experience of watching it on TV—re-enacting Dickie Davies as the host of "World of Sports".

1. JC: "Right. This afternoon, we've got fly-fishing, athletics and golf." You'd go, "Oh, no."

2. JC: And then, "And rally cross."

3. JM: Yeah.

4. RH: And you had those tiny televisions, the black-and-white screen...

5. JC: **No.**

6. RH: ...You were watching it on.

7. JC: **You might have done in Birmingham.**

The first excerpt shows how Jeremy Clarkson exercised his humor by attacking the addressee's positive face wants. He exercised one of Culpeper's output strategies namely, the use of inappropriate identity markers because he called guest star Saul Hudson, the world renowned guitarist, by his nickname "Slash"—in a situation where distant relationship pertains. How he uttered "I need a Slash" additionally signifies a mockery as slash in that sentence means the act of needing to go to the bathroom. In the second excerpt, Jeremy

clarkson attacked the addressee's positive face wants by denying association or common ground with Richard Hammond. Because Hammond confidently expected Clarkson to be on the same ground as him, but instead he was denied by a clear 'no' from Jeremy. This resulted the impoliteness to be humorous and envokes laughter.

Negative Impoliteness

Episode 1 (00:20:38-00:20:55)

In "The News" segment the three boys discussed a new Maserati concept car.

1. RH: This is quite awkward, because somebody'll have to tell them, "Hey, Maserati, it's been done!"

2. JC: **What I love about this, though, is it's called the Kubang, which, being a Maserati, is the noise it'll make the day the warranty runs out!**

3. AU: [LAUGHTER]

Episode 4 (00:11:57-00:12:35)

In "The News", the three boys were rejecting a new regulation where someone who had just passed their driving test must be accompanied in the few years by a sober experienced driver older than 25.

1. JC: What's the point if she gets to the pub

and she can't run me home if I've had a drink? It doesn't work.

2. RH: Actually, no, it's more complicated than that because she couldn't get to the pub to pick you up because she couldn't drive there on her own anyway, so...

3. JC: So she'd have to get an older boy friend.

4. JC: "Hello, Dad, have you met Keith, he's 53!"

5. JC: **Why are you looking so excited?** (Pointing to an elderly gentlemen amongst the audience)

6. AU: [LAUGHTER]

7. JM: He's brought his teenager with him.

8. AU: [LAUGHTER]

9. JC: **Are you just her experienced driver? Cause this is properly embarrassing for you if that's not what's happening.**

10. RH: "Think of me as a kindly experienced driver, my dear." It doesn't work.

The first excerpt shows how Jeremy Clarkson employed negative impoliteness through the output strategy of placing the addressee as an object of ridicule. He attacked the addressee's negative face wants by not treating them seriously—implying the message through his humor that Maserati is not a reliable car and suggests it will break down when the warranty runs out. This mockery entertained the audiences because Maserati is the clear target for the FTA. In the second excerpt Jeremy attacked the addressee's negative face wants by invading the other's space—placing himself closer to the elderly gentlemen than the relationship permits

(5) and asking information which is too intimate given the relationship (9). Jeremy also associated him with a negative aspect, which in this context is being old (Culpeper 1996). These jokes, which imply intentional threats to the target's face, is seen as being humorous from the audiences' perspectives.

Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Episode 1 (00:25:27-00:25:48)

Hammond's car broke down, so Jeremy and James decided to leave him behind at the side of the motorway, as it has become a tradition on Top Gear to leave their troubled colleague behind.

1. JC (VO): **We were leaving Hammond 200 miles away from Rome, and that made us feel quite sorry for him.**

2. JC & JM: [GUFFAWS]

3. JC: For two months, he's been looking forward to driving his Noble right across Italy, and he's only gone 30 miles!

4. JC: [CONTINUES LAUGHING]

Episode 2 (00:32:40-00:33:05)

Jeremy congratulated Matt LeBlanc for winning the Golden Globe Award and went on to discuss how annoyed he was that Top Gear lost to an award to a TV programme This Morning.

1. JC: We lost spectacularly last week to a programme called This Morning. You know this?

2. ML: No.

3. JC: It's a programme... In essence..

4. ML: Fix! Fix!

5. JC: Well, no, it's a programme where men put their fingers in other men.

6. AU: [LAUGHTER]

7. JC: They did! And as a result of that, we were blown out of the water. The viewing public likes that more. **So well done, This Morning.**

8. JC: [PULLS A SYNICAL EXPRESSION]

9. AU: [LAUGHTER]

In the first excerpt, Jeremy expressed politeness work in the form of sympathy for his stranded colleague. But the implication is that he is being insincere with his politeness work because he doesn't actually care about the fate of Richard Hammond—proved by how he guffawed cheerfully with James May afterwards. And in the second excerpt Jeremy insincerely congratulated This Morning for having won the TV award, because in reality he felt annoyed that his show Top Gear lost as a result of them winning—proved by how he pulled a synical expression afterwards. These impoliteness according to Culpeper is categorized as sarcasm

or mock politeness because Jeremy expressed politeness work insincerely and functions as a mere mockery, which in turn entertained the audience.

Withhold Politeness

Episode 6 (00:04:00-00:04:21)

Richard Hammond was overly excited to show his Morgan three-wheeler to the boys and how it was by far the lightest car out of the three, which is perfect for a track-day car.

1. JC: So it's actually a tricycle?

2. JM: It is a tricycle.

3. RH: It's a three wheeler. It's it's reminiscent of the original Morgan three wheeler, light...

4. RH: Ask me what it weighs, ask me what it weighs.

5. JC: What does it weigh?

6. RH: 495 kilos. Less than 500 kilos.

7. JM: But it's only half a car.

8. JC: Yes, the reas..

9. JC: **If I sawed my leg off, I'd weigh much less than I do now. I wouldn't actually function anymore, I'd keep falling over.**

Episode 6 (00:13:56-00:14:35)

Jeremy and James came up with a challenge where they believe Hammond's car would fail embarassingly.

1. JC (VO): Then came the moment we'd all been waiting for.

2. JC: Ladies and gentlemen, sit back now and get ready to laugh your ears off.

3. JM: As Hammond does a dough. It's only got one wheel so he can't do a whole doughnut.

4. [Richard Hammond does a perfect doughnut]

5. JC: Well how's that possible?

6. RH: Ha-ha-ha-ha! You didn't expect that, did you? Neither did I.

7. JC: I thou-I thou.. **It's a stupid test.**

8. RH: Oh! Cause I won!?

These two excerpts show how Jeremy Clarkson exercised impoliteness through the Withhold Politeness strategy. In the first one, he intentionally withheld a polite expression of appreciation that Richard Hammond expects to hear as his car weighs the least out of the three making it more suitable for track-driving. Hammond was also very upbeat to deliver this statistic but Jeremy mocked him instead and persisted on humiliating the fact that his car only has three wheels without giving Hammond any appreciation. The second excerpt also shows an act of politness being withheld. Because Jeremy and James, since Hammond's car only has one rear wheel, came up with a challenge that they are certain Hammond's car

would fail embarassingly—to do a 'doughnut' stunt. However, Hammond's car pulled a perfect doughnut and when he drove back to the boys, he did not receive the appreciation he'd come to expect. Jeremy, proved wrong and jealous, decided that it was a rather stupid test and never gave Hammond appreciation. These acts are viewed as humorous by the audience since Richard Hammond's face is clearly attacked by the politeness being withheld.

When compared, the data this research acquired resonates with that of previously done research, namely the research conducted by (Hafisa and Hanidar 2020) in regard of the most frequently occuring data being negative impoliteness strategy. The explanation behind this lies with a high possibility on the fact that both investigated impoliteness in a similar context, which is humor—as a media for entertainment. And the reason could be established further by observing how Jeremy Clarkson practices his humor in the show. He does it by being indirect, implying a hidden meaning of which both the audience in the studio and at home are expected to extract, of which then results the joke to be significantly funnier than it would otherwise have been if he merely had used a bold on record strategy. This is further proved by the second most frequently occuring data being the sarcasm or mock politeness strategy. Because this strategy also excercises the FTA in an indirect manner—requiring the audience to extract the real meaning behind a 'politeness work'.

Furthermore, Jeremy Clarkson's own characteristics highly influenced his method of delivering those impolite remarks being done most commonly through condescending, scorning, and ridiculing others. He is asserting his higher relative power through being contemptuous and uncaring to other people—not treating them with respect (Culpeper 1996).

However, througout Jeremy's numerous accounts for uttering impolite remarks particularly towards his co-hosts or a guest star, no target ever seemed they had been severely offended by them because in essence, they understood it to be a joke and doesn't take them personally. This is best elaborated by Leech's (1983) Banter Principle where he stated that:

> "In order to show solidarity with h, say something which is (i) obviously untrue, and (ii) obviously impolite to h" [and this will give rise to an interpretation such that] "what s says is impolite to h and is clearly untrue. Therefore what s really means is polite to h and true." (Leech 1983)

Leech further explains that this act reflects and fosters social intimacy particularly in regard to equality in authority and closeness in social distance. This best explains why Jeremy Clarkson is very contemptuous to his colleagues but no one gets offended—because they manifest intimate relationship as they have been working together for the best part of 20 years. The impoliteness, then, instead of functioning to purposely damage the addressee's face, actually becomes Jeremy's facile gateway to envoke laughter to the audience.

The Banter Principle is also relevantly applicable to analyze Jeremy Clarkson's impolite remarks to people with whom he exhibits distant social relationship. Because if we take an example from previous section, Jeremy Clarkson calling Soul Hudson by his nickname "Slash" and incorporating that nickname into a derogatory sentence 'I need a slash' which informally has the meaning of 'going to the bathroom (for a slash)' represents something that is (1) obviously impolite and (2) obviously untrue. Therefore, the actual meaning is polite and true, hence, although the target's face is attacked, they do not feel offended because the

impoliteness is understood to be untrue. The impoliteness, afterall, resides to function as being a mere communicative entertainment.

IV. CONCLUSION

To conclude, through conducting this research I have been able to answer the two research questions proposed earlier. The analysis of impoliteness strategies in Jeremy Clarkson's humor through Culpeper's (1996) framework has explicated Jeremy's tendency of how he employs impoliteness in his humor and what motivates him to do so. The data distribution revealing that negative impoliteness is the most commonly used strategy elucidates, above others, Jeremy Clarkson's discourteous idiosyncrasy and how it greatly influences how he presents his show(s). In addition, how he exercised the majority of that strategy through condescending, scorning, and ridiculing others support this statement—how he doesn't place consideration towards his verbal attack and/or how it impacts its target(s).

In the context of impoliteness being a media for entertainment, however, Jeremy Clarkson's aforementioned trait allowed him to exercise all those impolite humor without placing substantial threat or damage to the target's face. This is because everyone understood that the impoliteness is communicated for entertainment purposes—to keep the audience amused and the show entertaining. Although, I would suggest future research investigating Jeremy Clarkson's impolite behaviour to incorporate a theoretical framework that enables the elucidation of the degree of offence his remarks bring to the targets—because as we can see in many news medias, not everyone is amused by his impolite jokes. In addition, I would also suggest to keep the data sources to a managable amount which allows for a more in depth analysis and more incorporation of other theories assisting impoliteness..

REFERENCES

[1]   Al-Majdawi, A. M. and Abbas, A. N. (2018). A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in selected British social interviews. *International Journal of Science and Research*, Vol. 7(9), p. 536–42. https://doi.org/10.21275/ART20191088

[2]   Baker, P. and Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.

[3]   Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[4]   Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[5]   Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 25 (3), p. 349–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3

[6]   Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[7]   Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse*. *A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.

[8]   Fitria & Tur, A.P.A. (2019). From Abstract to Concrete: Associating the Users' Tweets on "Success". Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics, Vol. 4(2), p. 121-134. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3af5/b3f2fe46421b4da5819ccb6c799aa9d9f6fa.pdf

[9]   Hafisa, A. and Hanidar, S. (2020). Impoliteness strategies in Trevor Noah's afraid of the dark stand-up comedy show. *Lexicon*, Vol. 7 (2), p. 215–23. https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v7i2.66571

[10]   Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

[11]   Sari, F.A. and Tur, A.P.A. (2019). Reshaping the society face through the culture of horror told in Shirley Jackson's the lottery. *Notion: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture,* Vol. 1 (1), p. 1-7. https://doi.org/10.12928/notion.v1i1.709

[12]   Tur, A.P.A. (2019). Patterns of linguistics features in private chat of social media account leading a person to be a victim of a cybercrime. *LEKSIKA,* Vol. 13(1), p. 29-38. https://jurnalnasional.ump.ac.id/index.php/LEKSIKA/article/view/3858/2423

[13]   Tur, A.P.A. (2022). Trend of having more name parts in homogenous community. *BAHASTRA*, Vol. 42(1), p. 17-25. http://journal1.uad.ac.id/index.php/BAHASTRA/article/view/66/18

[14]   Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.