CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Pragmatic

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that discusses understanding meaning in a context. Mey (2001) states that pragmatics examines how individuals utilize language in communication, shaping and influencing the way language is employed by people. Yule (2022) states that pragmatics involves studying the meanings expressed by speakers and how listeners should interpret implied meanings, even if they are not directly stated. Fahad & Mayuuf (2022) states that the focus in pragmatics lies on how speakers use knowledge to convey meaning. From some of the above statements, it can be concluded that pragmatics is a way used to understand a language used by humans in a certain context.

In pragmatics, several concepts must be understood. According to Erlinda (2019), there are six pragmatic concepts, namely English Deixis, English Presuppositions, Cooperative Principles & Grice's Conversational Maxims, Implicatures, Speech Acts, and Politeness Maxims.

1. Speech Acts

Speech acts are used to express actions through speech. Erlinda (2019) states that speech acts are the use of language to achieve something. Yule (1996) states that speech acts are actions performed through speech that are classified into apologies, complaints, compliments, invitations, promises, or requests. There

are three main types of actions namely Locutionary Acts, Illocutionary Acts, and Perlocutionary Acts. Examples of these three types of speech acts could be: "I am going to read a book" (locutionary act), to express the intention of reading (illocutionary act), and possibly producing new knowledge or a change of mind in the listener (perlocutionary act). This concept occurs when someone speaks, they not only convey information but also act.

2. **Deixis**

   Deixis refers to the use of words or phrases in the context of a particular situation. According to Yule (1996), deixis is defined as "pointing through language". The use of deixis allows the speaker to refer directly to the relevant object, location, time, or person in the ongoing communication situation. Erlinda (2019) states that deixis occurs when seeing a strange object and asking questions such as "What is that?". Deixis refers to the context-dependent use of words or expressions in communication, such as pronouns.

3. **Presuppositions**

   A presupposition is an implicit assumption underlying a statement or proposition, which is often taken for granted by the speaker or writer. Erlinda (2019) states that presupposition can simply be defined as inference. Erlinda (2019) states the main function of presupposition is to act as a requirement of a sentence. It can be concluded that presuppositions play a crucial role in

communication by ensuring the clarity of information, thereby preventing misunderstandings.

4. **Cooperative Principles & Grice's Conversational Maxims**

This concept was developed by Paul Grice. In communicating, speakers and listeners assume that they will strive to cooperate to achieve efficient and harmonious understanding. This theory addresses how people communicate effectively in everyday conversations by following certain principles. According to Grice (1975), there are four cooperative principles that speakers can use as guidelines for successful communication. The four cooperative principles are Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relationship, and Maxim of Manner.

5. **Implicatures**

Implicatures occur when additional or implicit meanings are conveyed through speech, which are not directly spoken but can be inferred from context and pragmatic norms. The ability to recognize and use implicatures is an essential part of understanding and producing effective language in everyday communication. For example, if someone asks, "Would you like tea or coffee?" and the listener replies, "I don't want coffee," the implicature of that answer is that the listener wants tea. Although the listener does not explicitly state that she wants tea, the information can be inferred from the context and the prevailing language norms.

6. Politeness

Politeness is behavior that demonstrates kindness, courtesy, and politeness in social interactions. It involves the use of certain words, expressions, and actions to show respect, consideration, and politeness towards others. Erlinda (2019) states that politeness is very useful in conversation to refine speech in different contexts. Ambarwati & Damayanti (2024) state that being polite is not only characterized by saying "sorry" and "thank you". In this concept, pragmatics notices that politeness in communication is needed to maintain good relations.

When interacting with someone, it is possible to encounter language that conveys meaning beyond its literal expression. According to Yule (1996), this research falls under the study of pragmatics as it pertains to the meaning of language or speech. Chaniago & Amri (2023) state that politeness is an important part of the study of pragmatics. Culpeper (1996) states that impoliteness is a parasite of politeness. So it can be concluded that in pragmatics we can study politeness and impoliteness.

B. Impoliteness Strategies

Everyone is probably very familiar with politeness, but sometimes they forget that they have to be polite when communicating with others. On some occasions, people will express themselves with impolite speech that causes conflict and misunderstanding. In certain situations, they will forget to control their speech when communicating with their interlocutors.

Kantara (2011) states that impoliteness is a behavior that causes disharmony. Culpeper (1996) defines impoliteness as an action aimed at causing the loss of face for the target. So impoliteness is an action that causes a target's face loss and creates disharmonious relationships when communicating.

Culpeper categorizes impoliteness strategies based on the opposite of politeness strategies proposed by Brown & Levinson. Politeness in Brown & Levinson (1987) is divided into four namely, Bald on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, and Off Record. Meanwhile, Culpeper (1996) divides impoliteness strategies into five, namely, Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Sarcasm or Mock Politeness, and Withhold Politeness. The following is an explanation of the five impoliteness strategies:

1. **Bald on Record Impoliteness**

   According to Culpeper (1996), impoliteness is done by being direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise in situations where face is irrelevant or minimized. It can be inferred that openly addressing bald on record in impoliteness can harm the interlocutor's reputation by employing direct statements meant to insult or degrade them. The speaker will attack the interlocutor's face when the speaker does not have the power (safely) to utter impolite utterances.

   A1 : I'm sorry I couldn't complete this task. I need extra time.

A2 : But the deadline is near, you should have planned it well

in advance. This is not acceptable.

A1 : I understand, but I can't finish it now. I need more time.

A2 : I don't accept your excuse. Hurry up and do your work,

there will be no more time delays.

In the above conversation, A2 uses an unfriendliness strategy by directly expressing dissatisfaction with A1 asking for additional time to complete the task. A2 says clearly that A1's reasoning is unacceptable and demands A1 to complete the task without further delay. This is an example of a bald-on-record conversation where unfriendliness is expressed without any layers or coverings.

2. **Positive Impoliteness**

According to Culpeper (1996), this strategy is designed to undermine the addressee's positive face wants. It can be inferred that instances of positive impoliteness may arise when speakers aim to undermine the positive image or self-esteem of their conversation partners. According to Culpeper (1996), the criteria of positive impoliteness consist of, ignore, sub the other, disassociating from the others, use inappropriate identity markers, use obscure or secretive language, seek disagreement, make the other feel uncomfortable, utilizing taboo words, and call the other names. The following is a further explanation:

a. Ignore, sub the other

In this case, the speaker fails to acknowledge the other's presence and excludes him/her from the activity.

A1: How are you, friend? Long time no see!

A2: Oh, yes, I'm good. But it seems like you've been pretty busy lately, right?

A1: Yes, it's been a bit busy. But what about you?

A2: Oh, nothing too exciting, just normal business. But you really have to watch your time, especially when you meet up with old friends.

A1: Sorry, I know I haven't contacted you in a while. I'll try to do better.

In the above conversation, A2 uses positive impoliteness sub the other A1 who has ignored or sidelined them in previous interactions. Although they do not directly express their dissatisfaction, they imply such feelings through their statements that emphasize the importance of attention and time in social relationships.

b. Disassociating from the others

In this criterion, the speaker refuses to have any association or common ground with the other, avoids sitting together, is disinterested, unconcerned, and unsympathetic.

A1 : Would you like to have the same bracelet as me?

A2 : Ah I'm not interested.

The conversation above shows that A2 refused and was not interested in A1's invitation to have the same bracelet as him.

c. Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic

A1: Hi, do you want to come to the charity event next week?

A2: Hmm, I'm not really interested in that kind of event. Thanks for inviting me, but I'll pass.

A2 clearly shows his disinterest in the charity event. A2 shows indifference towards the event by using words like "Hmm" which shows hesitation and lack of interest. A2 does not show sympathy towards the charity event and does not even give further reasons or explanations for his disinterest. Despite declining the invitation, A2 still gives a thank you as a form of politeness.

d. Use inappropriate identity markers

This criterion can occur due to using inappropriate identity markers when speakers use titles and surnames. This happens because the speaker has a close relationship with the interlocutor.

A1: Hi, how are you?

A2: Hi, beautiful. Do you still like shopping for expensive things?

A2 uses the word "pretty" to refer to A1, which may be considered inappropriate or impolite depending on the context and their relationship. By using an inappropriate identity marker, A2 shows disrespect and a lack of attention to politeness norms. By asking if A1 still likes to shop for expensive items, A2 may be trying to insinuate or ridicule A1, showing an unfriendly or unsympathetic attitude. A2's question about A1's shopping habits could come across as mocking or condescending, depending on the intonation and context of the conversation.

e. Use obscure or secretive language

This criterion can occur because the speaker confuses others by using jargon or code that is only known to the speaker without being known by the interlocutor.

A1: Hi, how are you? Would you like to join us for tonight's program?

A2: Hmm, it looks like I have other 'plans' tonight that I can't miss. Thanks for inviting me, but I'll have to pass.

A2 uses the term "plans" in quotes to refer to something without providing details or clarity. By using vague language, A2 avoids giving direct or clear information about the reason for declining the invitation. A2 does not give a concrete explanation of the other "plans", thus leaving the interlocutor confused or uncertain.

f. Seek disagreement

A1: Hi, what do you think about the city's development plan?

A2: Actually, I don't agree with the plan. I don't think it will bring significant benefits to the community.

A2 clearly states his disagreement with the plan proposed by A1. A2 did not use words that could temper or disguise his disagreement; instead, he expressed it firmly. A2 does not ask for A1's opinion or open further discussion, showing a lack of openness to different views. A2 does not show a willingness to seek common ground or to find a mutually acceptable solution, showing positive impoliteness in expressing disagreement.

g. Make the other feel uncomfortable

Speakers try not to avoid silence, joke, or use small talk.

A1: Hi, how do you feel after the presentation?

A2: Hmm, to be honest, I think there were some parts that were a bit boring. But of course, everyone has a different opinion.

A2 states honestly that she found some parts of the presentation boring, without including any significant reductions. A2 did not try to tone down his criticism or make it easier to bear but rather delivered it firmly. Although A2 made an unpleasant comment, he added a sentence stating that everyone has different opinions, which was probably meant to soften the effect of his criticism. By stating that some parts of the presentation were boring, A2 was able to make A1 feel uncomfortable or annoyed by his comments. This shows the use of positive impoliteness to create discomfort in the conversation.

h. Use taboo words

A1 : I dropped my laptop on the table, sorry

A2: Fuck it, what you did was never right.

In the conversation, it is clear that A2 uses the taboo word "fuck it" directly to A1.

i. Call the other names

A1 : Hey shorty, can you get me the books on the top shelf hahaha

A2 : What do you mean?

In the conversation above, it is clear that A1 uses another derogatory nickname in the word "hey short" which refers to A2's physique. A2 feels offended by A1's question which seems to be mocking to be able to get a book on the top shelf.

3. Negative Impoliteness

Culpeper (1996) states that negative impoliteness is a strategy designed to damage the negative face of the recipient. It can be inferred that negative impoliteness is a tactic directed at undermining the negative aspects of the interlocutor's self-image or autonomy. Culpeper (1996) divides negative impoliteness into four categories, namely:

a. Frighten

According to Culpeper (1996), this category occurs to instill the belief that actions that harm others will occur.

A1: Hey, how are you? You look a bit pale.

A2: Yeah, I'm fine. But, actually, I'm a little distracted. There's a big problem at the office.

A1: Oh no, what happened?

A2: You know, that new manager is a nightmare. He has made my life a living hell since he came. I'm afraid I'm going to lose my job.

A1: Wow, that sounds terrible. Hope the situation improves.

A2: I'm not sure. I feel like I'm on the edge of a cliff without a safety rope. I'm afraid I'll fall off at any moment.

In this conversation, the use of negative impoliteness is seen through the expression of discomfort, anxiety, and uncertainty experienced by A2. A2 uses words that express fear and anxiety, such as "nightmare", "hell", and "the end of the cliff without a safety rope", to show how dire his situation is. These expressions can make the interlocutor feel uncomfortable or disturbed due to the negative atmosphere created.

b. Condescend, scorn or ridicule

According to Culpeper (1996), this category emphasizes relative power, being insulting by treating

others not seriously and using the pronoun "little person" to belittle others.

A1: What did you think of my presentation?

A2: Well, I think it was, hmm, pretty good for the standard given. But yes, there are still some points that need to be improved.

A1: Oh, what do you think needs to be improved?

A2: Well, maybe if you prepare it better, you won't lose the flow of the story like that. And yes, the intonation of your voice sounded a bit flat, it made it a bit boring.

In this conversation, A2 uses negative impoliteness by condescending ("Condescend") and scorn ("Scorn") towards the presentation presented by A1. A2 shows his dissatisfaction condescendingly and scornfully, by using words such as "a given standard", suggesting that A's presentation only meets minimal standards.

c. Invade the other's space

According to Culpeper (1996), this category is either literal (e.g., getting closer to another person than the relationship allows) or figurative (e.g., requesting or discussing information that is too intimate given the relationship).

A1: Excuse me, could you please step back a little? You're too close.

A2: Oh, sorry. I didn't mean to. But hey, I just wanted to see what you were doing.

A1: Yeah, but it made me feel uncomfortable. I need a little personal space.

A2: Hmm, okay. But I think you're a little too sensitive. I just want to see, you have nothing to hide.

Although A1 asked A2 to step back a little because she felt uncomfortable, A1 did not heed the request and instead maintained her desire to see what A1 was doing. A2 showed a lack of understanding and disrespect for A's personal space by not complying with her request to step back. A2's final statement, "I just want to see, you have nothing to hide," adds pressure on A1 and shows A2's disregard for A1's personal space boundaries. This can make A1 feel uncomfortable and disturbed.

d. Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect

According to Culpeper (1996), in this category of personalization, use the pronouns 'I' and 'you'.

A1: Can you help me complete this project?

A2: Hmm, I'm not sure. You're always too slow and inefficient in your work.

A1: Sorry, I'll try harder.

A2: Yes, you should. Don't make me bear the brunt of your shortcomings.

In this conversation, A2 uses negative impoliteness by explicitly associating A1 with a negative aspect, namely A1's inability to work quickly and efficiently. By stating that A1 is "always late and inefficient," A2 directly blames A1 for the problems in the project. A2 does not express his criticism subtly or in a more polite way, but explicitly attacks A1's ability, which could make A1 feel uncomfortable or annoyed.

e. **Put the other's indebtedness on record**

A1: Hey, I wanted to remind you about the money you still borrow from me.

A2: Oh, really? Sorry, I forgot.

A1: Yes, it's been a few months and you haven't returned it. I hope you can handle this better in the future.

A2: Yes, I'll try. But you don't have to reprimand me too much either.

In this conversation, A1 uses negative impoliteness by noting the debt owed by A2,

showing A1's dissatisfaction with the fact that A2 has not returned the borrowed money. A1 shows his dissatisfaction explicitly by stating that it has been several months and A2 has not paid his debt. A2 responds by trying to get rid of his responsibility but also shows dissatisfaction with the way A1 reprimanded him. Overall, this conversation shows how one can use negative impoliteness to emphasize their dissatisfaction with the other party's unpaid debt.

4. **Sarcasm or Mock Politeness**

According to Culpeper (1996), this strategy is done with clear insincerity where someone performs actions or communicates with polite words, but the meaning behind it is inappropriate or dishonest.

A1: Wow, you came on time today. How rare!

A2: Oh, thank you very much. I feel very appreciated.

In this conversational example, A2 is using sarcasm. He responds to A1's comment about punctual attendance with excessive politeness, suggesting that punctual attendance should already be normal, not something out of the ordinary.

5. **Withhold Politeness**

This strategy can be interpreted as an action taken by someone without following the politeness strategy requested by the listener. According to Culpeper (1996), this strategy occurs when politeness does not occur where it is expected.

A1: Can you please help me with this project?

A2: Sorry, I'm really busy right now.

In the example conversation above, A2 restrains his politeness by not giving an overly exaggerated or convoluted explanation. He clearly states that he is busy without adding more details or over-apologizing.

Based on the theory of pragmatics and impoliteness, it can be concluded that language is not just a tool to convey information directly, but also a means of complex social interaction. Pragmatics theory emphasizes the importance of context, communication goals, and social norms in understanding language meaning and communication behavior. This research belongs to the field of pragmatic politeness because impoliteness itself is the opposite of politeness. In pragmatic impoliteness theory, language is used to express disagreement, conflict, or disruptive actions in social interactions. While politeness theory highlights how language is used to maintain harmonious relationships, impoliteness theory highlights the situations in which politeness is violated and how it

occurs. These two theories are intertwined in examining how people use language to interact socially. They show the way people speak and behave according to the situation, as well as how social norms influence the way we communicate.

C. The Function of Impoliteness Strategies

Culpeper divides impoliteness functions into three, namely affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness, and entertaining impoliteness. The following is a further explanation of these three functions:

1. Affective Impoliteness

According to Culpeper (2011) it is explained that this function is a theory of emotion, where humans will feel an emotion such as anger which is a response to frustration, and vent it with aggression. This function leads to an action to express negative or unfriendly emotions towards the conditions experienced. The message conveyed contains feelings of anger, disappointment, or frustration to others without paying attention to the norms of courtesy that are usually expected in communication. Affective impoliteness can make communication situations tense and create tension between the individuals involved. One example of affective impoliteness is laughing at a funeral, which is an act that is not by the norms of politeness that make the situation tense and not conducive.

2. Coercive Impoliteness

Power is one of the factors that influence coercive impoliteness. According to Culpeper (2011), coercive impoliteness is an impolite action that is attempted by the speaker to realign the values between the speaker and the speech partner so that the speaker benefits from the speech partner. It can also be interpreted as an act of forcing or manipulating others to do something or change their behavior according to the wishes expressed by the speaker. This behavior can have a detrimental impact on interpersonal relationships, as it can create discomfort, and tension, or even exacerbate existing conflicts. An example of coercive impoliteness is someone coercing by using verbal threats to get others to do what they want.

3. Entertaining Impoliteness

Entertaining impoliteness is a type of communication that mixes entertainment elements with impoliteness. According to Culpeper (2011), impoliteness can be well designed for listeners to be entertained. Many people feel entertained, but in fact, what is considered a joke by them violates the norms of politeness when communicating which can cause conflict. Although their goal is to entertain, if the joke is accompanied by innuendo, ridicule, or negative

judgment then the behavior is considered impolite. An example of entertaining impoliteness is roasting, where a comedian openly makes jokes or comments that are sharp and demeaning to a particular person or group that are intended for entertainment.

Based on the functions of impoliteness strategies described above, the researcher uses all three functions to analyze. Impoliteness strategies in language have several complex and often indirect functions. One of the main functions is to maintain the authority or social status of speakers in an interaction. The strategy of impoliteness is not only a rude form of communication but also has a complex function in maintaining social relations and expressing emotions. By understanding the different types of impoliteness and their respective functions, Culpeper shows the complexity and diversity of impoliteness strategies in language that go beyond mere impoliteness or rudeness.