

2.1.4. Impoliteness Strategies

Lachenict, one of the linguists, makes a theory about the act of attacking the addressee's face. He makes a term of 'aggravating language' which is the further scope of politeness theory. Aggravating language is a lesson of rude and insulting language (Turner in Bousfield, 2008: 83). Aggravating language has the same goal as the impoliteness strategy in which to attack the addressee's face. Lachenict (1980: 619) has proposed four strategies of 'aggravation'.

First, off record employs an aggravating language with the forms of vague insults, allusions, clues, and irony. Second, bald on record produces face threatening act and interruption directly. Third, positive aggravation shows an aggravation to the hearer that he or she is not accepted as the part of certain group. Fourth, negative aggravation designs an aggravating language which is intended to impose the hearer, disturb his or her freedom, and to damage the position of the hearer in the society.

Moreover, Culpeper also makes a theory which explains an intended act to attack someone's face. He calls his theory as the theory of impoliteness strategy. Compared to Lachenict's strategies, Culpeper's strategies are more comprehensive as they consist of five strategies; meanwhile, Lachenict's strategies consist of four strategies. By using Culpeper's impoliteness strategies, the researcher can gain complete and obvious finding of the data analyzed. Hence, the researcher uses Culpeper's impoliteness strategies to analyze the data. Impoliteness strategies which proposed by Culpeper (1996: 356-357) can be described as follows.

a. Impoliteness

People often express their feelings with impolite language that can cause conflict. They often cannot control their behavior or language when they communicate to others. They do not think about politeness strategy but they prefer to perform impoliteness strategy to express their feelings. According to Bousfield and Locher (2008: 3), impoliteness is a manner which is face-aggravating in a specific situation. It can be defined that impolite act is the behavior which is intended to irritate someone's face.

Eelen (2001: 15) also states that impoliteness is employed by people when they do not return a salutation or they prefer to keep silent. People often expect others to reply the salutation when they communicate. However, in some cases, some people often prefer to keep silent to perform impolite act.

In addition, there are some terms that refer to the same meaning with impoliteness; it is the term of rudeness. The term of impoliteness and rudeness have the same meaning in negative attitude. Rude behavior does not use the strategies of politeness when those strategies are hoped to do, in other ways that the utterance can be meant as deliberately and negatively argumentative (Lakoff, 1989:103).

Culpeper et al. (2003: 1564) also add that impoliteness intends to damage someone's face and it can make a disagreement between people. The use of impolite language also can make the relationship between

contrast, Brown and Levinson's model is about the *speaker* selecting strategies to achieve particular goals. The role of the hearer or target interacting with the speaker is barely mentioned.

A further point that Gumperz emphasizes is methodology: "Empirical methods must be found to determine the extent to which underlying knowledge is shared" (1982: 30). The thrust of Brown and Levinson's work is the traditional one of proposing a model and then testing its predictions against the data. It is not to derive empirically the model from the data, though clearly the data must have informed numerous aspects of the model. To be fair, every output strategy from their model is illustrated, but that does not necessarily mean that it is routine, which is purported to be part of their understanding of a strategy. And even if it is routine, we do not know the extent to which it is, the extent to which knowledge of that strategy is shared. Are some strategies frequent and well-known and others less so? What exactly is understood by the strategy and in what context?

In this paper, I take strategies to be ways of achieving particular goals in interaction that are conventional for a particular community. I understand conventionalization here in the same way as Terkourafi (e.g. 2003), namely, items conventionalized for a particular context of use.

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*

