

Article

Received: 05/12/2017; Accepted: 05/01/2018; Published: 31/01/2018

**Impoliteness and Rudeness
in *Sawungkampret* Comics by Dwi Koendoro**

Ayu Ida Savitri

English Study Program, Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University
e-mail address: aidaarsjaad@gmail.com

Abstract

Impoliteness and rudeness are two different terms referring to similar offensive behaviour. The difference of those terms lays on the intention of speaker in doing the offensive behaviour. Culpeper (1996) introduces Impoliteness Theory as something he calls ‘parasite’ of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) Politeness Theory by exposing five super strategies: Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness, and Withhold Politeness. He also divides impoliteness into three types: Affective, Coercive, and Entertaining. Meanwhile, rudeness is defined as what a speaker said or did –or even not said and done– which offends a hearer and prevents him/her to feel comfortable or convenience with the speaker’s words or acts (Rondina and Workman, 2005:3). It is a kind of negative behaviour which is insensitive or disrespectful reflecting someone’s disregard towards others (Dubrin, 2011:87). In relation with Brown and Levinson (1987) Face Threatening Act (FTA), Beebe (1995) defines rudeness as “an FTA or features of FTA” breaking social interaction norms of the social context of it (in Culpeper, 2011:19). Culpeper (2005) considers impoliteness is done either intentionally or accidentally because impoliteness comes about when: (1) a speaker intentionally hold face-attack communication, or (2) a hearer assumes and/or considers a particular behaviour as “intended face-attacking”, or a combination of (1) and (2)” (in Bousfield and Locher, 2008:131). According to Segara (2007:141), rudeness happens when someone disregard and disobey proper social manners with discourteous intention. It can be said that impoliteness is intentionally or accidentally occurs because of hearer’s linguistics’s incompetence, while rudeness is intentionally happens to offend hearer whether he/she gets offended or not. This research is done to show the difference of impoliteness and rudeness by using *Sawungkampret* Comics created by Dwi Koendoro as data source to get the sample of impoliteness and rudeness. The result shows that impoliteness can be done intentionally or not depending on what a speaker wants to show with his/her impoliteness, the hearer himself/herself gets the effect of impoliteness, and it is mainly used linguistics component. On the other hand, rudeness is done intentionally to show speaker’s want, the hearer and people around him/her get the effect of rudeness, and it uses linguistics component along with culture and the sense of humanities embedded in it.

Keywords; politeness, impoliteness, rudeness

1. Introduction

To hold a successful conversation where speaker is able to deliver his/her message to hearer without causing any misunderstanding, participants of conversation should obey Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975) that says, “makes your communication as it is being required, suitable with the context which it happens, by the understood aim or direction of the message exchange in which you are involved”. He also propose four Maxims (Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner) to make conversation easier and to achieve the aim of the conversation.

Grice’s concept leads to Politeness Theory as -in a good conversation- speaker should be polite to -in addition of being cooperative with- hearer. Two most prominent theories of politeness were proposed by of Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987). Leech (1983) proposes six Maxims of Politeness Principles (Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement and Sympathy) to show that speaker is being polite to hearer to prevent hearer to be offended. Meanwhile, Brown and Levinson (1987) propose a Face-Saving Theory by defining ‘face’ as “public self -image every member wants to claim for himself”, as ‘face’ is “something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must constantly be attended to in interaction”. The face itself is divided into Negative and Positive Face, showing someone’s desire not to be disturbed by others and to be liked or appreciated.

Brown and Levinson (1987) propose Face Threatening Act (FTA) referring to verbal or non verbal act attacking hearer’s face. There are three sociological variables (Social Distance, Relative Power, and Absolute Ranking) to measure the risk of the face-loss, showing that the closer, the more powerful and the higher social rank a speaker has, the higher risk of the face-loss a hearer has. In relation with FTA, there are five types of Politeness Strategies (Bald on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative Politeness, Off Record and Do Not Do the FTA) to redress the face showing the most impolite to the most polite strategi.

Different but related with Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Theory (1987), Culpeper (2011) proposes Impoliteness Theory by defining impoliteness as the languages or the behaviours which are negatively being evaluated by people in a particular context because they attack somebody’s face (identity or rights) and cause specific emotional reactions (e.g. hurt, anger). It is also related with directness-indirectness scale as the more indirect an act is the more polite it is for the hearer, vice versa.

Culpeper (2010) suggests Models of Impoliteness with five Super Strategies by which impoliteness can be created and received as follows.

- (1) Bald on Record Impoliteness: it is done when the face-risk is high where speaker is intended to ruin hearer's face so that impolite utterance will be done directly and clearly by doing Face Attack Act (FAA) with expressly from speaker.

- (2) Positive Impoliteness: it is done to ruin hearer's positive face want (his want to be welcomed by applying 8 (eight) sub-strategies: (a) neglecting or insulting others, (b) rejecting others reasons, (c) choosing "sensitive or undesirable topic" to be discussed, (d) making use of "inappropriate identity markers", (e) not interested in and being antypathy with others, (f) disagreeing others, (g) making use of unclear language and slipping secret within the talk, and (h) making use of "taboo words".
- (3) Negative Impoliteness: it is done to attack hearer's negative face want (his want not to be imposed) by applying 4 (four) sub-strategies: (a) scorn, (b) frighten, (c) ridicule and (d) invade hearer's space literally or metaphorically.
- (4) Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness: it is done when speaker does FTA with obviously insincere politeness strategies, by applying one or more sub-strategies which are superficially agreeable and acceptable but deep deeply have opposite meaning.
- (5) Withhold Politeness: it is done when speaker does not do politeness where it is expected such as says nothing when he/she is supposed to thank hearer.

Culpeper (2011) also exposes three Impoliteness Types as follows.

- (1) Affective Impoliteness: it is done when speaker shows his anger towards hearer that turns "negative emotional atmosphere" on between them.
- (2) Coercive Impoliteness: it is done when speaker gets profit from hearer as a result of the raising inequality of speaker and hearer. It is usually done when speaker has higher position, status and power than hearer to 'get power via language'.
- (3) Entertaining Impoliteness: it is done when speaker make fun of hearer and make use of hearer's feeling to be amused.

Similar but different with impoliteness, Rondina and Workman (2005:3) defines rudeness as 'what say or do -or do not say or do- that offends onthers or makes them feel uncomfortable or inconvenience'. Dubrin (2011:87) considers it as a kind of "insensitive or disrespectful behaviour engaged in by a person displays a lack of regards for others". In line with Brown and Levinson (1987) FTA, Beebe (1995) defines rudeness as "FTA or features of FTA such as intonation -which violates a socially sanctioned norm of interaction of the social context in which it occurs (in Culpeper, 2011:19). Thus, rudeness is language or act of speaker that offends hearer and considered not acceptable for common people. Segarra (2007: 141) suggest three types of rudeness as follows.

- (1) Rudeness of Word: it is done when speaker is (a) cursing; (b) using street language; (c) keeping interrupting others; (d) saying very dirty jokes; or (e) asking hearer whom he/she does not close with, with personal questions.
- (2) Rudeness of Action: it is done when speaker's verbal or non-verbal action is used to (a) insult and underestimate hearer like disrespecting others' feelings and argument; (b) be uncultured with hearer; or (c) ignoring basic rules of etiquette.
- (3) Inaction Rudeness: it is what speaker does not do rather than what he/she does, which covers the absence of required behaviour such as ignoring others while they are talking, not being responsive of others's help request, and being negligent or careless of others.

There are three different aspects of impoliteness and rudeness: (1) the intention of speaker in doing it, (2) who is being offended, (3) the related aspect. This research is aimed at showing the example and the difference of impoliteness and rudeness in *Sawungkampret* Comic created by Dwi Koendoro which shows many forms of impoliteness and rudeness of the main characters.

2. Methods

This descriptive-qualitative research describes impoliteness and rudeness of utterances and acts of the main characters of *Sawungkampret* Comics, action but comical comics with historical background, created by Dwi Koendoro. The main character -Sawungkampret- is the descendant of Panji Koming and Pailul, the main characters of *Panji Koming* comic strips once published in *Kompas* daily newspaper. This comic shows impolite and rude speeches since the two main characters Sawungkampret and Na'ip are using Indonesian mixed with Betawi and East Javanese languages in impolite and rude way. They also do impolite and rude acts which offend people around them.

To describe the impoliteness, I use Culpeper (1996) Impoliteness Theory with its five Super Strategies and the three Impoliteness Types, while to describe the rudeness, I use Segarra (2007) Rudeness Types. The data were collected from *Sawungkampret* Comics 1 and 2 as the primary data source by taking note of utterances and showing acts of Sawungkampret and Na'ip as the population of research by using Note Taking Technique and then selecting utterances and acts containing impoliteness and rudeness as the sample of research by using Purposive Sampling Technique. The data were then analysed by using Culpeper (1996) Impoliteness Theory and Segarra (2007) Rudeness Types to describe the impolite and rude speeches and acts.

3. Results and Discussion

Impoliteness and Rudeness in *Sawungkampret* Comic 1 and 2 by Dwi Koendoro

3.1. Impoliteness

3.1.1 Bald on Record Impoliteness



Sawungkampret 1, Pp.3.

Sawung (S) to Naip (N):

“Kamu curang! Potong kompas lewat bawah kapal! Pantas duluan sampai!”

[You are cheating! (You) cut the way under the ship! No wonder you won!]

In this situation, S is being upset with N since N is winning their swimming race by cheating S (N is cutting the way under the ship). S is doing Bald on Record Impoliteness by directly and clearly stating that N is cheating on him through his utterance, **“Kamu curang!”**. This sentence can be considered as a Face Attack Act (FAA)

with deliberate intention from speaker as S really wants to insult N who is cheating on S. What S said have a high risk of N being insulted since it is damaging N's face as N might get upset or sad after getting caught of doing a mistake. This type of Impoliteness is intentionally done by speaker to impolitely show that hearer is doing improper act; the one who are getting offended is only hearer; and the related aspect is linguistics as it used a sentence to do it.

3.1.2 Positive Impoliteness Denying Common Ground with The Hearer



Sawungkampret 1, Pp. 16
Doktor Van Klompen (DVK):
“*Jangan cederai Tan Ping San! Ik punya batangan emas, tapi ik ambil dulu di benteng.*”
[Do not hurt Tan Ping San! I have gold bar, but I must take it first from the fortress.]
JP Coen (JPC) 's soldier:
“*Alaa...paling-paling bohong. Londo miskin mbambung begini mana mungkin punya emas!*”
[Ah...(you are) just lying. Poor and pathetic Dutch like this would not have any gold bar.]

In this situation, a Javanese soldier working for the Dutch colonial is collecting tax from commoners. He is doing Positive Impoliteness of Denying Common Ground with The Hearer by denying what DVK said that he owns gold bar through his utterance, “*Alaa...paling-paling bohong*” meaning that he does not believe of what DVK said. What he said is damaging DVK's positive face want (his desire to be accepted) as DVK is an honoured man who will not lying to other. This type of Positive Impoliteness is not intentionally done by speaker to hurt hearer's feeling as he only said what he think is right based on what he sees, the one who are getting offended is only hearer; and the related aspect is linguistics as it used sentence to do it.

3.1.3 Withhold Politeness



Sawungkampret 2, Pp. 50.
Meeting participant:
“*Meja rapatnya di mana sih?*”
[Where is the table actually?]
Other meeting participants:
[say nothing to answer the question]

In this situation, all meeting participants are covered with medical plaster as they were injured in the gladiator arena by S and N. One of the meeting participants is sitting behind the meeting table, facing at the wall. When he cannot find the meeting table, he asks the other meeting participants where the meeting table is, nobody answers him. The meeting participants who keep silent are doing Withhold Politeness by not

performing politeness where it is expected as they are saying nothing to answer his question. What they do is impolite but they are doing it because they are all in the same condition with him but still able to sit properly facing at the meeting table, not the wall. This type of impoliteness is not intentionally done by speakers as they are also in the same condition with hearer but the sitting position, the one who are getting offended is only hearer if he knows that only him who is sitting facing the wall; and the related aspect is linguistics as it used language (as silent is also considered as one form of communication although it does not involved any word) to do it.

3.2. Rudeness

3.2.2 Rudeness of Action

‘disdain or belittle people like disregarding other’s feelings and opinions’



Sawungkampret 2, Pp. 52 (three panels)

Na'ip (N): “*Keblangsak lu, Sawung. Sepatu gua diiket sama kambing.*”

[Damn you, Sawung. My shoe lace is tied to a goat.]

Tan Mei Ling (TML): “*Bang Sawung kelewatan deh.*”

[Bang Sawung gets too much.]

Sawung (S): “*Tenang saja mbah. Rasanya Naip bakal tiba duluan di Rawabelong.*”

[Relax grandpa, I think Naip will arrive first at Rawabelong.]

N: “*Ketawa terus gua gampar lu!*”

[Keep laughing and I will slap you on your face!]

In this situation, S is doing a prank on N. As N always fails to tie his shoe laces up, S ties N's shoe lace up on a goat he owned. When the goat runs, N is being dragged by it. Instead of helping N, S only smiles at N's condition and even makes a joke of it by saying that N will be arrived first. S is doing Rudeness of Action by disregarding N's feelings as he is smiling at N's condition instead of helping him or being quiet. It even makes TML says that S is being too bad at N. This Rudeness of Action is intentionally done by speaker to show that what happen to hearer is so funny for him, the one who are getting offended is not only hearer but also other people around hearer who sees speaker's action as it is improper to do, and the related aspect not only linguistics (as laugh is also one form of communication although it does not involved any word) but also culture as speaker knows that it is improper to laugh at someone's pain but he still uses it to show that he is enjoying hearer's suffer.

4.2.3 Inaction Rudeness



Sawungkampret 2, Pp. 48.

Tan Ping San (TPS):

"Hayo! Tadi malem maen kamana?!!! Sawung jangan diem aja!"

[Where are you last night? Answer me!]

Sawung (S): "Criwit!!!"

[commenting TML's complain to TPS]

[S does not answer TPS's question]

In this situation, TPS asks S about his existence last night. Instead of answering the question, S talks about something else –not to TPS but to his sister, TML. S is doing Inaction Rudeness by neglecting TPS while he was talking to him and not answering TPS's question. What he does is considered as eliminating compulsory behaviours like neglecting people while they are talking; not responding to other's request of help; or ignoring and disregarding people since he is neglecting TPS (by not responding to his question and being careless at him). What he does is rude that makes TML also gets upset like his brother. This Inaction Rudeness is intentionally done by speaker to show that he does not want to answer the question as he does not want TPS to know what happened. The one who are getting offended is not only TPS but also TML as it is improper to do, and the related aspect is not only linguistics (as silent is also one form of communication although it does not involved any word) but also culture and humanities as speaker knows that it is improper to do but still does it to avoid something.

5. Conclusion

From the discussion of this research, there are only two impoliteness types found in the data. Affective Impoliteness happens when Sawung shows his anger toward Na'ip in Bald On Record Impoliteness which triggers Naip anger. Meanwhile, Entertaining Impoliteness occurs when Sawung laughs at Naip in Rudeness of Action where Sawung makes fun of Naip's suffer when his leg gets stuck on Sawung's goat after Sawung tied his shoe lace on that goat as Naip's feeling makes Sawung laughs even harder.

In impoliteness, (1) speakers are not always intentionally do the impoliteness as they are not always intended to offend hearers, (2) the one who got offended by speaker's impoliteness are hearers, and (3) impoliteness are mostly done in the form of linguistics component such as sentence. In rudeness, (1) speakers are always intentionally do the impoliteness as they are always intended to offend hearers, (2) the one who got offended by the speaker's rudeness are hearers and people around them as rudeness can be widely unacceptable in a common situation (sometimes it is universal), and (3) rudeness are done in the form of linguistics component with humanities (and culture) embedded in it as something is considered rude for a certain people in a certain culture. In addition to the conclusion, there are three types of impoliteness in the discussed data.

References

- [1] Brown, P. & Levinson, S. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987. B.
- [2] Culpeper, J. & Kàdàr, D. *Historical (Im)politeness*. Bern: Peter Lang. 2010.
- [3] Culpeper, J. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2011.
- [4] Dubrin, J. A. *Impression Management in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice*. New York: Routledge. 2011.
- [5] Kundoro, Dwi. *Asal-Usul Sawungkampret dan Pendekar Baju Belang dan Pipi Tembem Bagian 1*. Bandung; Mizan.
- [6] Kundoro, Dwi. *Asal-Usul Sawungkampret dan Pendekar Baju Belang dan Pipi Tembem Bagian 2*. Bandung; Mizan.
- [7] Leech, G. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman. 1983.
- [8] Rondina, C. & Workman, D. *Rudeness: Deal with It If You Please*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd. 2005.
- [9] Segarra, C. *How to Become a True Professional*. USA: Xulon Press. 2007.
- [10] Thomas, J. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman. 1995.
- [11] Yule, George. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996.