| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Implementation of Alternative Politeness Strategies in *Kick Andy* Talkshow

I Gusti Ayu Agung Sintha Satwika[1] ✉, Ni Luh Sutjiati Beratha[2], I Nengah Sudipa[3] and Made Budiarsa[4]

[1]*PhD Candidate, Linguistic Program, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia*
[234]*Professor, Linguistic Program, Faculty of Arts, Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia*
Corresponding Author: I Gusti Ayu Agung Sintha Satwika, **E-mail**: agungsintha24.unmas@gmail.com

---

| ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to elucidate how banter, a form of alternative politeness, is used on the *Kick Andy* Talkshow. The study employs pragmatic theory, specifically Leech's theory of general strategy of politeness and alternative politeness (2014). A qualitative methodology was employed in this research. The data for this study came from videos that were found on the official *Kick Andy* YouTube channel. Data was collected through non-participatory observation. Additionally, the data were analyzed using the general strategies of politeness. The results of data analysis are presented using a narrative approach and descriptive sentences. According to the findings of this study's analysis, the banter was accomplished by violating the politeness maxims-neg and pos. The maxims violated in neg-politeness (Neg-politeness) are modesty, opinion-renitence, and tact. Additionally, there are violations of the pos-politeness maxims, such as the sympathy, approbation, and agreement maxims.

---

1. Introduction

Courteous behavior is equated with socially acceptable or appropriate behavior. A polite person considers the interests of others, and polite people are those who blend in (Watts, 2003:1). Yule (2010: 292) continues by stating that politeness entails being aware of and considerate of other people's public self-images. Leech (2014) classifies politeness into two categories: Neg-politeness and Pos-politeness. Both neg-politeness and pos-politeness have an association with the concept of face. According to Leech (2014: 25), the face is a person's self-image or self-esteem to reflect how other people perceive him. Additionally, Leech (2014: 25) asserts that the face has two objectives: a negative face and a positive face.

A negative face is used to avoid losing face. Losing face results in a decrease in self-esteem. Face loss can occur due to a person's low opinion of themselves in the eyes of others. Meanwhile, the objective of positive advancement is to obtain or maintain face; that is, to increase or maintain one's self-esteem as a result of improving or maintaining one's judgment in the eyes of others. (Leech, 2014; Leech, 2014:25). Thus, neg-politeness is geared toward meeting negative faces, whereas pos-politeness is geared toward meeting positive faces. Neg-politeness and Pos-politeness are two general strategies for politeness (Leech: 2014)

Along with neg-politeness and pos-politeness, Leech (2014) proposes alternative forms of politeness. Alternative politeness is a component of a social-communicative strategy that falls under rapport management, or the capacity to develop and maintain positive relationships among community members (Leech, 2014:9). As an alternative to the general strategy of politeness strategy, this strategy fosters positive relationships by minimizing social distance and combining it with a warm attitude (Leech, 2014: 109). Banter is one type of alternative politeness. According to Hornby (2010:102), banter is defined as friendly remarks and jokes; to joke with someone. It is used because the participants in an interaction find it amusing and not serious. This technique demonstrates the speaker's and addressee's mutual solidarity. Mock impoliteness is another term for banter (Leech, 2014:100). Two or more people can exchange insults and other derogatory remarks while treating them as non-serious or humorous. The use

of banter demonstrates solidarity between participants in a conversation (Leech, 2014: 239). As can be seen from the explanation above, banter as a form of alternative politeness has distinct characteristics, making it worth studying.

2. Literature Review
As mentioned previously, banter is also referred to as mock impoliteness because the use of banter may constitute a violation of the general strategy of politeness, specifically neg-politeness and pos-politeness. This violation is intended to generate amusement or ridicule. This enables the establishment of solidarity between the presenter and the sourcepersons. Both Neg-Politeness and Pos-Politeness include S and O *(S= speaker, others = interlocutor, who is spoken to and the person being talked about) (Leech:2014)*

The difference between neg-politeness and pos-politeness can be explained as follows.

2.1 Neg-politeness (Neg-Politeness)
To accomplish the purpose of negative face, it is possible to employ neg-politeness maxims, such as:

2.1.1 Tact Maxim
Tact maxim means giving low value to the speaker's interests. In submitting requests, it is often done using indirect speech and refining and reducing the speaker's element of coercion against the interlocutor (Leech, 2014: 93).

2.1.2 Modesty Maxim
Giving a low value to self-quality is often considered polite (Leech, 2014:94)

2.1.3 Obligation of O to S Maxim
The response to apologies is often by minimizing mistakes (Leech, 2014: 96).

2.1.4 Opinion-Retinence Maxim
Speakers often undermine the strength of their own opinion or place low value on their own opinion. This is done to show politeness, for example, by saying 'I think, I think, maybe...' (Leech, 2014:97)

2.1.5 Feeling-Retinence Maxim
This type of maxim gives a low value to one's feelings. A person should not convey his feelings, for example, in a bad situation (Leech, 2014:98)

2.2 Pos-politeness
Pos-politeness consists of the maxims mentioned below. These maxims are applied to achieve the goal of a positive face.

2.2.1 Generosity Maxim
This maxim gives a high assessment of the interests of the interlocutor. This maxim is shown by showing generosity by giving an invitation or offer to the other person. (Leech, 2014:92)

2.2.2 Approbation Maxim
Approbation maxim means giving a high value to the quality of the interlocutor, for example, by giving praise (Leech, 2014:93).

2.2.3 Obligation of S to O Maxim
This maxim gives a high value to S's obligation to O. It is used to prioritize S's mistakes and obligations towards O, for example, apologizing and saying thank you (Leech, 2014: 96).

2.2.4 Agreement Maxim
This maxim gives a high value to the opinion of O. In responding to the opinions or judgments of others, approval is the preferred response (Leech, 2014: 96)

2.2.5 Sympathy Maxim
This type of maxim gives a high value to the feeling of O. Participating in what others feel is considered polite: for example, feeling sad when other people experience bad things and participating in feeling happy when others are happy (Leech, 2014: 97).

3. Methodology
This is qualitative research. Qualitative research is an umbrella term for various social science approaches and methods. Qualitative research collects and analyzes information or data from a variety of sources, including visual sources such as video recordings and

text sources such as interview transcripts (Saldana, 2011:3). This audiovisual research can use data that is already available, such as recordings of verbal interactions (Rapley, 2007:17). The *Kick Andy* Talkshow from 2019 was used as the data source for this study. The data were gathered through non-participatory observation, analyzed using a general strategy of politeness theory and alternative politeness theory (Leech: 2014), and presented using a narrative approach, in which descriptive sentences were used to present the data (Cresswell, 2019:267).

4. Results and Discussion

The use of banter between the presenter and the source persons in the *Kick Andy* Talkshow (2019) is illustrated as follows :

(4-1)

Disabled But Cool (Part 2)			
Andy	:	Anjas, tell me why I invited you to this event?	Q1
Anjas	:	So, Alhamdulillah, I am a Universitas Brawijaya student who received a total of nine awards, implying that there are nine international awards, both from Indonesia and internationally **(the audience applauded)**. Bronze, silver, and gold medals were awarded. I have nine in total, and I have seventeen international certificates (audience applauded)	A1
Andy	:	**On the other hand, I was never able to grasp any of it. I'm envious of this, I'm envious of this.**	Q2
Anjas	:	Yes…. And thank God I passed one of the scholarship programs from the United States Ministry of Foreign Affairs (the audience applauded) to be precise, later in September, I will go to the United States on a five-week student exchange program.	A2
Andy	:	Where is it exactly?	Q3
Anjas	:	I will be placed at the University Nebraska of Omaha in Nebraska; then in the last two days, I will be invited to the White House, at the White House, to meet the president (Anjas' voice was not clear enough because the loud applause of the audience covered it)	A3
Andy	:	But when it comes to school… maybe we'll be the same. You're going to school in Nebraska, right?	Q4
Anjas	:	Nebraska	A4
Andy	:	I'm in L. A	Q5
Anjas	:	L.A? Los Angeles?	A5
Andy		Lenteng Agung	Q6
Anjas	:	(Laughing)	A6

Anjas is an exceptional student who has been recognized with numerous awards at national and international levels. Anjas and his colleagues have developed a number of applications. Additionally, Anjas is developing an application called *Locable*. *Locable* was created as a result of Anjas' inspiration. This *Locable* application aims to assist in the tracking of already-disabled-friendly public spaces. Anjas was invited to the United States for a student exchange program due to his international achievements.

Andy used Q1 in the initial conversation to inquire as to why Anjas was invited to *Kick Andy*'s event. Anjas then responded to Q1 with A1. In A1, Anjas explained why he was invited to the *Kick Andy* event because of his national and international accomplishments.

The discussion continued with Andy's Q2 production. Q2 is Andy's response or reaction to hearing about Anjas' accomplishments in A1. Then A2 contains information about Anjas's upcoming trip to the United States to participate in the student exchange program.

Andy then spoke with Q3 to obtain additional details about the location of the student exchange program in which Anjas participated in the United States. Anjas responded to Q3 by submitting A3, in which he provided additional details about the location of the student exchange program in which he was enrolled, specifically the University of Nebraska Omaha.

It can be seen that Q4-A4, Q5-A5, and Q6-A6 are all done to generate jokes or jokes to liven up the atmosphere and strengthen the relationship with Anjas. Additionally, if you pay attention, Andy stated in Q2 that he was envious of Anjas' accomplishments in A1. 'Envy' is an adjective that refers to someone who is unhappy to see another's advantages, jealous, envious, and spiteful (Aziz et al., 2021: 657). If alternative politeness is associated with it, what Andy said in Q2 violates the sympathy maxim of pos-politeness since Andy did not demonstrate in Q2 that he was satisfied with Anjas' accomplishments. Of course, Andy's Q2 is a joke. As previously stated, the feeling of 'envy' arises due to others' advantages. By expressing his 'envy' for Anjas' accomplishments, Andy wishes to emphasize that Anjas' accomplishments are, in fact, Anjas' extraordinary strengths.

(4-2)

Anak Kolong Reach the World (Part 1)			
Andy	:	Well… I heard you have some patents, right?	Q1
Josaphat	:	Yes	A1
Andy	:	How much is it, exactly?	Q2
Joshapat	:	I have … quite a lot and cover 118 countries	A2
Andy	:	Seriously?	Q3
Josaphat	:	Yes, I'm serious. (Laughing)	A3
Andy	:	**What's so great about you?**	Q4
Josaphat	:	(Josaphat laughed, the audience laughed)	A4
Andy	:	**If people look at you physically…**	Q5
Josaphat	:	(Laughed) Okay	A5
Andy		**Surely people feel "I am greater than him"** (audience laughed)	Q6
Josaphat	:	(Laughed) Yes, yes	A6
Andy	:	But **I** don't have even one patent (laughed, the audience laughed)	Q7

Josaphat is a radar scientist with numerous international accomplishments. The patent filed by Josaphat relates to synthetic aperture, specifically radar for imaging. His radar can be used to observe the ground surface. Thus, even a 1 mm shift in the soil can be predicted, allowing for landslides and land subsidence prediction. Additionally, the radar he developed can be installed on crewless aircraft to monitor illegal fishing and ships entering Indonesian waters illegally and monitor Indonesia's border areas. Further, Josaphat is entrusted with designing satellites for Japan, Taiwan, Korea, and the European Space Agency (ESA).

Q1-A1 was used to ascertain whether Josaphat actually owns a patent in the initial conversation. The conversation was then shifted to Q2. Andy wanted to know the total number of patents owned by Jospahat in this Q2. Josaphat responded to Q2 on A2 by stating that he has a sizable patent portfolio covering 118 countries.

The conversation continued in Q3-A3 after the information was gathered in Q2-A2. Q3-A3 demonstrates that Josaphat does indeed hold patents in 118 countries. However, the conversation continued in Q3-A3, despite the fact that the information obtained is adequate. The discussion continued in Q4-A4, Q5-A5, Q6-A6, and Q7.

Additionally, if alternative politeness is considered, Andy's speech in Q4, Q5, and Q6 violates pos-politeness. Andy's statement in Q4, 'what's so great about you?' violates the approbation maxims because it appears to underestimate Josaphat. Additionally, there is a violation of neg-politeness, as evidenced by Q5 and Q6's utterances. Andy stated in Q5, 'If people look at you physically; and in Q6 'Surely people feel "I am greater than him".' Andy's statements in Q5 and Q6 violate the modesty maxim by exaggerating his own quality.

On the other hand, Andy performed Q5 and Q6 as a form of mockery to strengthen his relationship with Josaphat and liven up the atmosphere. Because Josaphat was discussing his radar findings, the atmosphere became a little stiff, and what was said was a little difficult for ordinary people to understand. The atmosphere became fluid as a result of these Q5 and Q6 utterances. Even these questions 5 and 6 did not offend Josaphat because he recognized Andy's lack of intention to insult or degrade him. Indeed, when Andy stated Q5 and Q6, Josaphat and the audience laughed. He recognized that Andy's statements in Q5 and Q6 were not serious. Andy's Q7 then brought the conversation to a close. Andy stated in this Q7 that he did not own a single patent. Andy's statement in Q7 emphasizes how insignificant he is in comparison to Josaphat, despite his sense of superiority. Additionally, Q7 emphasized that the statements made in Q5 and Q6 were made to attempt mock-politeness.

(4-3)

Anak Kolong Reach the World (Bagian 1)			
Andy	:	Wait a sec, how old are you?	Q1
Josaphat	:	I'm now ummm… 49. Sorry actually 48, still 48	A1
Andy	:	You are already a professor at the age of 48 years?	Q2
Josaphat	:	I have been a professor since I was 42 years old (acclaimed by the audience)	A2
Andy	:	Darn….. I'm going back (got up from the chair as if he wanted to go home)	Q3
Josaphat		(Laughed)	A3
Andy		I am at this age, only a vocational high school graduate (speaking to the audience, scratching his head, then sitting back in his chair). Ah, God is unfair sometimes	Q4
Josaphat	:	**It's not really unfair, but… it depends on who's working hard.**	A4

Andy	:	**Oh, you think I'm a slacker?**	Q5
Josaphat	:	(Laughed, the audience laughed too)	A5
Andy	:	**This is the first time I got a guest who insulted me**	Q6
Josaphat	:	(Laughed)	A6
Andy		I forgive you this time,	Q7
Josaphat	:	(Laughed)	A7
Andy	:	Because you brought me two new toys (smiles broadly, while pointing hands at the two miniature airplanes on the table) (audience laughs)	Q8

The preceding example is from the same source as the previous one, namely Josaphat Tetuko. Andy initiated the conversation above by saying Q1. Q1 is used to determine Josapahat's age. Josaphat then responded to Q1 with A1, indicating that he was 48 years old. The conversation continued in Q2-A2 after we learned about Josaphat's age. In Q2-A2, Andy expects information about Josaphat's age when he became a professor. Andy's request for information, precisely Josaphat's age when he became a professor, has been fulfilled on A2.

However, the conversation continued in Q3-A3, Q4-A4, Q5-A5, Q6-A6, Q7-A7, and Q8. Q3 depicts Andy's surprise upon learning that Josaphat has become a professor at 48. Additionally, Andy wanted to emphasize Josaphat's accomplishments in Q4, specifically that he is a professor at 42, while Andy is just a vocational school graduate. Andy's Q5 and Q6 violate the Opinion-renitence maxim of neg-politeness because they reinforce Andy's own opinion of Josaphat. Q5 and Q6 can lighten the mood and demonstrate solidarity with Josaphat. Josaphat recognized that Andy's statements in Q5 and Q6 were not serious. Josaphat was unconcerned when Andy related these stories. Andy's utterances in Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, and Q8 succeeded in making both Josaphat and the audience laugh. This demonstrates that both Josaphat and the audience understand that Andy's utterances are not meant to be taken seriously.

Additionally, a violation of the agreement's pos-politeness maxim was discovered. Josaphat violated this agreement maxim on A4. Josaphat has violated the maxim of agreement by expressing his dissatisfaction with Andy's Q4. Josaphat violated this agreement maxim when he realized Andy was attempting to establish intimacy since rising from his chair in Q3 and acting as if he were about to leave when he learned that Josaphat had earned his professorship at the age of 48.

(4-4)

Fate-changing Scholarships (Part 5)			
Andy	:	How old are you, Jerome?	Q1
Jerome	:	Twenty-one years old	A1
Andy	:	Twenty-one?	Q2
Jerome	:	Yes (nodded)	A2
Andy	:	We're only two years apart. (Audience laughed)	Q3
Jerome		**Two years difference, 20 years ago, right (laughed)**	A3
Andy	:	**You're a guest here (audience laughed)**	Q4
Jerome	:	Yes... yes, Sir.	A4
Andy	:	**Yes, so please behave yourself (audience laughed)**	Q5
Jerome	:	(Straightening his back, correcting his sitting position while smiling)	A5

Jerome is a well-known YouTube content creator with approximately 8 million subscribers. Apart from being a content creator, he is a student in Japan. He is a student at Waseda University's Department of Applied Mathematics. Jerome frequently documents his daily life as a Japanese student on his YouTube channel, *Nihongo Mantappu*. He frequently shares knowledge about the Japanese language and mathematics on his YouTube channel.

Andy requested information about Jerome's age in Q1 of the conversation above. Then, in response to Q1, Jerome stated A1, stating his age as 21. Q2 then continued the conversation from above. Andy spoke Q2 to confirm that Jerome is, in fact, 21 years old. Additionally, Jerome responded to Q2 with an A2 'yes.' In Q3-A3, Q4-A4, and Q5-A5, the conversation resumed.

Andy stated in Q3 that he and Jerome are two years apart in age. Andy's narration is intended to lighten the mood, as Andy is not contributing appropriately for his age. Andy Noya is a 60-year-old man born on November 6, 1960. (Noya, 2020:13). This Fate-changing Scholarships Episode was aired in 2019. Thus, Andy was 59 years old at the time of the conversation. Additionally, when he mentioned his two-year age difference with Jerome, the entire audience laughed.

Furthermore, when it comes to alternative politeness, Jerome's A3 does not satisfy pos-politeness, namely the agreement maxim. Jerome's statement on A3 demonstrates that he disagrees with Andy's assertion in Q3. The violation of the agreement maxim was committed because Jerome was well aware of the age gap between Andy and himself. As a result, Jerome was fully aware that Andy's statement in Q3 was intended to foster an atmosphere of intimacy. Q4 and Q5 indicate additional violations. Andy cautioned Jerome in Q4, and Andy said so with an angry face. Andy then made an imperative utterance in Q5 in which he urged Jerome to be kind. This Q5 utterance exhibits a direct speech. As a result, Q4 and Q5 violate the neg-politeness or tact maxim. Of course, these Q4 and Q5 are sarcastic asides with no serious intent. Jerome recognized Andy's Q4 and Q5 as forgeries. On A5, he straightens his back and corrects his sitting position while smiling.

.

(4-5)

The Ballad of *Dangdut Koplo* (Part 3)			
Andy	:	So who are you singing there for?	Q1
Sodiq	:	For umm... the Indonesian Embassy, the people of the Indonesian Embassy who invited us	A1
Andy	:	Okay. So, the audience is Indonesian people there, right?	Q2
Sodiq	:	Indonesian people	A2
Andy	:	How do they see you?	Q3
Sodiq	:	They were hysterical, I was hugged (hugged himself, the audience applauded)	A3
Andy	:	(laughed)	Q4
Sodiq	:	**Yes, you know, I am the most handsome artist there**	A4
Andy	:	Yes, yes, I believe it, no need to repeat it	Q5
Sodiq	:	But if there is another man, it will be different	A5
Andy		(Laughed) You're the most handsome if you're alone, aren't you?	Q6
Sodiq		Yeah (Laughed)	A6

Sodiq is a singer of Pantura dangdut. Sodiq is best known for the song "Numpak RX King." He is so well-known as a Pantura dangdut singer that he can perform up to 47 times a month. Sodiq has been invited to perform in several countries, including Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia.

Andy initiated the initial conversation by presenting Q1. Q1 is inquiring as to who invited Sodiq abroad. Then, in A1, Sodiq provides Andy with his requested information in Q1. Sodiq stated that he was invited abroad by the Indonesian Embassy.

Additionally, according to the information obtained in Q2-A2, most viewers who watch Sodiq abroad are Indonesians. Andy created Q3 after discovering that the viewers of Sodiq were Indonesians living abroad. Q3 is inquiring about the audience's reaction to seeing Sodiq. Then, in response to Q3, Sodiq produced A3. Sodiq stated in this A3 that the audience was hysterical and even embraced him. He said this A3 while tightly clutching his own body. Andy responded to A3 by producing laughter in Q4 when he heard Sodiq's response and what he did to A3.

A4 violates the neg-politeness, namely the modesty maxim regarding alternative politeness. Since Sodiq places a high premium on his qualities, A4 violates the modesty maxim. Sodiq's violation of the modesty maxim was most emphatically not motivated by malice. This offense is committed solely to make a joke, which can increase Andy and Sodiq's intimacy. Sodiq's carelessness in violating the modesty maxim is exemplified by his speech to A5, in which he states that if there were other men, the situation would be different, as he would no longer be an artist or the most handsome person.

5. Conclusion

The objective of the study is to analyze the application of banter as a strategy of alternative politeness in *Kick Andy* Talkshow (2019). The use of alternative politeness violates both the neg-politeness and pos-politeness maxims. The maxims violated in neg-politeness are modesty, opinion-renitence, and tact. Additionally, there are violations of pos-politeness maxims, specifically the sympathy, approval, and agreement maxims.

The neg-politeness maxims are violated through boasting (modesty maxim), reinforcing one's own opinion (opinion-renitence maxim), and issuing orders with a high degree of consistency (tact maxim). In pos-politeness, the violation is committed by displaying envy (sympathy maxim), demeanor toward the interlocutor (appropriation maxim), and disapproval of the other person's opinion (agreement maxim). Violation of the politeness maxims— (Neg-) and (Pos-) is done to generate ridicule or banter. The presence of banter based on alternative forms of politeness helps keep the interview atmosphere lively and not monotonous, as well as fosters intimacy and solidarity between the presenter and the source persons. This study only focuses on the use of

alternative politeness (banter) between male presenters and male sourcepersons. For further research, it is recommended to investigate the use of alternative politeness between female presenters and female sourcepersons.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1]   Aziz, A E, dkk. (2021). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia-KBBI Edisi Kelima*. Jakarta: Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia.
[2]   Creswell, J. W. (2019). *Research Design Pendekatan Metode Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, Dan Campuran Edisi 4*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
[3]   Hornby, A. S., & Turnbull, J. (2010). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English (8th edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[4]   Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
[5]   Noya, A. F. (2020). *Andy Noya Kisah Hidupku*. Jakarta: PT Kompas Media Nusantara
[6]   Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
[7]   Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. The United Kingdom. Cambridge University Press.
[8]   Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing Conversation, Discourse, and Document Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
[9]   Saldana, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research*. New York: Oxford University Press
[10] Kick Andy Show (2019, May 24). *Kick Andy - Balada Dangdut Koplo #3 (Sodiq Monata)* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jhZtsnP9o0k
[11] Kick Andy Show (2019, June 14). *Kick Andy - Anak Kolong Menggapai Dunia #1 (Joshapat Tetuko)*.https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6vprnjlewFk
[12] Kick Andy Show (2019, October 10). *Kick Andy - Disabilitas Tapi Keren #2 (Anjas Pramono)*.https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Eo-ICzX2no
[13] Kick Andy Show (2019, November 5). *Kick Andy - Beasiswa Mengubah Nasib #5 (Jerome Polin)*. Https://Www.Youtube.Com/Watch?V=Vqoiiddpg4g