CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the relevant theories that are relevant with this research. The previous studies are also provided in this chapter. This chapter is divided into two parts, they are the theoretical review and the previous studies.

2.1 Theoretical Bases

Before going to the impoliteness strategies' theories, the researcher wants to briefly add the opposite term of impoliteness, politeness, and also definition of face in order to acknowledge it.

2.1.1 Politeness

Politeness has a significant concept in language use and in communication. It is defined as an act to show awareness of another person's face (Yule, 1996). Politeness in pragmatics concerns with the relational function which is expressed in linguistic action (Barron, 2003). That makes supporting and maintaining relationships is the goal of the strategic way to be achieved by how language employed. Then, the discussion of politeness cannot be separated from the discussion of face.

Face can be defined as a public self-image (Noviani, 2014). It refers to the emotional and social sense of a human being and desire to be noticed by others (Yule, 1996). Brown and Levinson in Watts (2003) add about two kinds of face, negative and positive face. Negative face is when a person wants to be independent and a positive face when the individual has desire to be appreciated and approved of in social interaction.

2.1.2   Impoliteness

The basic concept of impoliteness is the opposite of politeness (Pratama, 2020). The thought of impoliteness which is defined as behaviors that can cause social friction or disharmony is pioneered by Jonatan Culpeper (1996), Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher (2008). There are some different thoughts in every impoliteness expert since they have a unique point of view in impoliteness strategy. However, in general, all of the research has a similar concept that impoliteness is about damaging the other person's face.

Moreover, Terkourafi (2008) states impoliteness has another concept of language that is related with culture, it occurs to respond to the utterances used which are not in accordance with the socio-cultural context that lies behind it or rudeness. Impoliteness has ability to threaten the face of the speech partner, but there are some impoliteness which are not used intentionally by the speaker to attack others face. In this impoliteness concept, there are also negative behaviors from the others where taken by the speakers that are not in accordance with the proper social context (Bousfield & Locher, 2008).

Culpeper (2005) has a statement about impoliteness where it is a communication which is intended to attack the face of the conversation partner or cause him/her to feel as the speaker's aim. It concludes that the act of impoliteness depends on the speaker's intention and the understanding of the listener in the intention of the speaker and their relationship. In other words, the qualification of impoliteness act is the consideration of the listener

to the speaker act in damaging the face of the listener and displaying an action of threatening.

2.1.3   Culpeper Impoliteness Strategies

The scope of the impoliteness strategy proposed by Culpeper (1996) is based on Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory. The difference is Culpeper (1996) defines five impoliteness strategies which seem to be the opposite of the four politeness strategies. Culpeper also states that there are several factors behind the use of language impoliteness, they are (1) the relationship between social speakers and speech partners who are very close or intimate, the closer they are, the greater the possibility of impoliteness. (2) The imbalance of power or social power between speakers, speakers with more dominant social strengths will tend to be impolite to speech partners with weak social strength. (3) The desire of the speaker who deliberately does not want to keep the face of the speech partner which may be due to a lot of conflicts of interest.

Culpeper impoliteness strategies include bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, withhold politeness. The five Culpeper impoliteness strategies are each explained by Culpeper (2005) in detail as follows. (1) Bald on record impoliteness: the FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized. (2) Positive impoliteness: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants (3) Negative impoliteness: the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. (4)

Sarcasm or mock politeness: the FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realisations. (5) Withhold politeness: the absence of politeness work where it would be expected.

Culpeper (1996) also explained that impoliteness has at least the following components: (a) The speaker's words are not in accordance with the norms expected by the listener/speech partner regarding how the speaker should speak to him/her. (b) Speakers 'words are suspected to cause insulting litigation or cause negative emotions for at least those who hear the speakers' words. (c) Other factors such as intentional elements can aggravate insults, but not under certain conditions. (d) Perceptions that arise are influenced by contexts.

2.1.4   The Types of Impoliteness

These are the output of impoliteness based on Culpeper (1996).

2.1.4.1   Bald on Record Impoliteness

The FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized. More importantly it is the intention of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer. For example:

When you offer some food to your brokenhearted friend:

- Eat! Starve won't bring him back! (Rosa, 2017)

This is a command without any regressive action, and therefore, it is a typical bald on record FTA.

2.1.4.2   Positive Impoliteness

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. An individual positive face is reflected in his desire to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by others. This can be done through the following ways, such as, 1) Ignore, snub the other. For example: Fail to acknowledge the other's presence. 2) Disassociate from the other. For example: Deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together. 3) Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic. 4) Use inappropriate identity markers. For example: Use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains. 5) Use obscure or secretive language. For example: Mystify the other with jargon, or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target. 6) Seek disagreement. For example: The criterion of the strategy is to select a sensitive topic in conversation. 7) Make the other feel uncomfortable. For example, do not avoid silence, joke, or use small talk. 8) Use taboo words. For example: Swear, or use abusive or profane language. And 9) call the other names. For example: use Derogatory nominations.

2.1.4.3   Negative Impoliteness

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. This can be done through the following ways, such as, 1) Frighten. For example: Instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur. 2) Condescend, scorn or ridicule. For example: Emphasize your relative power, be contemptuous, do not treat the other

seriously, and belittle the other. 3) Invade the other's space. For example: Literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship). 4) Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect. For example: Use the pronouns 'I' and 'you' to personalize someone. And 5) put the other's indebtedness on record.

2.1.4.4 Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Culpeper's sarcasm or mock politeness is surely the opposite of Brown and Levinson's social harmony that is achieved through off-record politeness. The FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realizations. For Example:

> PATIENT : I had a couple headaches last month and I have trouble concentrating. I was also thinking it might be fibromyalgia.
>
> DOCTOR : Excellent diagnosis. (Rosa, 2017)

As the patient thinks he is an expert on diagnosing himself with the help of the internet, the doctor decides to play along and agree with the patient.

2.1.4.5   Withhold Politeness

This refers to the absence of politeness work where it would be expected. For example, failing to thank somebody for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness.

2.1.5   The Function of Impoliteness

Culpeper also classifies the function of impoliteness, and these are three kinds of the functions in Mohammed and Abbas's (2015) research.

2.1.4.6   Affective Impoliteness

Affective impoliteness is one of the unique functions of impoliteness strategy. Impoliteness strategies, in general, function to challenge specific identities, interpersonal relationships, social norms, and so on. This feature arouses one's uncontrollable emotions in forbidden and unusual contexts, such as laughing at a funeral. According to Culpeper's theory, emotional expression is sometimes more impulsive, more reflective, and sometimes more strategic, more instrumental. The function of the instrument is to evoke even more intense emotions, often to the dismay of a person, and to blame the listener for creating negative feelings.

In this kind of impoliteness, the speaker exposes his anger towards the hearer and this consequently generates a negative emotional atmosphere between the speaker and the hearer (Huang, 2014). For example:

- You made me crazy!

In the example above, the speaker uses such an impolite utterance to express the passive effect of the hearer on him and inform him that he is unwanted anymore.

2.1.4.7   Coercive Impoliteness

The subsequent unique feature of impoliteness techniques is coercive feature. This feature will rearrange the values among speaker and listener. It is as though the impostor (speaker) has their modern advantage amplified or protected. The advantages may be material, for example, the speaker makes use of a well mannered method to pressure the listener to present something to him, or symbolic, together with a disrespectful insult with the intention of decreasing the price of the listener and growing the price of the speaker. This feature can also additionally arise in conditions of imbalance in social popularity and power. People who have more potent power, together with parents, bosses, teachers, can be arbitrarily towards individuals who are taken into consideration inferior. Moreover, it is able to additionally be utilized in a greater same dating with other, greater effective individuals to benefit social power.

This version of impoliteness increases realignment among the speaker (the producer) and the hearer (the target) in order that the speaker profits earnings on the cost of the hearer.

Culpeper believes that this impoliteness type takes place, to a greater extent, in situations where the producer belongs to a higher and

more powerful social level than the hearer's level. In a nutshell, coercive impoliteness is a means of getting power via language (Culpeper, 2011). The following is an example of this type of impoliteness:

- Shut up or I'll smash your head! (Huang, 2014)

Here, the speaker puts an end to the addressee's behavior by warning him not to speak. Such an utterance is produced when the speaker has a command over the hearer.

2.1.4.8   Entertaining impoliteness

In the case of impoliteness, one can also indulge in impoliteness, which is another aspect of the strategy of impoliteness. This strategy requires entertainment at the expense of potential impoliteness goals, as Culpeper points out. A potential victim is another term for a possible target. The victim is often unaware of the impoliteness of others in these situations, while the entertainer is aware of the target, even though the target's true identity remains unknown. True identity is different from graffiti or blogging, where real identity is often unknown or uncertain. Not only the target, but others can also understand the impact of the target's expected impoliteness. As a result, he will enjoy being rude. According to Culpeper, the fact that individuals can be amused by symbolic violations of identity and social rights is the essence of impoliteness. As a result, although it is a symbolic violation, the speaker's impoliteness towards the listener can be amusing to others.

This kind of impoliteness is generated when the speaker pokes fun at the hearer and utilizes the target's feelings to obtain amusement. The following example which is taken from Charles Dicken's novel Great Expectations shows this type of impoliteness: (in response to Miss Havisham's invitation to play cards with Pip)

> - Young Estella: with this boy! Why, he is a common laboring boy (Johanson, 1994).

2.1.6 The Hidden Figures Movie

The *Hidden Figures* movie is a film directed by Theodore Melfi in 2016. It is about African-American female mathematicians who worked at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The movie is based on a non-fiction book with the similar title written by Margot Lee Shetterly.

The movie is about the untold story of Katherine G. Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson. Three brilliant African-American women working at NASA and serving as the brains behind one of the greatest operations in history, the launch of astronaut John Glenn into orbit. The visionary trio crossed all gender and race lines to inspire generations to dream big.

2.2 Previous Studies

There are several previous studies that have been conducted by some researchers, and related to this study. Those previous studies were taken from undergraduate thesis and journals.

Rosa's (2017) research, The researcher endeavors to analyze kinds of the impoliteness strategies that occur in the film *The Fault in Our Stars* film, to classify the type of counter strategies used in film, and to analyze the relation between power level difference and the choice of strategies. Using Jonathan Culpeper theory in Impoliteness, the writers knew that the choices of the strategies in some cases are different from the notion given that participants with lower power level shouldn't perform impoliteness strategies. Moreover, it was found that some characters used the strategies as the notion explained. The strategies and the notion were compatible with each other. Here, power level did not really influence the choice of impoliteness strategies.

Besides, in Pratama's (2020) research, he focused on the Impoliteness strategies that were used by the characters in *The Big Wedding* movie. He used the politeness theories from Culpeper (1996) as the references. In this research, the researcher found out that the most common politeness used by the characters in the movie is Bald on record which appears in the film for 14 times. Then the frequent characters that used the impoliteness strategy in this movie are the woman characters, they are more dominant than the man in this film.

Then Zuhra's (2021) research, This study examined the types of conversations between candidates in the 2020 presidential debate in America. In this study, the theory used is the impoliteness theory of Culpeper (1996). This study used a qualitative method to analyze examples of impolite strategies and the function used in the presidential debate in America in 2020. In this study, the researcher found all types of impoliteness strategies and impoliteness functions

17

according to Culpeper's theory used by presidential debate candidates in America in 2020.

There are some journal research used in this research as well. Start from the impoliteness strategies' theory from Culpeper (1996). His paper provides the foundation framework of impoliteness strategies. Next, the journal from Mohammed and Abbas (2015), it studied about the differences of impoliteness and rudeness, and they found out that rudeness is intentionally delivered then impoliteness could be accidental or intentional. After that, Waliyadin (2016) also conducted research about impoliteness strategies used in the novel entitled Charlie Pippin. This research concluded that each character in the novel used a different strategy of impoliteness according to their social level. Mirhosseini *et al* (2017) in their research found out that for assessment and judgment of a linguistic behavior whether it is polite or impolite depends on the cultural norms, social norms, and the context in which the communication takes place. Then, an analysis in a movie also delivered by Sari *et al* (2019), they analyzed the *Peter Rabbit* movie and found out that all five types of impoliteness based on Culpeper's theory was present in the research. Last, the journal entitled Hate Speech on Joko Widodo's Official Facebook: An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Used by Different Gender, from Pasaribu's (2021) research. It found out that male netizens tend to be clearer, more harsh and straightforward than females in expressing their hatred when using impoliteness strategies.

Regarding the mentioned studies, the researcher took them as the references because it provided the concept of research in the impoliteness strategies field.