

STUDENTS' VERBAL IMPOLITENESS OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM

Ali Wira Rahman¹
aliwira.rahman@gmail.com

Rizka Indahyanti²

Muhammadiyah University of Parepare^{1,2}

Abstract

This research concerning on the students' verbal impoliteness outside of the classroom, when they were associate with others friends. This research aimed to found the type of impoliteness they use d and how far it influences the relationship each other. This research was conducted using qualitative research, more specific including as discourse analysis. The population were the English students of *Universitas Muhammadiyah Parepare* and the subject were two students of the sixth semester. The data were collected by observation, interview, Recording and the data analysis using discourse analysis method namely by extracting all of the conversation to be analyzed. The result of this research showed that (1) the three types of impoliteness used in the verbal communication of the students outside of the classroom. (2) the closer the relationship, the more impolite the verbal communication will be.

Keywords: impoliteness, type of impoliteness, friendship

Abstrak

Penelitian ini berfokus pada ketidaksopanan verbal mahasiswa pada saat mereka berada diluar kelas, ketika mereka bergaul dengan teman-tamannya. Penelitian ini ditujukan untuk menemukan jenis ketidaksopanan apa yang mereka gunakan dan sejauh mana hal tersebut berdampak terhadap hubungan kekerabatan mereka. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif yakni analisis wacana. Populasi dari penelitian ini adalah mahasiswa bahasa inggris di Universitas Muhammadiyah Parepare sementara subjeknya adalah mahasiswa semester enam. Data dikumpulkan melalui observasi, wawancara, rekaman dan data tersebut dianalisis menggunakan analisis wacana dengan mengekstrak semua data kemudian menganalisisnya. Hasil dari penelitian ini adalah; (1) ada tiga tipe ketidaksopanan verbal yang digunakan diluar kelas. (2) semakin akrab hubungan kekerabatan seseorang maka semakin tidak sopan mereka dalam berkomunikasi.

Kata Kunci: Ketidaksopanan, Tipe Ketidaksopanan, Persahabatan

Introduction

Over the last twenty years many researchers directing their research on politeness aspect of the language where focused on how to maintenance social harmony in interaction or communication in social context of society so that we have understood the kind and how the people use politeness in their own language. On the other hand, little work has been done on communicative strategies with the opposite orientation that attacking the interlocutor and making disharmony in interaction is impoliteness that has been mostly neglected.

In informal situation, impoliteness sometimes occur in the people interaction , Opp (1982) argues that regular behaviors develop into expectations, and those expectations give people a sense of certainty, and it is this certainty that has positive value. People generally like to know what will happen next, a point also made forcefully by researchers in social cognition. Additionally, in the area of human relations, Kellerman and Reynolds (1990: 14), investigating the link between expectations and attraction, state that deviations from expectations are "generally judged negatively". It is important to note, however, that this is a claim about *general* expectations. In interaction, things are more complicated, as the interaction can itself become a norm. Furthermore, it clearly that not the case that all violations of expectations are negative, because when we do something seems impolite, the other one can claim that as an common things in certain place. The point is that social choices have social implications.

Some social norms may develop parallel rules of behavior which are reinforced by social sanctions. Thus, throwing litter on the floor breaks a social norm; the parallel social rule is 'do not litter'; breaking such rules incurs sanctions (e.g. a fine). Impolite language - that is, abusive, threatening, aggressive language - is often explicitly outlawed by signs displayed in public places (e.g. hospitals, airport check-in desks). Sanctions are underpinned by social institutions and structures (e.g. a legal system) and enforced by those in power. Also, if social norms become internalized by members of society, sanctions can take the form of disapproval from others or guilt emanating from oneself. Thus, they take on a moral dimension.

Note that social norms are sensitive to context. There are some situations in which impolite behaviors are unrestricted and licensed. Often, such situations are characterized by a huge power imbalance.

It is the obligations associated with social norms that underlie their morality. Impoliteness violates social norms of behavior and leads to a sense of moral outrage. There are also social norms to do with how face (see above) is managed in interaction. The idea of reciprocity is key. A threat would lead to a reciprocal counter-threat, and thus a speaker has a vested interest in maintaining the hearer's face, since this will enhance the probability of reciprocal support (cf. Goffman 1967; Brown and Levinson 1987). If someone fails to reciprocate politeness with politeness, it is likely that their actions will be perceived as breaking some implicit social norm, thus giving rise to a sense of unfairness, which is where immorality comes in. In fact, reciprocity also has negative side, as work on aggression has shown the importance of reciprocity in fuelling a conflict spiral. If somebody is verbally attacked (or even if somebody just thinks they have been verbally attacked), people feel justified in retaliating.

Furthermore, not all impolite behavior or utterance can be categorized as negative interaction because sometimes in close relationship the people use impolite utterances to show their friendship. In this case they sometimes use slang words to express their impolite utterances and the effect was not hurt each other. This research was coming from a conversation between the students who know each other and in long time so that they have so close relationship each other, talking about something in the cafeteria of their university.

Definition of Impoliteness

In earlier publications on interpersonal communication, impoliteness was either ignored or simply treated as a pragmatic failure to meet the politeness principles of talk (Leech, 1983). More recently, however, we find a growing tendency to categorize impoliteness as a “systematic” (Lakoff, 1989), “functional” (Beebe, 1995), “purposefully offensive” (Tracy and Tracy, 1998) and “intentionally gratuitous” (Bousfield, 2008) strategy designed to attack face. Among all proposed definitions by different researchers, though they are all

reasonable and respectable, it seems that the definitions by Bousfield (2008) and Culpepper et. al (2003) have gained more popularity.

Bousfield (2008) defines impoliteness as constituting the issuing of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive face-threatening acts (FTAs) that are purposefully performed. Culpepper et al. (2003, P. 11) firstly defined impoliteness as “communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony”. Later on (2005, P. 38), in another study they defined this concept in a somewhat different and more comprehensible way:

Impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2).

In line with this point, researchers such as Arundale (2006), Locher and Watts (2005), and Mills (2003, 2005), amongst others, argue for the necessity of a model of impoliteness which considers and accounts for the constructed nature of the phenomenon. This necessity seems to be in place and also important. When there is a model and framework explaining different aspects of impoliteness, its understanding and as a result, its teaching and learning will be more effective, practical and possible.

Mugford (2008) also argued that the world of L2 is not always a polite and respectful one. L2 users must be prepared to be involved in impolite and rude, as well as congenial and social interactions. While the learners’ language level will be of paramount importance, L2 students, at the very least, should be aware of impoliteness in the target language. In the classroom, teachers can discuss perceptions of impoliteness in terms of intentionality, speaker purpose, and level of aggressiveness. Mugford’s statement can point to the significance of the present study.

The lowest common denominator, however, can be summarized like this: *Impoliteness is behavior that is face-aggravating in a particular context.* Most researchers would propose that this is ultimately insufficient and have indeed proposed more elaborate definitions. One of the main differences that emerges when comparing some of these is the role assigned to the recognition of intentions in the understanding of impoliteness:

Impoliteness, as I would define it, involves communicative behavior intending to cause the “face loss” of a target or perceived by the target to be so. (Culpeper: 36)

Impoliteness occurs when the expression used is not conventionalized relative to the context of occurrence; it threatens the addressee’s face (and, through that, the *Miriam A. Locher and Derek Bousfield* speaker’s face) but no face-threatening intention is attributed to the speaker by the hearer. (Terkourafi: 70)

Types of Impoliteness

Spencer-Otay (2000) also offered a framework for various types of impoliteness. According to this framework, there are four types of impoliteness:

1. Individual impoliteness: impoliteness which the hearer perceives as a personal attack.
2. Social impoliteness: impoliteness which the hearer perceives as an attack on her/his social role.
3. Cultural impoliteness: impoliteness which the hearer perceives as an attack on her/his ethnic group.
4. Banter: impoliteness which reflects the playful use of impolite language.

Mugford (2008) asserts that the Spencer-Otay’s taxonomy makes it possible to differentiate between impoliteness at a personal level (i.e. individual impoliteness) which may be unique and opportunistic to a given occasion and social and cultural impoliteness which may be more systematic and recurring. The inclusion of banter offers a light-hearted way of dealing with impoliteness and offers a linguistic resource which L2 speakers can employ to try to tone down perceived impoliteness. However, banter is a cooperative activity between speakers and hearers and, if not appreciated for what it is, it can be perceived as aggressive. He further adds that whether banter should be considered as one kind of impoliteness or not is a matter of controversy.

Friendship

According to (MacIntyre 1985: 156) Friendship of this kind necessarily involves conversations about well-being and of what might be involved in living the good life. Through networks of friends, Aristotle seems to be arguing, we can begin to develop a shared idea of the good and to pursue it. Friendship, in this

sense, involves sharing in a common project: to create and sustain the life of a community, 'a sharing incorporated in the immediacy of an individual's particular friendships.

There are three types of friendship based on Aristoteles:

1. Friendship based on utility

Utility is an impermanent thing: it changes according to circumstances. So with the disappearance of the ground for friendship, the friendship also breaks up, because that was what kept it alive. Friendships of this kind seem to occur most frequently between the elderly (because at their age what they want is not pleasure but utility) and those in middle or early life who are pursuing their own advantage. Such persons do not spend much time together, because sometimes they do not even like one another, and therefore feel no need of such an association unless they are mutually useful. For they take pleasure in each other's company only in so far as they have hopes of advantage from it. Friendships with foreigners are generally included in this class.

2. Friendship based on pleasure

Friendship between the young is thought to be grounded on pleasure, because the lives of the young are regulated by their feelings, and their chief interest is in their own pleasure and the opportunity of the moment. With advancing years, however, their tastes change too, so that they are quick to make and to break friendships; because their affection changes just as the things that please they do and this sort of pleasure changes rapidly. Also the young are apt to fall in love, for erotic friendship is for the most part swayed by the feelings and based on pleasure. That is why they fall in and out of friendship quickly, changing their attitude often within the same day. But the young do like to spend the day and live together, because that is how they realize the object of their friendship.

3. Perfect friendship is based on goodness

Only the friendship of those who are good, and similar in their goodness, is perfect. For these people each alike wish good for the other *qua* good, and they are good in themselves. And it is those who desire the good of their friends for the friends' sake that are most truly friends, because each loves the

other for what he is, and not for any incidental quality. Accordingly the friendship of such men lasts so long as they remain good; and goodness is an enduring quality. Also each party is good both *absolutely* and *for his friend*, since the good are both good absolutely and useful to each other. Similarly they please one another too; for the good are pleasing both absolutely and to each other; because everyone is pleased with his own conduct and conduct that resembles it, and the conduct of good men is the same or similar. Friendship of this kind is permanent, reasonably enough; because in it are united all the attributes that friends ought to possess. For all friendship has as its object something good or pleasant — either absolutely or relatively to the person who feels the affection — and is based on some similarity between the parties. But in this friendship all the qualities that we have mentioned belong to the friends themselves; because in it there is similarity, etc.; and what is absolutely good is also absolutely pleasant; and these are the most lovable qualities. Therefore it is between good men that both love and friendship are chiefly found and in the highest form.

Definition of slang

There are several definitions of slang word in Fowler's Modern English Usage:

- 1) The term *slang* is first recorded in the 1750s, but it was not used by Dr Johnson in his *Dictionary* of 1755 nor entered in it as a headword (he used the term *low word*, with implications of disapproval). Nonetheless, the notion of highly informal words or of words associated with a particular class or occupation is very old, and this type of vocabulary has been commented on, usually with disfavor, for centuries. More recently, the development of modern linguistic science has led to a more objective assessment in which slang is seen as having a useful purpose when used in the right context.
- 2) Drawing the line between colloquial language and slang is not always easy; slang is at the extreme end of informality and usually has the capacity to shock. In English slang often has associations of class or occupation, so that many slang words have their origins in cant (the jargon

of a particular profession, e.g. *bogus*, *flog*, *prig*, *rogue*), criminal slang (*broad* = female companion, *drag* = inhalation of tobacco smoke, *nick* = to steal), racing slang (*dark horse*, *no-hoper*, *hot favourite*), military slang (*bonkers* = crazy, *clobber* = beat or defeat, *ginormous* = huge), and most recently computing slang (*hacking* = breaking into networks, *surfing* = browsing on the Internet). Other words stay largely within their original domain of usage, such as drugs slang (*flash* = pleasant sensation from a narcotic drug, *juice* = a drug or drugs) and youth slang (*blatantly* = definitely, *wicked* = excellent).

- 3) Slang words are formed by a variety of processes, of which the following are the main ones:
- a) Established words used in extended or special meanings: *flash* and *juice* in the previous paragraph, *awesome* = excellent, *hooter* = nose, *take out* = kill.
 - b) Words made by abbreviation or shortening: *fab* from *fabulous*, *pro* from *professional*, *snafu* (= *situation normal: all fouled up*).
 - c) Rhyming slang: *Adam and Eve* = believe, *butcher's* (*hook*) = look.
 - d) Words formed by compounding: *airhead* = stupid person, *couch potato* = person who lazes around watching television, *snail mail* = ordinary mail as opposed to email.
 - e) Merging of two words: 'portmanteau' words such as *ditsy* = *dotty* + *dizzy*, *ginormous* = *gigantic* + *enormous*.
 - f) Back slang, in which the spelling or sound of other words are reversed: *yob* from *boy*, *slop* from *police*.
 - g) Reduplications and fanciful formations: *heebie-jeebies*, *okey-doke*.
 - h) Words based on phrases or idioms: *bad-mouth* = to abuse, *feel-good* as in *feel-good factor*, *in-your-face* = aggressive, *drop-dead* = extremely (beautiful etc.), *must-have* = essential, *one-night stand* = brief sexual encounter.
 - i) Loanwords from other languages: *gazump*, *nosh*, *shemozzle* from Yiddish, *kaput* from German, *bimbo* from Italian (= little child).

- j) Words taken from dialect or regional varieties: *manky* = dirty, from Scottish; *dinkum* = genuine, right, Australian and New Zealand.
- 4) Slang uses are especially prevalent in areas in which direct language is regarded as taboo or unsocial, such as death (*to kick the bucket*, *to hand in one's nosebag*, *to snuff it*), sexual functions (*to have it off*, *to screw*), and excretion (*to dump*, *to sit on the throne*).
- 5) Slang is by its nature ephemeral, and relatively few words and uses pass into standard use. Examples of these include *bogus*, *clever*, *joke*, and *snob* (all classed by Dr Johnson as 'low words'). Conversely some words that were once standard have passed into slang (e.g. *arse*, *shit*, *tit*).
- 6) The first work to record English slang was published as B.E.'s *Dictionary of the Canting Crew* in 1699. Modern works include Eric Partridge's famous *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (1937; most recently edited by Paul Beale, 2002), *The Oxford Dictionary of Slang* (edited by John Ayto, 1998), *The Slang Thesaurus* (2nd edition, edited by Jonathon Green, 1999), and the *Cassell Dictionary of Slang* (also edited by Jonathon Green, 2000).

Methodology

This research applied a kind of qualitative research namely discourse analysis with its' own steps and phase. This research starting by some observation for finding the best place outside of the classroom to conduct this research and finally cafeteria has been chosen. The next step was recording without knowing by the subject. The researcher recorded the conversation between two English department students on the sixth semester. After doing the recording, the researcher then interview them to find out the relationship between them.

Finding and Discussion

Findings

Extract 1

- 9 B : But I mean, I can't take the marl but the white one you know this is not sell for the fuck'n hmmm what it's adult.
- 10 R : ***What the hell's going on?*** What the hell's going on here, what's the eeeee...I mean...

- 18 R : wow, But I like class mild because it has it's own class, you know, high class, classmild,,
- 19 B : Haaaa You fuck'n ass, if you going to some eeee, I mean I say like this one, if you go ing to the for example the harbor, the cafe you might find aaaa very aaaa much kinds of smoke for example aaa classmild one ,Marlboro one, the urban one, the relax one, but I like marlboro one.
- 21 B : High class **my ass**.
- 22 R : No, my ass just like eeeeeee....
- 23 B : Like a **dumb ass**.
- 48 R : Yeah.. I prefer just like aaaaa big cola maybe...
- 49 B : Uhuk..uhuuuh...you like big cola? Uhuk...uhukkk. .
- 50 R : Wow men.
- 51 B : uhukk..because **this fuckin** Marlboro you know? It is the red one I like the white one.
- 52 R : I don't even know about Marlboro.
- 53 B : Really? Will you taste it?
- 54 R : no no no I don't wanna taste it. Because I prefer the class mild you know, I'm telling You that classmild has heeee high class cigarette for eeeee it means that for us college student.
- 55 B : How many buddies ... How many buddiesyou know consume class mild.
- 56 R : Many of us, many my classmate consume more class mild then Marlboro because it has a hard taste.
- 57 B : Really?
- 58 R : it's mean Like a hard core.
- 59 B : Yup like a music.
- 60 R : Yah.

Extract 2

- 62 R : I don't wanna go abroad because too many **bithchess**.
- 63 B : Really?

Extract 3

- 102 B : She is nice girl She is nice girl she is **My ex girlfriend** if I not mistaken.
- 103 R : wow, she is your ex?
- 104 B : Yah, **she is my ex**, she is like a girl of God.
- 105 R : wow.
- 106 B : May I have her phone number maybe?
- 107 R : No **she is like a fuckin ass hole**, you will take ale-ale

Discussion

The three extract above show us how and in what condition the impoliteness can occur and also the types of it. Most of the words or the utterance used in the conversation is slang words because it is the most appropriate word to

use in a close-friend relationship. In doing this research, the researcher took or recorded a conversation at the cafeteria about two students and then put it in some extract. Based on the extract also we can see that the impoliteness used are have vary not only in one type but more than one, so the researcher put it in several types of impoliteness and also found that there is correlation between relation and utterance.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher concludes that there are three types among the four types of impoliteness used in the conversation namely individual impoliteness, cultural impoliteness and banter. When our interlocutor perceives our utterance as a personal attack, we categorize that as an individual impoliteness while cultural impoliteness was used when the interlocutor perceives the utterances as an attack on certain ethnic group and banter was used when there is a cooperative activity between speakers and hearers and, if not appreciated for what it is, it can be perceived as aggressive or jokes. Based on the conversation also the researcher concluded that the more close our relation, the more impoliteness the utterances will be used.

References

- Ahmadi, Alireza., Heydari Soureshjani, Kamal. 2011. *Should We Teach Impolite Language? A study of Iranian EFL Learners, Teachers, Experts and Non-Iranian Experts Attitude*. Finland: Academy Publisher.
- Bousfield, Derek. 2008. *Impoliteness in Interaction*. America: ANZI Printed Library.
- Bousfield, Derek., Locher A. Miriam. 2008. *Impoliteness in Language*. Germany: ANZI Printed Library.
- Joshua. 2008. *Theory on Friendship* (Online),
(<http://www.medhopeful.com/archive/theory-on-friendship>, retrieved April 11, 2012)
- Scudder Jr, John R., Bishop H. Anne. 2001. *Beyond Friendship And Eros*. New York: State University of New York Press.