Propagating Impoliteness: Disaffiliative humour and attitudes towards the elderly in media discourse

Heba Ahmed Ragai Aly Zaytoon

Department of English Language and Literature

Faculty of Women/Ain Shams University.
Heba.zaytoon@women.asu.edu.eg

Abstract:

Concealed maltreatment towards the elders became extraordinarily recurrent in various types of media discourse. This paper brings to focus the impoliteness inflicted upon elders in media discourse with the aim of satisfying viewers and stimulating a humorous effect. After providing a review of the literature on impoliteness and humour, the paper adopts Culpeper's (2003) framework for Impoliteness along with Dynel's (2013) framework for disaffiliative humour. The purpose of the study is to identify the impoliteness strategies employed in the media extracts where elders are involved. It aims to investigate the communicative strategies used to promote impoliteness and generate humour. The negative portrayal of the elders in some media discourses is related to assumptions regarding their lifespan and lifestyles.

Keywords: media discourse, impoliteness theory, disaffiliative humour, ageism, superiority, power

Introduction:

In recent years, impoliteness came to be utilized as a source of humour to inflict funny reactions on viewers in different media outlets such as sitcoms, standup comedies, Facebook posts, advertisements, talk shows, prank shows and competition programs. Stereotyping the elders and their aging process is a way of promoting negative attitude towards them which most probably has an unfavorable influence on their physical and mental health along with their positive or negative face.

The concept of Face was first introduced by Goffman (1971) and further developed by Leech's (1983) Politeness principles and Brown and Levinson's (1987) Face threatening acts (FTAs) all of which aim at, to use Leech's terminology, "maintaining social equilibrium". In (1996) Culpeper proposed his theory of impoliteness which he considered to be the opposite of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory and whose aim is to cause "social disruption". The theoretical framework adopted for this paper is that of Culpeper et al. (2003) & Culpeper (1996, 2011) for impoliteness along with Dynel's (2013) framework for disaffiliative humour.

The paper investigates impoliteness as a tool for entertainment by examining the relationship between humour and impoliteness in a variety of media discourse targeting the elderly group and the services or products designed for them. Entertainment stems from the indirectness by which impolite belief is communicated. The impoliteness as occurring in the chosen media extracts do not attempt to amuse the hearer at the inter-character level. However, the further humorous effect is directed towards an external audience/viewer.

Though media based, the research is not concerned with the multimodality of the media production but focuses on the pragmatics of impoliteness directed to the elders through situation and language analysis to reveal the impoliteness strategies employed where elders are made the subject of humour. Impoliteness is constructed through interaction and by analysing the context and the interactions taking place, the impoliteness strategies are revealed.

In the humorous situations exhibited in the selected media extracts, three main participants are identified: the media producers and the viewers, who are both colliding against the butt. Elders are treated as an out-group, whereas media makers unit themselves with the viewers as members of an in-group. The media producers affiliate with the viewer for whose enjoyment the advertisements or programs are produced at the expense of face threatening the butt around who the ad or programme revolves. The humorous acts elicit distress and social distance. Distancing one age group from the rest of the society by ridiculing them and stereotyping their incapability of being efficient in the society lies in the heart of disaffiliative humour. The target of the impoliteness (the elders in the ad) are totally naive and unaware of the face threatening act inflicted on them. They are merely used as a requirement for the media makers to indicate their cleverness in

promoting humour to the viewer. By stereotyping "a social group to whom a joke hearer has an unsympathetic or even antagonistic attitude," (Dynel, 2013) media makers actually overlap humour with offensiveness. The characters in the ad promote solidarity with the viewers of their age and identical health conditions. This category of viewers might not find the ads amusing, and are most probably face threatened.

2. Aim of the study:

This study aims to inspect the relationship between impoliteness (as a form of aggression), and humour (as a form of entertainment) targeting the ageing community. Selecting extracts from twelve advertisements and programs, where grey heads are the prominent figures, the paper aims to analyse the proposed relationship using Culpeper's (2011) and Dynel's (2013) frameworks for Impoliteness. It aims to investigate the communicative strategies used to promote impoliteness and generate humour.

3. Research Questions:

Which impoliteness strategies are utilized in the samples that deal with elders?

What are the communicative strategies utilized in the media to inflict humour and cause disharmony to this age group?

How is power manifested by the media makers over the elderly generations?

4. Methodology and Data:

The research adopts a descriptive qualitative approach to the collected data. A pragmatic approach is adopted to analyze the impolite interactions and the FTAs directed to the elders. The data is collected by watching, then selecting twelve different types of media discourse, which involves gray people as the subject to whom impolite attitude is directed. To reveal the impropriety done to the elders, the selected data consists of five advertisements, a parody of another five advertisements, one episode from a prank show, and one episode from a competition show where elders are targeted, and the impoliteness is directed to them. The selected media discourse samples are all meant to entertain the audience and/or viewers but at the expense of infringing the elders' face through causing

disharmony and social conflict. Analysis mainly focuses on extracts utilizing language. Disaffiliative humour is what combines the researcher's selection of the data. Links to the data are placed in the appendix.

The selected ads focalize the elders in advertising their beneficial services or products that are targeting the old generation. In the prank show, two actors, one of them an elder, fake a situation where impoliteness is directed towards the elder citizen and record the bystanders' reactions to this impoliteness. In Gordan Ramzy's culinary Programme, contestants compete to make their dishes in a limited time. Regular participants in the programme are generally contestants in their late twenties to late thirties. However, the selected parody episode, was a special one where the contestants are old people in their seventies and above with the intention of creating a humorous effect.

Extracts from the selected data are analysed using Culpeper et al's (2003) framework for impoliteness along with Dynel's (2013) incongruity framework for disaffiliative humour to pinpoint the impoliteness strategies dominating these discourse types along with the communicative strategies that helped in the production of impoliteness.

5. Review of Literature and Theoretical Framework:

5.1 Impoliteness:

Impoliteness is considered by several linguists as a realm of pragmatic investigation. Leech (2014, 239) asserts that "when impoliteness does become a common phenomenon in everyday society, this is reflected in widespread concern and indignation in the community, as amplified in the media." In accord to Brown and Levinson's politeness principles, impoliteness inflicts heightened face damage. Culpeper et al (2003) assert that "impoliteness covers verbal aggression and communicative strategies designed by the speaker to cause social conflict and disharmony." Culpeper (2011) later adds that "impoliteness is often entertaining and provokes laughter." Abundance of research has been conducted in the area of impoliteness since its advancement by Culpeper in (1996) and his later revision of the impoliteness theory in (2003) and (2011). Contrary to Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies, Culpeper's impoliteness strategies are employed to attack the interlocutor's face. He (2013) affirms impoliteness refers to "the disruption of

social harmony through the expression of negative evaluations of the target and/or through doing what is not accepted expected or wanted."

In *Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness*, Culpeper (1996, 350) focused on inherent impoliteness and mock impoliteness along with the contextual factors that accompany the impolite act. He classified impoliteness into five super strategies that the speaker employs to perform the Face Threatening Act and some non-exhaustive output strategies for the realization of the super strategies. They are scaled from the highest to the least impolite acts and include:

Bald on-record is the most obvious and straightforward impoliteness where face is not observed, and the face threatening act is clear, direct and unambiguous. Positive impoliteness strategies are designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants; the desire to be appreciated or to be approved of. They include the output strategies of using inappropriate identity markers, use obscure or secretive language, seek disagreement, avoid agreeing with the hearer's position, use taboo words, call the other names, ignore or snub the other, exclude the other from an activity, and dissociate from the other. (Culpeper 1996, 357) With negative impoliteness strategies the addressee's negative face is attacked by attacking their territories, personal preserves and rights to be non-distracted. It includes the output strategies: frighten, condescend, scorn or ridicule, invade the other's space, explicitly associate the other with negative aspect, put the other indebtedness on record with a negative aspect. (Culpeper, 1996, 358) Sarcasm or mock politeness: where politeness is only on the surface, it is insincere politeness thus causing a face threatening act. This strategy is close to Leech's (1983, 82) irony where offense is carried out indirectly and requires implications on the part of the addressee to infer the intended meaning. Sarcasm can often be detected through contextual clues along with the speaker's tone. Withhold politeness is to refrain from making a polite remark where it is most expected. This includes the absence of manners where they are expected in normal situations.

Culpeper (2011, 234) identifies five sources of pleasure associated with impoliteness: , "aesthetic pleasure" related to verbal creativity, "emotional pleasure" (formerly, "intrinsic pleasure") depending on a pleasurable state of arousal, "the pleasure of being superior" which results from observing people in a worse position than oneself, "the pleasure of feeling secure" that the viewer is not in the position of the people being ridiculed, and "voyeuristic pleasure" stemming from viewers' being privy to people's reactions to impoliteness and self-exposure.

All types of pleasure are found to emerge in the extracts of media discourse under analysis.

Intentionality is a basic concept in Culpeper's views on impoliteness. For an act to be perceived as impolite, the intentions of the speaker to offend, threaten or damage face should be understood by the hearer. Though it is not an easy task to recognize the intentions of the media producers, however, one can claim that they do not intentionally aim at being aggressive nor at damaging the elders' face even if the external audience can still clearly perceive the intentional face-attack. However, through their presentations of elders, media makers shape how elders are to be perceived by the society and thus stereotype them. The notion of intentionality is further asserted in Mills (2005, p.268) definition of impoliteness as "any type of linguistic behavior which is assessed as intending to threaten the hearer's face or social identity or as transgressing the hypothesized community of practice's norms of appropriacy."

In contrast to Cupeper who adopts a first order approach to impoliteness by focusing on its theorization, Locher & Watts (2008, 78) adopts a second order approach by examining the notion of politeness and impoliteness as primarily a judgmental act on the part of the participants in a particular situation. In dealing with impoliteness, they presented the notions of "Relational work" and "Frames." The former "comprises the entire spectrum of the interpersonal side of social practice." Whereas the later refers to the "cognitive conceptualisations of forms of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour that individuals have constructed through their own histories of social practice." They further add that frames of expectations are acquired and developed over time.

Mirhosseini et al. (2017) analysed eight extracts from the Iranian movie "Mother" to compare the impoliteness strategies in the discourse of a male and a female in order to identify gender differences in the use of these strategies. They concluded that males use all of Culpeper's five super strategies with Positive impoliteness scoring the highest of all strategies and the percentage of males' use of impoliteness surpasses that used by females. They attributed this to the power difference that males have over females in the Iranian patriarchal society.

In their work on impoliteness in talent shows, Lorenzo et al. (2013, p.199) scrutinise the evolution of impoliteness in the genre of Reality TV and assert that,

these types of shows represent "the rise of spectacular incivility in the media" and that impoliteness has become a characteristic of the newly evolving genre of Reality TV shows. These shows are simulating real life and encourage audience's participation. Impoliteness is manifested in the humiliation of ordinary people.

5.2. Humour:

Humour is no longer restricted to the realm of comedy but extends to a variety of different genres that were too far from being humorous yet relies on impoliteness to inflict a humorous effect and provide an entertainment value for the viewer. Toddington (2015) referred to the scarcity of the research on the relation between humour and impoliteness.

Several theories were proposed for the analysis of humour. The most relevant to the current study are the Superiority /disparagement theory and the incongruity theory. Advocates of the superiority theory including the psychologists Zillmann (1983) and Hobbes (1996) believe that humour stems from verbal or non-verbal aggression towards the target. Morreall (2008, p.234) observes that most humorous incongruities are "human shortcomings – ignorance, stupidity, awkwardness, mistakes, misunderstandings, and moral vices. The Incongruity Theory would say simply that it is the out-of-placedness of these shortcomings that we enjoy." In an earlier work, Morreall (1983) asserts that incongruities can operate on different language levels as sounds e.g. alliteration and rhyming, juxtaposing ideas on the semantics level and mismatch between an utterance & representation on the pragmatic level. Dynel (2013: 130) elaborates on Morreall's views by stating that incongruity varies from one individual's cognitive model/experience to another but "humour typically resides in universal models, thereby being available to many language users within one culture or across cultures."

Dynel (2013, p.124) asserts that "incongruity is the primary cognitive and linguistic mechanism of humour, with the superiority account complementing it in the case of disaffiliative humour." She further adds that "it is the incongruity resolution approach that explains the mechanics of disaffiliative humour coinciding with impoliteness." (Dynel, 2013, p. 136) asserts that the viewer is the

one who usually experiences the disaffiliative humour, whereas the butt or the subject of ridicule shares little or no humour experience.

In *Developments in linguistic Humour theory*, Dynel (2013, p.115) asserts that "superiority originates in a person's realisation that he/she does not display the characteristics, such as stupidity or clumsiness, which a different person does." Humour in the superiority theory emerges from "a feeling of superiority and triumph based on the recognition of the target's infirmities, foibles, weaknesses or misfortunes." (Dynel 2013, p.115)

Dynel (2013) investigated impoliteness as a source of humour in film discourse. She termed impoliteness used with the aim of causing a humourous effect, as "*disaffiliated humour.*" This concept is built upon the superiority/disparagement theory since it is defined by Dynel "as a category resting on the speaker's expression of superiority and genuine aggression towards the butt." (107). In distinguishing between affiliative and disaffiliative humour, Dynel (2011b) explains that the latter is usually aggressive towards the target, whereas the former aims at promoting rapport and establishing solidarity. Dynel (2013, p.116) argues that "In essence, an individual can experience humour upon perceiving disparagement of unaffiliated targets, members of a social out-group, rather than an in-group." She then asserts that impoliteness related to disaffiliative humour is found in categories as disparagement, sarcasm, ridicule, conversational humour and mockery.

Disaffiliative humour, as stated by Dynel (2011a) "operates on two levels of communication, the *characters'/inter-character* level and the *recipient's level*, the latter concerning the viewer as a hearer to characters' talk." Culpeper (2011, p. 234) agrees with Dynel in that impoliteness can target not only the direct hearer but the over-hearer as well, with the aim of entertaining audience. Dynel (2013, p.107) stresses that though viewers can perceive impoliteness as humorous, the speaker himself might not have intended his impolite utterance to be humourous.

6. Analysis:

6.1 Laughter as an impolite communicative strategy:

With the advancement in technology, daily communication between machine and people became more recurrent. The ads under investigation are not an exception as two exhibit gadgets designed to aid the elders in the different aspects of life, especially those for which they are in dire need, either through conversing with them (Alexa), or interacting by providing different interactional features. The interactions take place between an elderly member and the new gadgets with occasional commentator voice over for clarification or elaboration on certain aspects of the devices.

The parody of the Amazon (official online shopping site) ad captures a diverse array of speakers and speaking styles of elders from the American society. It features two elderly males (White and African American (taking two roles)) and three elderly females (2 White and one African American). The ad as such lacks the structural organization of a single conversation with its openings and closings but presents fragmented parts of conversations about six different topics. The topics are all united within the frame of the ad which addresses potential buyers in the form of adjacency pairs between the old members and the gadgets. The ad was transcribed and is found to have 73 roles with the elder participants conversing with the gadget (Alexa), which is programmed to play the role of a real human, a voice over, and an invisible laughing audience.

In its attempt to shed light on the extraordinary potentials of the recently invented device, the whole ad is revealed to be a concentrated sarcasm on old age and its varying disabilities whether vision or hearing disability, temporary memory loss and forgetfulness. Laughter plays an important role in marking the impoliteness embedded in the ad. It is defined by Trouvain and Truong (2017, p. 343) as "a non-verbal phonetic activity that usually occurs in conversational interaction with an interlocutor."

 In addition to communicating impoliteness, laughter in the Amazon ad is utilized as a termination cue to move to a new topic or usage of the gadget. Trouvain and Truong (2017, p.340) assert that "Apart from amusement and joy, laughter can be a display of nervousness, positive surprise, hilarity, pleasure, non-seriousness, and

affiliation, but also maliciousness or as a face-saving or threatening action". Extracts from the elderly daily lives and activities are presented in a form of a sitcom with an interacting, yet invisible laughing audience, who are most probably an out-group, and whose sole role is to laugh out at each disability placed in focused.

Though the conversation in the ad is non-jocular, thirteen instances of audience laughter on how elders act and react are identified in the two minute and forty seconds ad. Jefferson et al. (1987) argued that laughter can come in sequences in the form of adjacency pairs similar to "greeting–return greeting." The laughter intervals perform the pragmatic function of inviting the real viewers to place a sequential laughter to the one initiated by the invisible audience. As such, it is an attempt to affiliate with the viewer as members of an in-group and at the same time an invitation to participate in the face threatening act inflicted on the elders.

The ageist remark "Great Generation" is meant to be a respectful way of referring to the elders, but the construction and presentation of the ad subtly perpetuate the idea that "old" is bad. Laughter in these instances become face threatening since there is no stimulus to the laughter. Trouvain and Truong (2017, p.341) stress that "Laughter expressed to underline a malicious thought is rather negative". Since the only reason attributed to the laughter is the disability displayed by the elders, so to laugh at these disabilities is a face threatening act and humiliating to the elders who are supposed to be treated with more respect and tolerance.

Laughter as communicative strategy communicates positive impoliteness towards the elder's "desire to be appreciated or to be approved of." Their face is damaged by dissociating them from the rest of the society as an out-group.

Through the variety of social contexts, elders are shown to have an inaccurate interpretation of reference. This is evident in their questioning the gadget about a certain matter then they fail to make appropriate reference when the answer is provided.

Old white woman wrapped in a blanket in her bedroom and asking the gadget:
  Old woman: Alegra, what is the weather outside?
It is 74 degrees and sunny. Alexa:
  Old Woman: Huh? (Requesting repetition)

Alexa: It is 74 degrees and sunny.

Old Woman: Where?

Audience: <Laughter>

Alexa: outside

Old woman: What about it?

Alexa: The temperature outside is 74 degrees and sunny.

<Laughter>   *Audience:*

Old Woman: I don't know about that (turning face away from the gadget)

Audience: <Laughter>

The excerpt initiates by providing an instance of forgetting the original name "Alexa" and replacing it by a phonetically closer alternative "Alegra". The conversational sequence enunciates with the adjacency pair question/answer. The old woman poses a question about the weather followed by a precise response by the gadget. However, due to hearing impairment, the speaker requests repetition by using the interjection "huh?" with a rising intonation to indicate that the message was not received. The device attends to the hearing impairment by repeating exactly the requested information about the weather.

The elder woman was still incapable of making correct reference to the pronoun "it" and when she asked for repetition, she still got the same response with the referential "it" to which she has no interpretation. Accordingly, follows the supposedly irrelevant question "Where?". Focusing on short term memory of the elderly lady, who forgot what she was asking about in the first place, triggered another wave of disaffiliative laughter instead of compassion and sympathy. The question word "where?" indicates her inability to make appropriate reference to her original inquiry and which is followed by the direct response "outside" to which again the elder can still make no relevance and requests clarification for the word "outside" by posing a further question "What about it?" By forgetting the original topic of the conversation as a result of the short memory disability, she breaks the conversation rules and triggers another wave of disaffiliative laughter from the audience. However, the smart gadget managed to observe the conversation strategies and wrap up the requested information in one complete sentence, with no referential pronouns as is the case in natural conversation, to avoid further misinterpretation. The laughter following this sentence is another

instance of disaffiliative humour over the elder's inability to make the proper reference to previous turns in the conversation due to her memory loss.

The ad makers focused on the elders' uncooperativeness through her failure to maintain Grice's (1975) "relevance maxim." Their apparent intention could be to focus on this disability and exhibit the potential of the gadget to maintain communication despite the difficulty in communication. However, the implicit intention of entertaining the viewers is realized in their use of impoliteness strategies, as evident in the different instances of laughter, which led to the disaffiliative humorous effect. The viewer appreciates the humorous effect created by the witty media maker over the belittled elderly generation.

By terminating the excerpt by the recurrent statement in the ad "I don't know about that", the ad makers focalizes the woman's complete loss of memory which is again followed by the third wave of audience laughter in this short excerpt. Culpeper (1996, p.352) asserts that "by drawing attention to an undesirable aspect of the addressee, the utterance inflicts unavoidable damage to his or her positive face." The two communicative goals for the above strategy are mainly impoliteness and its consequent humorous effect.

Voiceover: The new Amazon echo has everyone asking Alexa for help
Black man: Alexa what time is it? (0.6)
Previous gadget: No response
Black man: What the hell is wrong with this blasted thing?

(removes it from place and investigates why it is not responding as it is supposed to)
(shouting and trying a different name using the same initial) AMANDA
Audience: Laughter
Voice over: But the latest technology isn't always easy to use for people of a certain age.

(Actor 1 knocking on the device)

Black man: These kids bought me a busted :: machine again…

   O: : : DESSA

(Trying again drawing himself closer to the gadget and using a louder, clearer voice)

Voice over: That's why Amazon partnered with AARP to present the new Amazon Echo Silver. The only smart speaker device designed specifically :: to be used by the great generation. It is super loud and responds to any name even remotely close to Alexa.

Audience: Laughter

(accompanied by the screen showing list of names starting with the initial A and the audience continue laughing)

Voice over: (overlaps with the laughter)

The excerpt begins by an introduction to a previous gadget which was not functioning efficiently. By shouting and trying different names, the old man indicates that he is not sure of his capabilities and suspects that he might have forgotten the name. Not trusting his memory and thinking that he could be the one mistaken by forgetting the name triggered a wave of audience laughter.

The disaffiliative humour is implicitly communicated through a misplaced laughter over the inability to recall the gadget's name or confusing it with close names with similar sounds. In the following turn, the voice over attempts to mitigate the face threatening act inflicted by the audience's laughter. The use of "certain age" indirectly categorized the elders as an out-group that need certain treatment or specific advancement in the technological devices to ease the use by this group of people as opposed to other capable groups of people who would not find difficulty in dealing with technological advancements. Framing them as an out-group is as Edelman (1993, p.232) states, often "driven by ideology and prejudice."

The old man's use of "kids" to refer to his children carries the implication that they are immature and are not fully aware of their father's needs, yet they turn out to be the ones in power who decide on what to buy. Throwing the blame on the machine "busted machine," and not on his ignorance with how to operate it, triggers another wave of audience laughter. The use of "again" implies that the inability to deal with the machine is recurrent.

 By paying due respect using the term "great generation", the voice over, in the following turn, intentionally distances himself from any claim of committing a face-threatening act or being impolite to the elders. However, the laughter that follows is a clear indication of the mixed messages communicated by the ad.

Laughter at this point is disaffiliative to the content of the message communicated by the voice over. Not being able to recall the exact name and trying with near options, especially by the elders is a disability that calls for empathy not sarcasm and ridicule. The overlapping of the voiceover with the audience's laughter is intended to bring a halt to the disaffiliative laughter, as though the commenter sensed the embarrassment that the laughter would cause.

In a different ad, though impoliteness is not communicated through language and though laughter is not obvious in the content of the ad, however, the situations provided in the ad are intended to trigger laughter from the viewers. To promote for an insurance service, the ad makers employed bald-on record impoliteness by being clear, direct and unambiguous in portraying the elders in comic situations making them the subject of ridicule. It provides non-verbal examples of on-record impoliteness within the frame of elder representation in the media. The ad is accompanied by the Banana Boat song in the background, which was very popular in the 50s and where the main verse is "daylight come and me wan' go home." The ad keeps the main verse and altered "daylight come" with a rhyming phrase "I'm 85". The lyrics are slightly altered to serve the content of the ad.

The ad, targeting people in the work force, below 60, utilizes the elders, 85and above, and portrays them in10 scenes in various occupations (Pilot, Surgeon, firefighter, DJ player, lifeguard, Window cleaner, courier…) that they could not possibly engage in in real life at that age. It starts with teeth set placed in a glass, a bottle of pills on the bed side and a wrinkled hand silencing an alarm clock previously set on 6am. It is then followed by scenes of a courier old woman carrying huge box with papers and letters falling apart as she passes through the company's revolving glass gate, an elder surgeon holding a rotating drill and about to operate on a patient's brain, an imbalanced skyscraper window cleaner swinging and cannot reach the window she is supposed to clean, a firefighter holding on to the fire hose and the water force flipping him around…, all the actors are above 85 and the situations are intended to trigger the viewers' laughter.

The viewer is confronted with a surprising, incongruous stimulus which cannot be assimilated into any familiar conceptual category, or as Morreall (1983, p.60) states "a conceptual shift, a jolt to our picture of the way things are supposed to be." The unbound creativity account for the humorous effects communicated by the impolite representation of the elders.

All the scenes intentionally present the elders sarcastically in these occupations to imply that they are unable to operate in any profession to reach the climax of the commercial which is to entice younger generations to work on a saving plan with the insurance company and open a retirement account in order not to keep crying out the same song "I'm 85 and I wan' go home." As such, the ad makers breached the societal norm with regards to the level of respect and honour entitled to the elders. In addition to novelty and the presence of surprise elements, humour emerges from the incongruity in portraying the elders' incapability to perform appropriately in different occupations. Dynel (2013, p.124) asserts that "Superiority and incongruity theories may be seen as complementing each other to jointly explain the workings of disaffiliative humour."

The notion of impoliteness as depicted from the four ads is not communicated through aggressive language use. Being sarcastic in their presentation of the elders in various occupations is a way to mask aggression against them. The clumsiness by which the ads portray the elders is the reason behind the ads communicating what Culpeper (2017, p.342) termed "mixed messages". Culpeper identified three functions of mixed messages: affective, instrumental and interpersonal functions. The affective function has to do with stimulating positive or negative emotions among participants. The instrumental function of mixed messages includes causing offence and gaining power over others. Finally, the interpersonal function "encompass both relational and identity work." Where a mixed message can be viewed as inclusive or exclusive to group members to foster solidarity or to maintain out-group.

On the one hand, the general aim of each ad is to aid the elders by providing them with a service or a device to their best interest; as such, their affective function is to stimulate positive attitude towards the elders and their lifestyle and to attend to their positive face. On the other hand, "the disaffiliative humour" utilized to market the service or the device ends up being humiliating, face-threatening and derogatory to the elders, who are either inter characters or recipients and treating them as an out-group.

Media makers failed to demonstrate concern for the face-threatening potential of the content of their production, and how they are exhibited to the viewers. As such the content of these excerpts is characterised as exhibiting "inherent impoliteness" which is defined by Culpeper (1996, p. 351) as an act that "does not involve virtual

or potential offence: it is in its very performance offensive and thus not amenable to politeness work."

6.2 Indirectness as an impolite communicative strategy:

Impoliteness is indirectly communicated in the chosen media extracts through the constant sarcasm made on how the elders act and the accompanied laughter on what is very normal and mundane practice carried out on daily basis by this elder generation.

Indirectness is utilized as a different communicative strategy in an incongruent situation to convey impoliteness towards the elders in the prank programme "What would you do?" In the episode analysed, cameras are hidden in one of the shops and the butt is an elderly person who is paying in coins. Both the elderly man and the cashier are actors. The aim is to see how shoppers react to the cashier's improper treatment to the elderly.
Elderly man: One, two, three...

Cashier: [Looking at him impatiently, rolling her eyes and head to the left and pressing her lips as a sign of despair and sighs <h>]

Elderly man: Three oh four

Cashier: [Looking behind the man to the line of shoppers waiting for their turn] You know sir, we don't have all day.

Elderly man: Hold your horses ... I just need to count it out ... now where was I ... One, two...

Cashier: You don't have cash ..or credit card?

Swaying the head and rolling the eyes in a direction away from the addressee are paralinguistic and non-verbal means of communicating impoliteness by the cashier in her first turn. The communicative goal of the episode is not to trigger laughter as the rest of the data, but to entice action from the bystanders and amuse the viewers.

Power is exercised where it is least expected in conformity to Culpeper's (2017, p.343) instrumental function of mixed messages. Though she apparently respects the old man by using the address term "sir", however, the exaggerated factual statement "we don't have all day" indirectly implies the impolite attitude of

shaming the old man for paying by coins which hyperbolically can take a whole day to count and as a cashier she is not ready to spare the time and wait till he finishes counting. Instead of showing "relative politeness" by aiding the old man, the cashier intentionally resorted to impoliteness by exercising power over him.

"You don't have cash ... or credit card?" Again, impoliteness is indirectly communicated through the scornful put down which belittles the old man as lacking on something which is handy & common to the general public. The scornful putdown functions as a stimulus that is evaluated against a relevant cognitive model and according to Morreall (2008, p.225) since there is a mismatch between the cognitive model and the stimulus, (surprising) incongruity arises. Incongruity is then considered to be "something which does not fit our ordinary mental patterns."

The humiliation and embarrassment to which the old man has been exposed resulted in his public image being damaged. Humiliation and impoliteness in this instance are again not embodied in the use of certain lexical item or taboo words, but through the sarcasm indirectly embedded in the factual question.

As the episode proceeds, the cashier's bald on record impoliteness intensifies with her questioning the different customers' attempts to help the man out of his predicament.

ma'am, Why are you giving the money?

Why are you helping this old man?

But he's paying it all change, it's annoying. Doesn't it annoy you?

Why would you help someone you don't know?

You're gonna pay for him? (with a surprised intonation)

Questioning the customers' good actions in helping the old man is an indirect rejection of people trying to aid him. Positive impoliteness is exhibited in her unsympathetic and unconcerned attitude towards the old man and her enticement to the other people to follow suit. Dynel (2013) asserts that "The recontextualisation of impoliteness in socially opposite contexts may reinforce socially opposite effects, namely, affectionate, intimate bonds amongst individuals and solidarity amongst members of that group." So,

questioning the customers with the aim of swaying them had an opposite effect of strengthening their act and uniting with the old man against the cashier.

6.3 Intonation as an impolite communicative strategy:

Intonation plays an important role in communicating impoliteness. According to Leech (1983, p.82) Sarcasm is usually done with falling intonations or elongating the words. Culpeper (2005, p.36) states that "the phenomenon of impoliteness is to do with how offense is communicated and taken."

In the prank episode, "What would you do" impoliteness is intentionally pre-planned, and the viewer is aware of it. By determining the way impolite turns are materialized, media makers manipulate the customers' empathy towards the elder since they are unaware that the impoliteness is fake.

Elderly man: No this is all I have.. I .. I .. What was the total again? I..I can't seem to remember. $6 one, two

Cashier: [Non-verbal reaction looking at the line of shoppers waiting, turning her head and pressing her lips in disdain. And puffing air]

Elderly man: I've lost track

Cashier: [with a rising intonation] Can't you see you're holding up the line?

Elderly man: Ah ah ah I'm sorry, but it won't be much longer.

Cashier: Sir, you can't pay with this change..... All right your total to me 12:33

Elderly man: Okay let me just get my changeup

Cashier: (addressing the old man who is busy counting his coins) This is ridiculous...

Making use of the elder's helplessness and inability to focus on his counting, encouraged the cashier to use a rising intonation while speaking as a way of indicating that she has relative power over the addressee. Accordingly, intonation in this situation is regarded as a means of communicating impoliteness.

Throughout the exchange with the old man, the cashier exhibited four of the impoliteness strategies suggested by Culpeper. By making the indirect assumption that her time is more precious to spare, the cashier comprehensively and

systematically attacks the old man's positive face. First non-verbally through paralinguistic features; pressing the lips, puffing the air and turning the head in another direction she snubs the old man and makes him feel uncomfortable, a second time by prosodic means through raising her intonation while passing an indirect accusation "you're holding up the line". Instead of attending to the senior client with more patience and tolerance, the cashier attacks the addressee's negative face by invading his territory and laying the responsibility of delaying other customers on him. She extends her attack further through her denial of the old man's method of payment "Sir, you can't pay with this change" to communicate the thought that the old man is performing an obsolete act by counting coins, thus, associating a negative aspect to him. Finally, she went bald on record in her describing the act of paying in change as "*ridiculous*"

Negative impoliteness strategy is further realized in emphasizing her relative power over him and by challenging him through stressing the amount required: "All right your total to me 12:33" implies that to count this amount is far beyond the elder's capabilities. Impoliteness is further communicated through the assumed superiority using the pronouns "*your total to me*", "*You owe me eight dollars*" and "*We need two more dollars*" all uttered in falling intonation to indicate finality and to highlight the old man's inferior position. Uttered with a challenging and victorious tone, the use of "we" to speak about herself is an indication that she stresses the power she has over him. To further emphasizes the powerful role that the cashier assumed for herself and bluntly exercised on the elder, the attack on his face is followed by a submissiveness and apologetic attitude on the part of the elder. The accumulation of the (non)verbal aggression and impoliteness are intended as an effective attention-grabbing device to serve the aim of the prank.

Cashier: (side talking to herself, yet close customers could hear her clearly) I hate when he coming here all change.(to which another client gave her a look of disbelief)

By intentionally making her fake murmur hearable to the old man and the by standers, the cashier communicates her bald on-record impoliteness through communicating her hatred bluntly "I hate" which acts as a direct insult. The impoliteness is doubled in the situation by labeling the old man as "all change" thus subjugating him through what Culpeper termed "calling names." Laying extra stress and elongating the word "hate" intensifies the impoliteness further and stuns

the bystanders as impolite as it infringes the desired self-image of the old man and how he wants to be seen.

Cashier: Look how much change he has

Again, the falling intonation plays a role in communicating impoliteness through denial of the act of purchasing using change by revealing it as an obscene act and directing customers to witness it.

6.4 Power and superiority as humorous:

Factors such as context, social relations and power are involved in identifying a linguistic or non-linguistic gesture as impolite. The feeling of superiority over and disaffiliation from the target of ridicule is one of the sources of pleasure identified by Culpeper (2011). The humour experienced by the viewer is derived from observing the media makers' superiority and intellectual victory over the elders, as being the targets of the ridicule, whether or not they deserve to be ridiculed.

The power as presented in the selected data is not only that of media makers but it is obvious that everyone who is less powerful than the elders attempt to exercise power over the elders. These include the cashier in the supermarket, the gadgets "Alexa" or "Lifeguard", the Programme announcer, superiority over elders is always in focus. Locher and Bousefield (2008, p.9) assert that "power is not static; rather, power is highly dynamic, fluid and negotiable. Even interactants with a hierarchically lower status can and do exercise power through impoliteness."

"Alexa" is a device given a female name and programmed with a female speaker who is capable of conversing with the elders on various aspects of life. The deliberate naming of the gadget with a female name has its own implications on two levels. First, based on female stereotype, females are more tolerant with the elder's special needs. Second, females are more submissive & more liable to comply to orders. However, the smart gadget is presented in the ad as having power over the elders who are totally dependent on it and who became more submissive at that age than the stereotyped females. Though the device is addressed with an authoritative tone, like that of masters to servants, yet the gadget is presented as the one having power over the helpless dependent ageing person. The elders' repeated phrase, "I don't know about that" in one of the ads, used to terminate every topic, is an indirect confession of their powerlessness and which

implies the gadget's superior knowledge over them. Dynel (2013, p.110) argues that "power manifestation is an indication of superiority, which in turn is the bedrock for employing face-threatening acts and thus impoliteness."

The power of knowledge and its role in establishing superiority is evident in an exchange between the advertised gadget and an elder

Voice over: The new Amazon Echo silver plays all the music they loved when they were young.
Old white man: Angela play Black Jaaazz
Alexa: Playing aaa jazz

The device's hesitation "aaa…" and delayed response is a sign of refusal to repeat the racist term "black." Hesitation is intended by Alexa as an attempt to update the elder that this term has become obsolete. The gadget thus asserts its power of knowledge over the elder with a view to appearing superior and having control over his knowledge and constantly updating it.

In the prank programme 'What would you do?' a power differential is manifest between the cashier and the elder customer. According to Culpeper (1996, p.354)

There are circumstances when the vulnerability of face is unequal and so motivation to cooperate is reduced. A powerful participant has more freedom to be impolite, because he or she can (a) reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness (e.g. through the denial of speaking rights), and (b) threaten more severe retaliation should the less powerful participant be impolite.

The cashier who is entitled to serve clients is supposedly of less power than the clients whom she is serving. The old man could be wealthier and of higher social status than the cashier, as he is the one who provides financial benefit to the store through his purchases. However, being placed in a situation where he does not have ready cash, gave the cashier more power over him and enabled her to exercise impoliteness either non-verbally or implicitly. Abhishek (2011, p.818) asserts that "impoliteness is mostly seen as an exercise of power even when used by less powerful interlocutors." Similarly, Locher and Watts (2008) argue that similar to impoliteness, power is negotiable and is available in every social interaction.

Instances of direct and indirect sarcasm of the elders' actions and culinary skills are presented in Gordan Ramsy's competition programme. The power of culinary knowledge possessed by Gordan Ramzy is utilized in the following excerpts to trigger audience's laughter at the expense of humiliating the seniors.

Gordan Ramzy: It's time to cook.
All of you take your stations please. Let's go.
Audience: <Laughter> as the camera exhibits the elders in their cooking aprons.
Gordan Ramzy: (sarcastically) Take your time (accompanied by look of despair) and looking at his watch

Audience: <Laughter> as the seniors head to their stations some with walking aid, walking stick others on wheel chairs.

"Take your time" is uttered sarcastically, given its incongruence with the context where contestants are competing within a time limit. The audience's laughter as the camera focuses on the elders is incongruent. "incongruity may be understood either as a mismatch stemming from the structural features of a stimulus or as a clash between cognitive schemata. Both of which apply to impoliteness as disaffiliative humour." (Dynel 2013, p.125) The clash is between the cognitive schema of how elders should be treated and how the media presents them.

Gordan Ramzy: (referring to a dish prepared by the elder) You call this Flambe? It looks like a Hobo just threw up.

Senior: (with signs of disbelief to what she is hearing) What?

Gordan Ramzy: It… looks … like … someone just threw up.

Senior: You need to speak up

Gordan Ramzy: (Uttered a taboo word which is bleeped).

Ramzy in the above excerpt is purposefully producing an unmitigated face-threatening utterance, in three consecutive turns, with the intention of inflicting a humourous effect on the viewers. He exhibits superiority and power over the elder by ridiculing and downgrading the outcome of her culinary activity. His repetition to the elder's inquiry "what?" (uttered in disbelief) is a repetition of his derogatory statement but only replacing "Hobo" with "someone" assuming that the elder could not understand what is meant by "Hobo." The intensification of impoliteness

reached the level of "rudeness" in his third turn with a direct, yet bleeped, insult, when the senior asked him to "speak up" still not grasping the fact that he is humiliating her. He is abusing the fact that the senior has a hearing disability and could not pay back the impoliteness inflicted upon her.

Gordan Ramzy: So tell me how you made this dish?

Old woman: Well …When I was a little girl, you know, meee and my friend Mary we just used to looove to cook you cannot catch mice with rats <laughs> So we always celebrate birthdays every other year …

Gordan Ramzy: Just tell me how you made this [bleep] dish?

In the above excerpt, laughter is triggered by focusing on the lack of cohesion in the senior's narration and her declining cognitive abilities by diverting topics. Showing direct contempt and sarcasm at the outcome of their actions by using derogatory remarks is a way of communicating bald on-record impoliteness.

Aggression towards the elderly group is not always intended as a genuine negative exposition. Dynel (2013, p.112) argues that "From the hearer's reception end, the hearer takes pleasure in humour by means of which the speaker displays his/her superiority over, and disaffiliates himself/herself from, the butt." This can be seen in an ad where the accidental falling of an elderly lady was exhibited in a canned joke frame to reveal the device's potentials. The elder is shown to experience pleasure with the way the advertisement is framed. Being placed in a helpless position [falling on the floor and cannot help herself up] and holding the advertised gadget in her hand was entertainment enough for her that kept her laughing till help reached her.

7. Conclusion:

In a materialistic world, where matter and the acquisition of wealth prevail over cultural and spiritual values, media makers legitimize all means to make maximum profits. Instead of maintaining and improving the elders' self-image in society, media spread the ideology of stereotyping elders and damaging their face through their supposedly humorous presentations. They disaffiliate from the elders as the subject of ridicule and affiliate with the amused viewer. Placing elders in this frame reduces their desire to interact and even the desire of other age groups to interact with them.

In the light of a detailed review and application of Culpeper's impoliteness theory along with Dynel's incongruity/superiority theory, the current paper delved into examining the utilisation of humorous impoliteness towards the elders in media discourse. The motive behind the impoliteness in all analysed excerpts is to entertain even if the means to achieve this end is derogatory to the elders' face. As such, media producers exhibit their power/superiority over the age group of elders and invite the viewers to follow suit. The elders as seen in the media extracts are looked down upon as comic, despicable or inferior. All the situations where the elders are involved are face-threatening and accordingly impolite.

Through the power differential between the elders and media makers, impoliteness in the analysed data is found to be communicated by various means. First, it is communicated by using falling intonation and elongation of words in some situations. Second, by using direct and indirect sarcasm, disaffiliative humour is communicated and audiences are entertained. Finally, laughter is found to communicate impoliteness through its misplacement in situations that do not call for it.

Culpeper's (1996, 2003) impoliteness strategies are found to be applied to the maximum in the elder's representation in the media. Sarcasm is the feature characterizing all the media extracts. The Bald on-record impoliteness is evident where derogatory insults are directly addressed to elders. Positive impoliteness is exercised through snubbing, dissociating, and excluding the elders. It is further intensified by being unsympathetic and disinterested. Negative impoliteness is exerted by associating the elders with negative aspects along with condescending, ridiculing, and emphasizing relative power.

 The public image of the elders is infringed by these types of media production. The elders have supposedly established their social self-image of being experienced; they need to be respected and honored, and they want the whole society to recognize them as such. When they are stereotyped by media producers as having the incapability to remember, hear, grasp ideas, work, and participate in the society they lose their positive face. They need to be liked, they need to feel that they belong and can interact not only with their age group but also with other age groups.

Future research can investigate the elderly viewers' reactions to these media excerpts through designing a questionnaire. Another unexamined domain is the language-based age discrimination that needs to be recognized and rectified.

References

Abhishek, KK. (2011). [Review of the book *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, by D. Bousfield & M. A. Locher (Ed)]. *Discourse & Society,* 22(6), 817-819. doi:10.1177/0957926511406830f

Beebe, L. (1995). Polite fictions: instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. In J. Alatis, C. A. Straehle, B. Gallenberger, & M. Ronkin (Ed.), *Linguistics and the education of language teachers: ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistic aspects* (PP.154–168). Georgetown University Press.

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

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 Offence*. Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper,J. Haugh, M, & Sinkeviciute, V. (2017). (Im)politeness and mixed messages. In J. Culpeper et al. (Ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 323 – 355). Palgrave Macmillan.

Dynel, M. (2013). *Developments in linguistic humour theory.* John Benjamins Publishing.

Dynel, M. (2013). Impoliteness as disaffiliative humour in film talk. In M. Dynel. (Ed.), *Developments in Linguistic Humour Theory* (105 -144). John Benjamins Publishing.

Dynel, M. (2011a). 'You talking to me?' The viewer as a ratified listener to film discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 43(6), 1628–1644. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.11.016

Dynel, M. (2011b). Entertaining and enraging: The functions of verbal violence in broadcast political debates. In V. Tsakona & D. Popa (Ed.), *Studies in Political Humour* (109–133). John Benjamins Publishing.

Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan*. Oxford University Press.

Jefferson, G., Sacks, H. & Schegloff, E. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button & J. Lee (Ed.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp.152–205). Multilingual Matters.

Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press.

Locher, M. & Bousefield, D. (2008). Impoliteness and power in language. In Bousefield, D. & Locher, M. (Ed.), *Impoliteness in Language Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice* (1 -14). Mouton de Gruyter.

Locher, M. & Watts, R. (2008). Relational work and impoliteness: negotiating norms of linguistic behavior. In D. Bousefield & M. Locher (Ed.), *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (pp. 77 -99). Mouton de Gruyter.

Lorenzo-Dus,N. Bou-Franch,P. & Garcés-Conejos,P. (2013).Impoliteness in US/UK talent shows: a diachronic study of the evolution of a genre. In N. Lorenzo-Dus et al. (Ed.), *Real talk: Reality television and discourse analysis in action* (pp.199 – 217). Palgrave Macmillan.

Maynard, D. & Peräkylä, A. (2003). Language and Social Interaction. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (233 – 257). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Mills, S. (2005). Gender and impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research,* 1(2), 263–280. https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.2.263

Mirhosseini, M. Mardanshahi, M.& Dowlatabadi, H. (2017). Impoliteness strategies based on Culpeper's model: An analysis of gender differences between two characters in the movie *Mother. Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research,* 4(3), 221-238.

Morreall, J. (1983). *Taking laughter seriously*. State University of New York press.

Toddington, R. (2015). *Impoliteness as a vehicle for humour in dramatic discourse* (Doctoral dissertation). http://clok.uclan.ac.uk

Trouvain, J. & Truong, K. (2017). Laughter. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and humor*. (pp.340-355). Routledge.

Zajdman, A. (1995). Humorous face-threatening acts: Humor as strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 23, 325–339.

Zillmann, D. (1983). Disparagement humour. In P. McGhee and J. Goldstein (Ed), *Handbook of humour research* Vol. 1*,* 85–107. Springer-Verlag.

Appendix

Links to data

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d56-22bpyh0

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DIrQ9ilL8aw

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CGafFvnUC-I

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ceim653uPqw

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e6eDFf-ezXU

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YvT_gqs5ETk

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V6-0kYhqoRo

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TVh2EGxEIyE&t=60s

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ipuUYJwzWyE

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O58qVglvGCQ

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gXfLl3qYy0k

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CNmJmiwxpPs

Propagating Impoliteness: Disaffiliative humour and attitudes towards the elderly in media discourse

نشر الوقاحة: فكاهة ومواقف انفصاليه تجاه كبار السن في الخطاب الاعلامي

هبه أحمد رجائي على زيتون

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها

كلية البنات، جامعة عين شمس، جمهورية مصر العربية

Heba.zaytoon@women.asu.edu.eg

المستخلص:

تسلط هذه الورقة الضوء على اللامبالاة التي يتعرض لها كبار السن في الخطاب الإعلامي. باختيار مقتطفات من الإعلانات والبرامج، حيث تكون الرؤوس الرمادية هي الشخصيات البارزة، تهدف الورقةالبحثية إلى تحليل العلاقة بين عدم الأدب والفكاهة باستخدام الإطار النظري ل"كالبابر" (٢٠١٣) للافتقار إلى الأدب و الإطار النظري ل"دينال" (٢٠١١) للفكاهة غير المنحازة. يهدف البحث إلى التحقيق في استراتيجيات التواصل المستخدمة لتعزيز عدم الأدب وبهدف توليد الفكاهة. وخلصت الدراسة إلى النتائج التالية: عدم الأدب المتبجح يتضح في توجيه الشتائم المهينة إلى كبار السن مباشرة. تمارس اللامبالاة الإيجابية من خلال ازدراء وفصل واستبعاد كبار السن. يتم تكثيفها من خلال كونها غير متعاطفة وغير مبالية. يتم ممارسة القسوة السلبية من خلال ربط كبار السن بالجوانب السلبية جنبًا إلى جنب مع التنازل والسخرية والتأكيد على القوة النسبية. وقد توصل البحث الي ان نقل اللامبالاة يتم بوسائل مختلفة: أولاً، يتم توصيلها باستخدام التنغيم الساقط واستطالة الكلمات في بعض المواقف. ثانيًا، باستخدام السخرية المباشرة وغير المباشرة ، يتم إيصال الدعابة الساخرة والاستمتاع بالجماهير. أخيرًا، وُجد أن الضحك ينقل اللامبالاة من خلال وضعه في غير موضعه في المواقف التي لا تتطلب ذلك.

الكلمات الدالة: الخطاب الاعلامي، نظرية اللامبالاة ، النكتة الغير منتسبة ، الشيخوخة، التفوق ، السلطة