

IMPOLITENESS IN TANJUNG AGUNG TRADITIONAL MARKET

Rini Afrilesa, Jelita Untari, Merdeka Putri Kh. R. A, Rina

English Department, Faculty of Language, Muara Bungo University, Jambi, Indonesia.

Abstract

This research investigates linguistic impoliteness used in Tanjung Agung Traditional Market through the examination of impoliteness strategies proposed by Jonathan Culpeper. It examines how impoliteness are used on the traditional market of Tanjung Agung Village. The research uses descriptive qualitative method. First, The writer found that people in the market sometime use impoliteness strategies in daily life, usually can be in the Market. It can be happen between the buyers and sellers conversation to express the negative attitude in the Traditional market. Second, the writers found that four out of the impoliteness in Tanjung Agung Traditional Market.

Keywords : Impoliteness Strategies, Traditional Market, Tanjung Agung.

INTRODUCTION

Language is a communication tool used by humans to be able to express or convey their ideas and thoughts. language can also express self, connection, and understanding. Language includes various forms, including written, spoken, and signed.

According to Brown (2000:5), language is a system of arbitrary conventionalized vocal, written or gestural symbol that enable members of a given community to communicate intelligibly with one another. It means that language cannot be separated from human because they use it as a way of communication. In learning of language we cannot be separated from linguistic because linguistic is the relationship between language and society.

Robin Lakoff (1989:116) suggested two underlying rules of pragmatic competence; be clear and be polite. Ideally, the speakers must fulfil both requirements,

but sometimes the rules conflict. Talking about politeness, sometimes speech also gets impolite words and actions seen from the situation of the place and its use. Politeness refers to behavior, gestures, language to show respect and politeness to others. it shows politeness to social and norms. politeness is important and valued across cultures. Politeness can be seen and expressed in writing, speech and actions. Impoliteness leads to rude and impolite behavior. this is like insulting social norms, ethics, or other people's feelings. Impoliteness can also take the form of various ways, namely, offending someone, demeaning and belittling others. Disrespect has several synonyms in English and somehow they all refer to negative behavioral evaluations. According to Culpeper (2010: 3233), because it attacks a person's identity or rights, and causes certain emotional reactions such as anger or hurt.

This has been directly linked to speaker intent and listener perception.

Tanjung Agung is a village located in Muko Muko Batin VII sub-district, Bungo district, Jambi province. Therefore, in this study the author will examine the phenomenon of impoliteness by investigating participants in serving customers by using the five impoliteness strategies as a means of attacking faces proposed by Culpeper, namely; on a note of rudeness, positive irreverence, negative irreverence, sarcasm or feigned politeness, and withholding politeness; and the second is knowing the most used strategies for expressing impoliteness in language or behavior.

Spencer-Oatey (2007:642) states that the definition of face is related to the attributes that speakers and situational contingents want to recognize. Faces may imply different types of wants or facial desires that people have. Faces can be conceptualized as positive or negative. A positive face refers to a desire to be appreciated or approved, whereas a negative face refers to a basic claim to personal territory and persistence. When the face is attacked, there will be a lack of politeness which leads to impoliteness in communication. Establishing a definition and theory of politeness has proved somewhat problematic as there is no established theoretical framework that can be used properly. With regard to this study, Culpeper's definition of impoliteness is used as follows:

According to Culpeper (2010: 3233), impoliteness is a negative attitude towards certain behaviors that occur in certain

situations and contexts. It is supported by expectations, desires and/or beliefs about social organization, including, in particular, how one's or group's identity is mediated by others in interaction. Through this research, the writer wants to monitor the impoliteness strategies by Culpeper (1996, 2003, and 2005) in order to find out which strategies are mostly used by most of the market community in Tanjung Agung village in serving buyers. The strategies were note impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or feigned politeness, and withholding politeness which were systematically related to the level of face threat from lowest to highest. These five strategies are related to three crucial social variables; relative strength, social distance, and the strength of the actions involved (otherwise referred to as strength, solidarity, and weight). Bald On Record of Immodesty

The act of face threat (FTA), a threat to someone's face, is carried out in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is irrelevant or minimized. According to Brown and Levinson (1987:69), This is the most obvious and straightforward impiety.

1. Positive Disrespect

Refers to strategies designed to undermine the recipient's positive face desire, the desire to be appreciated or approved. These strategies include ignoring others, excluding others from an activity, not interested, uncaring, unsympathetic, using inappropriate identity markers, using unclear or secret language, seeking disagreement, using taboo words, using inappropriate speech.

2. Negative disrespect

It attacks the negative face of the recipient, which is the basic claim to territory, personal protection, right not to be disturbed – namely freedom of action and freedom from coercion. Scaring, demeaning, ridiculing or mocking, humiliating, not taking others seriously, belittling others, invading other people's spaces (literally or figuratively), explicitly associating others with negative aspects (personalizing, using the pronoun “I” and “You”), and recording debts of other parties are included in the strategy of negative impoliteness.

3. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Here, the FTA is conducted using a decidedly disingenuous politeness strategy, and thus remains a surface realization. The two strategies are the same, making impolite utterances because the intentions are clearly not sincere. It is closely related to context and it is surface politeness which can be interpreted as impolite due to certain contextual clues and intentions not to offend but rather to indicate social intimacy. Often one has to know the person well to understand that he is being sarcastic, mocking you, or that he is joking.

4. Withhold Politeness

The meaning of politeness that is expected in certain situations but is abandoned for some reason. For example, Culpeper (1996: 357) argues, impoliteness can be manifested through, "a lack of politeness at work where it is expected." Then, Culpeper (2005: 42) gave an example that "not thanking someone for a gift can be considered as intentional impoliteness".

METHODS

Linguistic scholars seeking to answer question about impoliteness and the strategies have found experimental and quantitative methods to be insufficient in explaining the phenomenon they wish to study. Therefore, the research is decided to use descriptive qualitative approach supported by quantitative data in order to explore behaviour, perspective, feeling, and experience as impoliteness. The techniques which used are analysis language use in the Tanjung Agung Traditional market.

The source of the data were taken by Tanjung Agung Tradional Market. So the data would be the language use of the people in the market, the data can be taken by conversation in all of the people from the village. After the writer come and have a analysis on the market, the writer found 14

impoliteness that used by buyers and sellers in making transactions. In this analyze the writer

Table 1. The Findings of Impoliteness Strategies Used

No.	Model of Impoliteness	Number of Findings
1	Positive Impoliteness (PI)	4
2	Negative Impoliteness (NI)	6
3	Bald on Record Impoliteness (BOR)	1
4	Sarcasm / Mock Politeness (MP)	7
5	Withhold Politeness (WP)	0
	TOTAL	18

just have one day for finding the data that is in June 11 2023. When the data had been collected, the writer would sort them as

polite or impolite. The writer surely referred to the theory from Culpeper about the definition of impoliteness which is a negative attitude toward specific behaviours occurring in a specific context. The writer would detect any impolite utterances came through the five strategies of impoliteness:

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

From 14 Utterances collected for a day thorough on the Tanjung Agung Tradional Market. the writer finally got the finding of strategies used and mostly used by Indonesian participants. The findings show that from five impoliteness strategies proposed by Jonathan Culpeper (1996:356-7, 2005:41-2), there is one strategy that Indonesian participants do not use, i.e. withhold politeness. After doing the analysis the writer found that people in the market use positive strategy followed by negative impoliteness. The reason why the data that writer found is a little, because the writer do the research directly in the Tanjung Agung Traditional Market.

a. A Positive Impoliteness

It exists to employ strategies aimed at undermining the positive face of the intended recipient. A positive face indicates, for example, a need to be wanted; If someone suggests doing it together, they're showing interest in the other person's positive face.

- Topic : a seller at the Tanjung Agung Traditional Market calls other sellers using only exclamatory words, without any name calling.

Penjual : “*Hu hu! hu!*”

Seller : “*Hu hu! hu!*”

The author takes this material because the writer considers this to be an impolite act for calling other people without mentioning their names or other frills. Even

though it seems close, this action cannot be justified because the expression of the recipient/interlocutor shows an uncomfortable face as well.

- Topic : A girl around the age of 7 ran from quite a distance and screamed when she was going to buy something she wanted while running.

Anak Perempuan : “*Beliii, beli Sasa!*.” (Brand of one sachet cooking seasoning)

Girl : “*I want to buy, a Sasa!*”

Yelling at elders is certainly an act of impolite, especially when the girl was screaming while running when she was about to buy.

- Topic : Visitors who pass food when offered by the seller

Pengunjung : “*Iko, lah makan.*”

Visitor : “*I have eaten.*”

The narrow market aisle creates jostling, a seller selling food (the position of the food is below, covered with a table 1/2 meter from the ground.) calls visitors who seem to already know him to buy his wares. but the market visitors only replied briefly while passing the food underneath. Whether consciously or not, but his casual words with his slightly uncomfortable actions made the seller's face a little annoyed.

b. Negative Impoliteness

Negative politeness strategies are designed to destroy the recipient's desire for a negative face. A negative face indicates a need not to push or annoy others. For example; When someone says they're going

to leave you alone so you can concentrate, they're attracted to the negative faces of other people. This strategy is the second most used abusive strategy. This often appears as a combination strategy of positivity and respect. This is possible because this strategy has a long list of sub-strategies compared to other strategies. Many performance strategies support both positive and negative disrespect strategies; ignoring, not caring, looking for differences, ridiculing, belittling others, scaring etc. The strategy can be seen in the following examples:

- Topic : The code of seller's talk at the Tanjung Agung traditional market.
Penjual : “Cair~”
Seller : “Cash~”

Although everyone knows what he means, expressing it in public is very impolite. especially the seller said while showing off the money he got. while other sellers may not be so lucky. Because the sellers' positions were close to each other, of course many sellers were aware of the incident, this action invited the gazes of other sellers who were nearby.

- Topic : Asking inappropriate things to say to new people.

Penjual : “Ado chip, dek?”

Seller : “Do you have a ‘Chip’?”

A salesperson asks something that is inappropriate to say to new people, it just so happens that the person being spoken to is the writer. Before saying that, the seller first asks about our presence in the market, asks what we want to buy and so on. the next conversation that comes out, maybe the seller feels close to the visitors who come.

- Topic : Sellers and buyers

who are arguing a bit about toys that are no longer for sale.

Penjual : “Itu mainan dah lamo, dak ado lagi.”

Seller : “It's an old toy, now no one is selling it anymore.”

The buyer shows the cell phone to the seller, showing a toy he is looking for. however, since the toy is no longer for sale, the seller insists that the toy is old and no one is selling it anymore. buyers who feel disappointed show their dislike through expressions when they don't get what they want, moreover the seller explains that the toy he is looking for is a toy that has been out for a long time and currently no one is selling it anymore.

- Topic : One of the unfriendly sellers when a buyer asks.

Penjual : “Cabe Curuk, Jangkat.”

Seller : “Curuk’s chilli, Jangkat’s chilli.”

Without any pleasantries or saying a word like a seller in general who offers his wares, this seller tends to be curt and outspoken. The seller, who is estimated to be 47 years old, only replies briefly and concisely the name of the chili he sells. however, it makes shoppers feel neglected and irritated with an unfriendly attitude. no smiling or interacting/gazing with buyers, adding tension when talking. the author also immediately approached and asked the same thing as other visitors and the results were completely the same as the service to previous visitors. proven, maybe the character of the seller is not friendly, but it's a shame because the writer and his fellow researchers also feel uncomfortable and also

feel annoyed.

c. Bald Record Impoliteness

Bald Record Impoliteness is the most obvious and direct rudeness. This strategy is usually used when many faces are at stake and the speaker intends to attack the listener's face and/or the speaker does not have the (safe) power to say the offensive word. proverb Usually used by people who have a close relationship. Staretyg application is shown below:

- Topic : complaints from a visitor, women around the age of 30 who want to get their motorbikes out of the parking lot.

Pengunjung : *"Kan aku dah bekato, di stang (motornya)"*

Visitor : "I already told you, the motorbike is locked on the handlebars."

This complaint occurred when previously there was distrust between visitors (let's call it visitor A) and visitor B (who could not get his motorbike out). Visitor A was adamant that visitor B's motorbike could get out even though the situation was really busy, but in fact the motorbike parked behind visitor B was locked so he couldn't get out. Visitor B was annoyed because his words were ignored, until finally visitor A realized by himself that the motorbike behind him was locked. Be a Bold Record Impoliteness conversation visitor B spoken.

d. Sarcasm/Mock Impoliteness

Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness means that the act of threatening face is done

Pembeli : *"Woi dak dapek!"*

Buyer: "can't get it!"

with a politeness strategy that is clearly not genuine and thus remains a surface perception. There are many types of impoliteness Sarcasm found during research. The following is an example of speech that shows the politeness strategy of sarcasm or pretend that the writer found.

- Topic : visitors who are protesting to the seller who is selling meatballs with other buyers.

Pengunjung A : *"Bang, punyo kami lah bang?"* **Pengunjung B :**

"Sabar bu, antri." **Pengunjung**

A : *"Eyy lah dari tadi."* **Visitor A**

: "Sir, is my order finished?"

Visitor B : "Be patient please,

wait in line." **Visitor A :** "Eyy, I ordered earlier."

The researcher saw for himself how visitor A complained because his order had not been completed, even though he said he had already ordered. but in reality, visitor A only came after visitor B and the researcher came to queue for the meatballs. The short sentence he uttered was indeed sarcastic even though in truth it was visitor A whowas in the wrong here. however, other visitors queued quietly if visitor A didn't pester and pretentiously came first, not to mention the sarcasm that was issued as if he was the one being ignored even though he was the one being impolite.

- Topic : Sarcasm from the seller to the customer.

Penjual : *"Ini bukan lagi nonton, nih."*

Seller : "All waiting in line not watching."

It started because a visitor came to buy meatballs and asked the seller whether they were still waiting in line for a

long time and whether theirs had been wrapped. the seller seemed annoyed to be asked that, because it was clear that many people had joined the queue and had been waiting since earlier.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This research is about impoliteness strategies used by people in the Tanjung Agung Traditional Market. After conducting research the authors found a lot of impoliteness that is used in the market. There are four types of impoliteness proposed by the culper to be used by the community in the Tanjung Agung market and and the most widely used impoliteness is Sarcasm or mock politeness.

Based on the journal above the writers found four from types impolitenese by Culpeper there are bald on record of impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. In the journal the writers

found 1 (one) data of bald on record impoliteness, 4(four) data of positive impoliteness, 6 (six) data of Negative impoliteness, 7 (Seven) of Sarcasm or mock politeness, while for hold courtesy impoliteness the writer did not find a single data.

Though this study does not discuss polite behaviour in traditional market situation, it does not imply that all communication is carried out in impolite ways. Hopefully this research may reveal impoliteness phenomenon in Indonesian context and give some contributions, having better understanding toward notion of impoliteness and strategies used, on linguistic research which is rarely done by researcher in Indonesia. Such judgement of (im)polite are part of a nevaluation not of the language but the people and the cultural values that a particular group, in this case is impoliteness in Tanjung Agung Traditional market.

REFERENCES

- Allan, K., and Burridge, K., (2006).
Forbidden Words: Taboo and
the Censoring of Language.
Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.
- Bonvillain, N. (2011). Language,
culture, and communication:
the meaning of message, 6th
Ed.
USA: Pearson Prentice Hall
- Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness
in Interaction.
Amsterdam: John Benjamins
Publishing Company.
- Brown, P., and Levinson, S. C. (1987).
Politeness: Some Universal sin

- Language Usage. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2006). Language and the
internet, 2nd Ed. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards
an anatomy of impoliteness.
Journal of Pragmatics 25:349-
367.
- Culpeper, J., Derek B., and Anne W.
(2003). Impoliteness re-
visited: With special reference
to dynamic and prosodi
caspects. Journal of
Pragmatics 35: 1545- 1579.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and
entertainment in the television

- quiz show: The Weakest Link, Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture 1:35-72.
- Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalised impoliteness formulae. Journal of Pragmatics, Volume 42, 3232-3245.
- Culpeper, J. (2011a). Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Denzin N. And Lincoln Y. (Eds.) (2000). Hand book of Qualitative Research. London: Sage Publication
- In c. Duthler, K. W. (2006). The Politeness of Requests Made via Email and Voice Mail: Support for the hyper-personal Model. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. Vol. 11. P. 500-521.
- Eelen, G. (2001). A critique of Politeness Theories. Manchester, U.K.: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Ige Olamide, B. (2007). Impoliteness in Context: Impoliteness, Gender and Construction of identities at a South African University. Durban: University of Kwa Zulu-Natal.
- Kuntjara, E. (2012). Gender, Bahasa, dan Kekuasaan. Jakarta: Libri
- Laitinen, M. (2011). Breaking the Rules of Communication: Verbal and non verbal impoliteness in the American hospital drama House M.D. Finland: University of Jyväskylä
- Lakoff, R. (1989). "The limits of politeness." Multilingua 8:101-129.
- Locher, M. A. and Derek B. (2008). Introduction. In Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher (eds.), Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice (Language, Power and Social Process 21), 1- 13 .Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2007). Theories of identity and the analysis of face. Journal of Pragmatics 39:639-656.
- Trenholm, S., and Jensen, A. (2008). Interpersonal communication. 6th Ed. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.