



**IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES USED IN LIONEL LOGUE'S  
UTTERANCES IN *THE KING'S SPEECH* MOVIE**

**THESIS**

Written by

**KHUSNUL KHOTIMAH**

**NIM 080110191045**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT**

**FACULTY OF LETTERS**

**JEMBER UNIVERSITY**

**2015**



**IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES USED IN LIONEL LOGUE'S  
UTTERANCES IN *THE KING'S SPEECH* MOVIE**

**THESIS**

A Thesis Presented to the English Department,  
Faculty of Letters, Jember University, as  
One of the Requirements to Obtain the  
Award of Sarjana Sastra Degree  
in English Studies

**Written by:**

**KHUSNUL KHOTIMAH**

**NIM 080110191045**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT  
FACULTY OF LETTERS  
JEMBER UNIVERSITY**

**2015**

## DEDICATION

This thesis is highly dedicated to:

1. My beloved parents for their unwavering love, prayers, patience and supports. I thank them for everything that happened in this world to me;
2. My dear sister Novia Ratna Dewi, S.E. and Eka Puji Nuraini, for colouring my life with their smile and joy;
3. All of my friends in Faculty of Letters, academic year of 2008, I thank them for their hospitality and best friendship during the years in Faculty of Letters;
4. My Alma Mater.

**MOTTO**

*“Do what you fear and fear disappears”*

(David Joseph Schwartz)



## DECLARATION

I hereby state that the thesis entitled *Impoliteness Strategies Used in Lionel Logue's Utterances in the King's Speech Movie* is an original piece of writing. I certify that the analysis and the research described in this thesis have never been submitted for any other degree or any publications. I certify to the best of my knowledge that all sources used and any help received in the preparation of this thesis have been acknowledged.

Jember, December 17, 2015

The writer,

Khusnul Khotimah

NIM 080110191045

**APPROVAL SHEET**

Approved and received by the examination committee of the English Department, Faculty of Letters, Jember University.

Day : Thursday

Date : 17 December 2015

Place : Faculty of Letters, Jember University

Chairman

Secretary

Drs. Syamsul Anam, M.A.

Hari Supriono, S.S.,MEIL

NIP. 195909181988021001

NIP. 197903152006041001

The Members:

1. Prof. Dr. Samudji, M.A.

(.....)

NIP. 194808161976031002

2. Sabta Diana, S.S., M.A.

(.....)

NIP. 197509192006042001

Approved by the Dean,

Dr. HairusSalikin, M.Ed

NIP. 196310151989021001

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise to Allah the almighty, the Lord of the universe. I am grateful as with His gracious help, I can finish the thesis well. I am sure without His mercies; it is hard for me to carry out this writing.

I also would like to thank to the following people:

1. Dr. HairusSalikin, M.Ed, the Dean of the Faculty of Letters, and Dra. Supiastutik, M.Pd., the Head of English Department, for giving me the chance to write this thesis;
2. My first supervisor, Drs. Syamsul Anam, M.A. who gives his intellectual inspiration and advises to me in writing this thesis;
3. Hari Supriono, S.S., MEIL my second advisor for his encouraging advices, guidance, inspiration, assistance, and patience in writing this thesis;
4. My academic supervisor, Reni Kusumaningputri, S.S., M.Pd. for her advices during my academic years;
5. All of the lecturers of the English Department who have given me the valuable knowledge during my academic years.

Jember, 17 December 2015

Khusnul Khotimah

## SUMMARY

**Impoliteness Strategies Used in Lionel's Utterances in The King's Speech Movie;** KhusnulKhotimah, 080110191045; 2015: 47 pages; English Department, Faculty of Letters, Jember University.

The objective of this study is to examine the language strategy used by the character of Lionel Logue in a movie entitled The King's Speech. It is conducted to reveal his impoliteness strategy represented in the movie and the function of impoliteness in it. The investigation is based on Culpeper (1996) impoliteness strategies they are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness.

This study applies qualitative method to analyze the data. Qualitative method is applied to describe the data in the form of sentences in the movie script. The movie subtitle as one of the data is taken from <http://www.yifysubtitles.com/subtitles/the-kings-speech-english-yify-948> [October 21, 2014]. The data are collected by using purposive sampling. The finding of this study exposes that Lionel Logue in this movie only uses three types of impoliteness; bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. Through this analysis, it is proved that it seems Lionel employs impoliteness to gain an equal status in order to make his hearer feel close to him.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<b>FRONTISPICES</b> .....	i
<b>DEDICATION PAGE</b> .....	ii
<b>MOTTO</b> .....	iii
<b>DECLARATION PAGE</b> .....	iv
<b>APPROVAL SHEET</b> .....	v
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....	vi
<b>SUMMARY</b> .....	vii
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	viii
<b>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>1.1 Background of the Study</b> .....	1
<b>1.2 Research Topics</b> .....	4
<b>1.3 Research Problems</b> .....	4
<b>1.4 Purposes</b> .....	4
<b>1.5 Research Questions</b> .....	5
<b>1.6 Goals of the Study</b> .....	5
<b>1.7 The Significance of the Study</b> .....	5
<b>1.8 The Organization of study</b> .....	6
<b>CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL REVIEW</b> .....	7
<b>2.1 Previous Researches</b> .....	7
<b>2.2 Theoretical Framework</b> .....	9
2.2.1 Pragmatics .....	9
2.2.2 Politeness and Face .....	11
2.2.3 Impoliteness .....	19
2.2.4 Responses to Impoliteness .....	22
2.2.5 Context of Situation .....	25

<b>CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.1 Type of Research .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.2 Type of the Data .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.3 Data Collection .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.4 Data Processing .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.5 Data Analysis .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4.1 Summary of “The King’s Speech” .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4.2 The Discussions .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>4.2 The Findings .....</b>	<b>32</b>
4.3.1 The Impoliteness Strategies Analysis .....	33
4.3.2 The Function of Impoliteness strategies .....	42
<b>CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>47</b>

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides the complete introduction to the thesis. It will elaborate the background of the study, research topic, research problems, purposes, research questions, the goals of the study, the significance of the study, and the organization of the study which are going to introduce further what this thesis is about.

### 1.1 Background of the Study

People use language as tool of communication. Through communication people can interact with each other. Besides, language can also be used to maintain the social relationship.

To maintain harmonious relationship, people have to conduct their speech well in order to make the conversation run smoothly. There is a language strategy that can be applied to fulfil these purposes, namely the “politeness strategy”. One of the most well-known theorists of politeness is Brown and Levinson’s (1987). Brown and Levinson (1987) define politeness as a universal feature of language use, which means that every language has its own ways to express politeness. Furthermore, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness strategy is developed or used in order to save the hearers' "face". Face refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself.

In Brown and Levinson’s (1987:62) account, face is divided into two concepts: *positive* and *negative face*. Positive face is “the wants that a member wants other to find desirable; such as love, liberty, and piety”. Thus a disagreement toward one’s opinion has failed to maintain the positive face. Negative face is “the wants that his action be unimpeded by others” (1978:62).

Then, any act that failed to maintain the positive and negative face wants is known as face-threatening acts (FTA).

Thus, to minimize or avoid FTA people use certain strategy. Brown and Levinson (1978) proposed 5 strategies that could help speaker to communicate more politely and save other's face. The strategies are: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record and not doing the FTA. In brief, politeness, which function is to soften the FTA, concerns with how people employ communicative strategy to maintain social harmony. From this explanation, speaker is expected to preserve his/her hearer's negative and positive face to get the successful communication.

In fact, impoliteness strategy also occurs in daily life conversation. It is really hard to determine which one is polite or impolite because first, different person (speaker or hearer) will interpret it differently depending on the context, culture, and other factors. Second, the rules related to attitude and behaviour in communication is commonly unwritten.

Culpeper (1996) takes Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness as the underlying point of departure for his work. Culpeper (in Bousfield, 2008:83) defines impoliteness as the use of communication strategy that attack one's interlocutor and cause disharmony and/or social disruption (rather than promoting or maintaining social harmony, which is the purpose of politeness strategy). The impoliteness strategies proposed by him are (a) bald on record impoliteness (b) positive impoliteness (c) negative impoliteness (d) mock politeness (e) withhold politeness.

This language phenomenon on impoliteness can also be seen in the form of movie. *The King's Speech* movie directed by Tom Hooper from a script written by David Seidler, is chosen as the object of this study. *The King's Speech* movie or film is one of famous historical drama films released in the United Kingdom on 7 January 2011 that receives a number of awards. This film won seven BAFTAs, won four Academy Awards, Oscar Award, Grammy Award, Eagle Award and many others. It has 118 minutes long starring Colin Firth as King George VI

(Prince Albert Frederick Arthur George) and Geoffrey Rush as Lionel Logue, a speech therapist who helped Prince Albert to overcome his stammer.

The study concerned with Lionel Logue's utterances because Logue is an interesting character since the language that he uses can be so problematic. Logue was famous with his unconventional methods and relationship to help assisting in curing the Prince's stammer. Lionel and Prince Albert's relationship is often an antagonistic one because Lionel feels the need for the two to be equals during their sessions. Whoever the patients, Logue just accepts them on his consultation room. There is no exception, including his special patient, The Prince.

This equality can be seen on the language he uses. In English, for instance when we talk to a person we do not know well, it is appropriate to address them as Mr. or Mrs instead of their real name or their nick name. But in this film, Logue shows the opposite. For example, in the first meeting with the Prince, Logue refers to the Prince as "Bertie" instead of royal highness. He also debates and answers back to what Bertie says. Lionel refuses to let Bertie smoke during their speech sessions, saying "sucking smoke into your lungs will kill you." These examples of manner are considered impolite and breaches royal etiquette. Moreover, Bertie is not used to such dealings with a commoner. Hence, by knowing what kinds of language impoliteness strategies used by Lionel, we get deep insight of the kinds and the role of impoliteness strategies that Lionel Logue used in the film.

Therefore, I take this movie because first a movie is one of the media to show the existence of language. *The King's Speech* movie is chosen for this study since it reflects the characters and events in real world. Moreover, this movie is one of the famous historical drama films that receive many of awards. In addition, it also shows the impoliteness strategy used by the characters especially Logue when communicating with George VI.

For these reasons, under the title *Impoliteness Strategies used in Lionel Logue's utterances in The King's Speech movie*, this study applies Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategy to analyze Logue's utterances.



## 1.2 Research Topics

The research topic of this study is the impoliteness strategies performed by Logue. There are some impoliteness strategies that Lionel used in communication. By evaluating the impoliteness strategy, the role of impoliteness strategies used by character can be understood.

## 1.3 Research Problems

People are expected to use polite speech when they communicate with others to save both positive and negative face wants by using politeness strategy. However, in this film, the phenomenon in language interaction namely impoliteness also occurs. Thus, this research is conducted to figure out the types of impoliteness strategy performed in Logue's utterances. In addition, it tries to figure out the role of impoliteness strategy used by character, Lionel Logue on the film.

## 1.4 Purposes

The aims of this research are to investigate the use of impolite utterances and how they are received by the character on the film and to show the role of impoliteness in the interactional communication. This is attempted by the following research questions.

## 1.5 Research Questions

Based on the problems mentioned above, the research questions of this study can be formulated as follow:

- 1) What types of impoliteness strategies are used by Logue?
- 2) What does the function of impoliteness used by Lionel Logue in this film?

### **1.6 Goals of the Study**

The study is intended to analyze the movie through the application of theories and designed to achieve several goals:

- 1) To analyze the types of impoliteness strategies used in Lionel Logue's utterances.
- 2) To identify the function of impoliteness used by Lionel Logue.

### **1.7 The Significance of the Study**

This study is expected to give a contribution in the field of Pragmatics, particularly for the information of using Impoliteness strategy, theoretically and practically. Theoretical benefits of this study are: 1) this study is expected to be helpful in serving more knowledge about the understanding impoliteness, 2) this study could be used as additional reference for a further research. While, the practical benefit is that this research could be the framework for further study about impoliteness.

### **1.8 The Organization of the Study**

This study consists of five chapters: introduction, theoretical review, research methodology, discussion and conclusion. The first chapter presents the general view of the study, it consists of background of the study, research topic, research problems, purposes, research questions, the significance of the study, and the organization of the study. The second chapter, theoretical review, provides brief description of theoretical framework related to the topic. Chapter three takes up the research design and method describing the type of research, type of data, data processing, data collection and data analysis. Chapter four focuses on the analysis of the research data using the related theories mentioned in chapter two. The last chapter is concerned with the conclusion of the research results.





## CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

This chapter consists of two sub chapters: previous researches and theoretical framework. The previous researches tell the readers about the former research that is related to the topic of this study. Before proceeding to find out language phenomena in the intended object of this research, *The King's Speech*, it is necessary to define politeness, to see the models in politeness study, and finally to find out what impoliteness is as the theoretical framework. This study will be complemented with the impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996). Context is also needed because verbal communication is never free from this item.

### 2.1 Previous Researches

There are some researchers attempting to analyze impoliteness strategy in the form of thesis and journal articles by using communication strategy as the main theory of their researches.

One of them is Irawan (2011) who studied the impoliteness strategy used by Sheldon Cooper in verbal interaction with other characters in "The Big Bang Theory" TV shows. The aims of his research were to describe what impoliteness strategies Sheldon Cooper mostly uses and how they are performed throughout the show. Further, he also sees how the other characters have reacted to Cooper by looking at their own utterance in response to Cooper and also paying attention to their nonverbal cue that show how they react to Cooper's being impolite. Irawan used library research in analyzing the data based on Culpeper's impoliteness theory (1993) and applied qualitative and quantitative research as the research methodology.

The results of his thesis present the occurrence of impoliteness strategies but withholding politeness strategy is never used by Cooper because Cooper

always responds to other character. The other characters perform offensive and defensive responses, accept the speaker's attack, and ignore the speaker as the respond to Sheldon Cooper's impolite remarks.

Primadianti (2015) from Yogyakarta State University focused on impoliteness aspects presented in *Paranorman* movie. The objectives of her research are to describe the types of impoliteness strategies addressed to the main character, to explain the realizations of the impoliteness strategies addressed to the main character, and to describe the main character's responses to the impoliteness strategies addressed to him. She used mix method for research design and methodology. The data were in the form of utterances spoken by the characters in *Paranorman* movie, while the contexts of the data were dialogues. The sources of her research were the script of the dialogues spoken by the characters in *Paranorman* movie and the video of the movie. The findings were: first, four types of impoliteness strategy (bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm) occur in other characters' utterances in *Paranorman* movie. Second, each type of impoliteness strategy has its particular realization. Third, there were three responses which occur in the movie, they are no response, accepting, and countering the face attack. The responses of impolite acts were influenced by the way the face attacks are conveyed, the relationship between the persons doing the face attacks and the addressees.

Beside those theses, there are two articles concerning impoliteness strategy. One of the articles is from a student of Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Wijayanto (2014). The goal of his research was to describe the impoliteness strategy used by the characters on the TV series that has a teenager life theme which is televised on some TV stations in Indonesia. The data were taken from 99 dialogues that were recorded from 9 TV series. He used Culpeper's Impoliteness strategy (1996) as the tool for data analysis. The result showed that the characters on the TV series use impoliteness utterances to express anger, insult, scold, curse, and so on. Negative impoliteness and positive impoliteness were contently use. The different social status of the speaker was the main factor causing impoliteness to occur.

Omar and Wahid (2010) from Anbar University also did a research on the identification of impoliteness strategy on some plays of Pinter. They examined the role of impoliteness strategy in interactional communication and its function on three plays of Pinter. The focus of their study was only on strategy in question. They found that impoliteness can be analyzed from the speaker's and the hearer's perspective since it depends on the speaker's intention and the hearer's reception. In their data, bald on record and positive impoliteness strategies are used more frequently than others. It seems that Pinter employs impoliteness to reveal the life of a modern man who lives in a constant struggle between himself and others to join high status and gain respect. The finding also shows the impact of two World Wars on modern man's life. Impoliteness leads to the development of the character and plot. Briefly, in their finding, they prove that impoliteness is interpreted differently depending on the context.

From those previous researches, it can be concluded that these have similar discussion with this study but the object, the data analysis and how the analysis is different. The first research assists in understanding the theory of impoliteness. The second research gives contribution in understanding the response of impoliteness. It uses mixed method but in this study used qualitative method as the research method. The third research assist in comprehend impoliteness theory but it is quite different from the present research since his research is focused on the impoliteness used by characters who speak Indonesia whereas this study aims to focus on the impoliteness strategies use by characters who speak English. In addition, the last research is assist in understanding the role of impoliteness in interactional communication and its function.

## **2.2 Theoretical Framework**

This subchapter focuses on the review of the theories which support and relate to the study. It covers pragmatics, politeness and more specifically on impoliteness strategies by Jonathan Culpeper (1996).

### 2.2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a systematic way of explaining language used in a context. It attempts to explain aspects of meaning which cannot be found in the sense of the words or structures, like explained by semantics. It's for example, Finch (1998:160) said that if we do not understand something we usually ask either "*What does it mean?*" or "*What do you mean?*" In the first case the concern is with the sense of what has been said, while in the second, it is with the speakers' attitude or point of view being questioned.

Yule (1996:3) argued that pragmatics is the study about meaning which is conveyed by the speaker (or writer) and interpreted by the hearer (or reader). Furthermore, Yule (1996:4) divides four areas that pragmatics is concerned with. First, he states that pragmatics is the study of what the speaker means in a communication. It means that pragmatics focuses more on the implicit meaning of some words or some utterances uttered by the speaker rather than the explicit meaning.

Second, pragmatics is "the study of contextual meaning". The meaning of some words or utterances is influenced by a particular context and the interpretation of what people mean in particular context.

Third, pragmatics does not only concern with what the speaker means but also focuses on how the listener understands the speaker's utterances. In the other words, pragmatics focuses more on the meaning which is unsaid by the speaker. It can be concluded that pragmatics is the type of study which focuses on how the people get the intended meaning in the communication.

Fourth definition, pragmatics deals with the social distance between the speaker and the listener. It means that the social distance of the speaker and the listener determines how much the speaker will speak in the communication. It can be said that pragmatics is the study of the social distance reflection.

Still, according to Yule (1996:4), studying pragmatics brings an advantage and the same time a disadvantage. He describes that the advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that "one can talk about people's intended meanings, their assumptions, their purposes or goals and the kinds of actions (for example



requests) that they are performing when they speak”. In contrast, “the disadvantage is that all these very human concepts are extremely difficult to analyze in a consistent and objective way”. Based on the definition above, it can be concluded that pragmatics is the study of speaker’s meaning which is related to the context and its use of language which depends on the shared knowledge between the speaker and hearer. The study of pragmatics will help us to understand communication including its context, about who, when, why, and where the communication takes place. Even if, it is difficult to analyze in an objective way, it shows us how to know implicit meaning in utterance.

Pragmatics has some fields in its study, i.e. speech acts, deixis, presupposition, conversational implicature, and politeness. First, the base or the smallest part of linguistic communication is called speech acts (Searle, 1976:16). There are five types of speech acts in terms of functions: declarations, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives.

Second, Yule (1996: 9) states that deixis is giving a term to an object through language. Someone notices an object using deictic expression; to determine people (I, you), place (here), and time (tomorrow, now).

Third, presupposition is something which is accepted by the speaker to be the case (Yule, 1996: 133). It means that before the speaker talks about something, he or she considers that the hearer understands his or her utterance.

Fourth, conversational implicature is something which is conveyed implicitly by people in a conversation. When the speaker talked to each other, he or she sometimes has a meaning that is conveyed implicitly. Meanwhile, the hearer either can understand the meaning or he cannot understand the implicit meaning of the utterance.

Finally, Yule (1996: 60) states that politeness means the consciousness of other people’s public self-image. Moreover, public self-image is equal or has the same meaning with face. In studying both politeness and impoliteness as the next discussion, face is an important concept to understand those fields. Hence, face is explained further before discussing politeness and impoliteness.

In brief, politeness theory as the starting point of Culpeper's impoliteness falls within domain of pragmatics and it cannot be separated to explain language phenomena in this study.

### 2.2.2 Politeness and Face

The term politeness as used in pragmatic is potentially misleading. We may think that it has something to do with social etiquette, in fact it does not. Literatures have also presented many different ways on defining politeness with no real consistency and certainty. People give the definition of politeness based on everyday usage, an attempt to conform socially agreed codes of good conduct. In spite of its universal nature in everyday usage, politeness needs to be defined in a scientific manner.

Yule (1996:60) defines politeness in interaction as "the means employed to show awareness of another person's face". The theory of politeness is first organized by Brown and Levinson (1978). They explain the nature of politeness and how it functions in interaction. Their base theory is on the concept of face proposed by Goffman (1967) who defines "face" as "the positive value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact".

In accordance with that definition, Brown and Levinson coined the idea of face as a universal aspect in politeness study. They define face as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (1978:66). Brown and Levinson (1987) introduce two types of face wants that every person has; positive and negative face wants, both which will later base the concept of politeness.

Brown and Levinson (1987) define Positive face as "the wants that a member wants other to find desirable' or "the positive consistent self image or personality (including the desire that this self image appreciated and approved of claimed by interactant). It is characterized desired to be loved, admired, ratified, liberty, and piety" and negative face is "the wants that his action be unimpeded by others" or the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, right to non-distraction

the freedom of action and freedom from imposition i.e. It is characterized by the desire not to be imposed upon. They argue that in order to be polite we have to maintain both the hearer's positive and negative face wants. If failed to maintain both positive and negative face wants are called "face-threatening acts (FTAs)".

There are two kinds of FTA; Negative Face-Threatening Acts and Positive Face-Threatening Acts. Negative Face-Threatening Acts against speakers' freedom of action. In other words, it impedes someone's negative face wants. Negative FTA can damage both the speaker and the hearer in the following ways:

a. Damage to the Speaker

- 1) The speaker succumbs to the power of the hearer.

Examples: Expressing thanks, accepting a thank you or apology, excuses, acceptance of offers, a response to the hearer's violation of social etiquette, the speaker commits him to something he doesn't want to do.

b. Damage to the Hearer

- 1) An act that affirms or denies a future act of the hearer creates pressure on the hearer to either perform or not perform the act.

Examples: orders, requests, suggestions, advice, reminding, threats, or warnings.

- 2) The speaker is sentimental of the hearer or the hearer's belongings.

Examples: compliments, expressions of envy or admiration or expressions of strong negative emotion toward the hearer (e.g. hatred, anger, lust).

- 3) These acts express some positive future act of the speaker toward the hearer. In doing so, pressure has been put on the hearer to accept or reject the act and possibly incur a debt.

Examples: offers, and promises.

While Positive Face-Threatening Acts occur when the speaker or the hearer does not care about their addressee's feeling or want. In short, it occurs when one is considered less important. This can also damage both the speaker and the hearer.

a. Damage to the Speaker

- 1) An act that shows that speaker is in some sense wrong, unable to control himself.

Examples: apologies (speaker is damaging his own face by admitting that he regrets his previous acts), acceptance of compliment, inability to control one's physical self, inability to control one's emotional self, self-humiliation, confession. (Brown & Levinson, 1987:68)

#### b. Damage to the Hearer

- 1) The speaker is indifference toward the hearer's positive face. This is most often expressed in obvious non cooperative behaviour.

Examples: interrupting, non sequiturs.

- 2) The speaker misidentifies the hearer in an offensive or embarrassing way. This may occur either accidentally or intentionally. Generally, this refers to the misuse of address terms in relation to status, gender, or age.

Examples: Addressing a young woman as "ma'am" instead of "miss".

- 3) The hearer might be embarrassed for or fear the speaker.

Examples: excessively emotional expressions.

- 4) The speaker indicates that he is willing to disregard the emotional well being of the hearer.

Examples: belittling or boasting.

- 5) The speaker has a negative assessment of the hearer's positive face or an element of his/her positive face. The speaker can either directly or indirectly indicate that he dislikes some aspects of the hearer's possessions, desires, or personal attributes or express disapproval by stating or implying that the hearer is wrong, irrational, or misguided.

Examples: expressions of disapproval (e.g. insults, accusations, complaints), contradiction, disagreement or challenges.

- 6) The speaker indicates that he does not have the same values or fear as the hearer.

Examples: disrespect, mention of topics which are inappropriate in general or in the context.



- 7) The speaker increases the possibility that a face threatening act will occur. This situation is created when a topic is brought up by the speaker that is a sensitive societal subject.

Examples: topics that relate to politic, race, religion.

(Brown and Levinson, 1987:65-68)

To minimize or avoid FTA Brown and Levinson formulate certain strategies that one can choose to use in order to mitigate the impact of such acts toward the interlocutor's face wants. Brown and Levinson provide four politeness super strategies that could help speakers to communicate more polite.

#### **a. Bald on-record**

This strategy almost disregards the face of the hearer. However, there are ways bald on record politeness can be used to try to minimize FTAs implicitly. It is better performed when speaker has close relationship with the speaker because these strategies often cause embarrassment to the addressee for example close friends or family. Brown and Levinson outline two kinds of instances to show when this strategy is applied at its best.

- 1) Instances in which threat minimizing does not occur. One of these instances is great urgency or desperation. For example: *Help!!*
- 2) Instances in which the threat is minimized implicitly. Examples: Welcomes: *come in*, Offers: *leave it, I'll finish it later!*

#### **b. Positive Politeness**

This strategy is used to promote high involvement and solidarity. It tries to decrease the social distance between those who know each other very well.

This strategy is used in the following instances:

- 1) Attend to hearer's interest, needs, wants: You must be hungry; it's a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch?
- 2) Exaggerate interest in hearer and his interests: That's a nice hair cut you got, where did you get it?
- 3) Intensify interest to hearer: I've never seen such a row.
- 4) Use solidarity in-group identity markers: Bring me your dirty clothes to wash, honey

- 5) Seek agreement: I always help her; she shouldn't have done this to me, right?
- 6) Avoid disagreement: Ok. I will be seeing you then.
- 7) Presuppose/raise/assert common ground: Yes dear, it hurts terribly, *I know*.
- 8) Joke: How about lending me this old heap of junk? (H's new Cadillac)
- 9) Include both speaker and hearer in activity: If we help each other out, I figure we would finish the job on time.
- 10) Assume or assert reciprocity: Look, I know you want the car back by 5.0, so should I go to town now?
- 11) Give gifts to hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation): I have chocolate for you.
- 12) Hedge opinion: You really should sort of try harder.
- 13) Be optimistic: I'll just come along, if you don't mind
- 14) Give (or ask for) reasons: Why not lend me your cottage for the weekend?

### c. Negative Politeness

This strategy performs the function of minimizing the particular imposition of FTA. These strategies are:

- 1) Be conventionally indirect: I'm looking for a comb.
- 2) Use hedges or questions: Is it true that you are marrying the man for sure?
- 3) Be pessimistic: You couldn't find your way to lending me a hundred thousand rupiahs, could you?
- 4) Minimize the imposition: I just wanted to ask you if you could lend me a little paper.
- 5) Give deference: We look forward very much to dining with you.
- 6) Apologize: I'm sorry to bother you.
- 7) Impersonalize speaker and hearer (avoid 'you', 'I'): (You) can do it.

### d. Off-Record

In this strategy the speaker will use indirect language without directly impose on the hearers. So that the hearer face is save. The examples of off record

strategy are: give hints, be vague, presuppose, use metaphor, be sarcastic or joking.

- 1) Give hints: It's a cold in here.
- 2) Be vague: Oh God, I've headache again.
- 3) Presuppose: At least I don't go around boasting my achievement.
- 4) Use metaphor: Harry's a real fish.
- 5) Be sarcastic, or joking: Yeah, it's really hot here.

In those ways, the speaker is not directly asking the hearer to do the job. Consequently, the hearer's face is very much saved.

#### **e. Do not do the FTA (withhold the FTA)**

Brown and Levinson (1987) do not discuss this strategy but Tanaka (1993) discusses two shorts of 'saying nothing'. This means that there are times when the speaker decides to say nothing and wishes to achieve the effect which the speech act would have on certain circumstances. Tanaka terms these strategies as ooc-genuine: S does not perform a speech act, and genuinely intends to let the matter remain closed. She or he does not intend to achieve the perlocutionary effect. Ooc-strategic: S does not perform a speech act, but expects A to infer his/her wish to achieve the perlocutionary effect. Therefore, some utterances pose no face threat at all but it is a matter of interest of social harmony. (Tanaka, 1993: 50 as cited in Thomas, 1995:175).

Leech (1938) also proposes politeness. He distinguishes relative politeness and absolute politeness. Relative politeness relates to a particular context, whereas absolute politeness refers to the politeness associated with acts independent of context (in Culpeper, 1995). Within absolute politeness, Lech argues, "some illocutions (e.g. order) are inherently impolite, and others (e.g. offers) are inherently polite". Instead of referring to "face", Leech based his model on the concept of Cooperative Principle which were previously introduce by Grice (1975). Grice (1975: 45-46) outlines four cooperative principles: maxim of Quality, maxim of Quantity, maxim of Relation, and maxim of Manner.

To fulfil maxim of Quality, the speaker is required to tell the truth. He is not allowed to say something he knows it is false. The second maxim is maxim of

Quantity. To accomplish this maxim, the speaker should make the utterances as informative as required for the topic being discussed. The speaker is not allowed to make his utterances more informative than is required. The next maxim is the maxim of Relation where this maxim necessitates the speaker to make utterances relevant to the topic being discussed. The last maxim is maxim of Manner. The speaker should make his utterances unambiguous, concise and neat to execute this maxim. If failed to observe the maxim it's called flouting the maxim.

In sum, face and maxim are closely related to politeness and impoliteness theory because the concept of face and maxim are the core for studying politeness and impoliteness theory. Then, impoliteness theory is based on politeness theory; hence it is difficult to understand what impoliteness is without knowing politeness theory first.

In addition, it is better to know how the polite etiquette when we have a conversation with royal family. Never try to call "Queen" or "Elizabeth" or "Liz" whatever name you have heard in the media.

### **2.2.3 Impoliteness**

Previously we learnt that Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed five politeness strategies one can use to mitigate the effect of potential face loss in a potential face threatening act. They are designed to save face and to guarantee that a communication breakdown does not hamper the success of the communication itself. Culpeper (1995), taking Brown and Levinson as his point departure to define impoliteness, comes with the opposite of those five strategies. Culpeper (1996:349) notes that impoliteness is the use of utterances or actions that attack one's interlocutor and cause disharmony and/or social disturbance rather than promoting social harmony. It is an attitude that is activated by specific kinds of behaviour in specific context. He argues that instead of supporting face, these five strategies are means to attacking face (1995:356).

Moreover, Bousfield (2008:72) states that:



“impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, ‘boosted’, or maximized in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted”.

This impolite behaviour is determined by the context in which this acts take place. This is the reason why defining impoliteness challenge on its own. We learn although some verbal behaviour is typically impolite, they will not always be impolite depends on situation. For example, in some culture shouting to an older person is considered offensive, and thus; impolite, becomes a rationally accepted manner when brought into sporting context such as in football games. Thus, the key difference between politeness and impoliteness is a matter of intention: whether it is the speaker’s intention and the context (Culpeper, *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*). To account for the aspect of impoliteness, Culpeper (1996) proposes an impoliteness framework which is parallel but opposite to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of politeness.

Leech (1938) also proposes politeness. He distinguishes relative politeness and absolute politeness. Relative politeness relates to a particular context, whereas absolute politeness refers to the politeness associated with acts independent of context (in Culpeper, 1995). Within absolute politeness, Lech argues, “some illocutions (e.g. order) are inherently impolite, and others (e.g. offers) are inherently polite”. Instead of referring to “face”, Leech based his model on the concept of Cooperative Principle which were previously introduce by Grice (1975). Grice (1975: 45-46) outlines four cooperative principles: maxim of Quality, maxim of Quantity, maxim of Relation, and maxim of Manner.

To fulfil maxim of Quality, the speaker is required to tell the truth. He is not allowed to say something he knows it is false. The second maxim is maxim of Quantity. To accomplish this maxim, the speaker should make the utterances as informative as required for the topic being discussed. The speaker is not allowed to make his utterances more informative than is required. The next maxim is the maxim of Relation where this maxim necessitates the speaker to make utterances

relevant to the topic being discussed. The last maxim is maxim of Manner. The speaker should make his utterances unambiguous, concise and neat to execute this maxim. If failed to observed the maxim it's called flouting the maxim.

In sum, face and maxim are closely related to politeness and impoliteness theory that will be explained in the following sections. It is because the concept of face and maxim are the core for studying politeness and impoliteness theory. Then, impoliteness theory is based on politeness theory; hence it is difficult to understand what impoliteness is without knowing politeness theory first.

Culpeper (1996) lays out five super strategies that speakers use to make impolite utterances:

**a. Bald on record impoliteness:**

The utterances are deployed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in situations where face is not irrelevant or minimized. This strategy is seen as typically being deployed where there is much face at stake, and where there is an intention on the part of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer and/or where the speaker does not have the power to (safely) utter an impolite utterance. It is the most effective way for the speaker to get his message through to the hearer but the speaker ignores the hearer's face and its wants.

**b. Positive Impoliteness:**

Strategies designed to damage the hearer's positive face wants. He gives a list of examples about this strategy which includes:

- 1) Ignore, snub the other: fail to acknowledge the other's presence.
- 2) Exclude the other from an activity.
- 3) Disassociate from the other, for example, deny association or common ground with other, and avoid sitting together.
- 4) Be disinterested, unconcerned, and unsympathetic.
- 5) Use inappropriate identity markers, for example, use titles and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains.
- 6) Use obscure or secretive language, for example, mystify the other with jargon or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target.

- 7) Seek disagreement: select a sensitive topic.
- 8) Make the other feel uncomfortable for example, do not avoid silence, joke or use small talks.
- 9) Use taboo words: swear or use abusive or profane language.
- 10) Call the other names: use derogatory nominations.

### **c. Negative impoliteness**

Strategy designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. This can be done through the following ways, such as:

- 1) Frighten - instil a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.
- 2) Condescend, scorn or ridicule - emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous. Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g. use diminutives).
- 3) Invade the other's space - literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship).
- 4) Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect - personalize, use the pronoun 'I' and 'you'.
- 5) Put the other's indebtedness on record-with a negative aspect, put the other's indebtedness on record (Culpeper, 1996: 358).

### **d. Sarcasm or mock politeness:**

The FTA is performed with the use politeness strategies that are obviously insincere and thus remain surface realisations. Sarcasm' (mock politeness for social disharmony) is clearly the opposite of 'banter' (mock impoliteness for social harmony). Sarcasm constitutes the use of individual or combined strategies and remains on the surface and appears to be appropriate. On the surface level , the utterances sound polite but their meaning is the opposite. According to Culpeper, sarcasm is mock politeness for social disharmony and it is the opposite of banter which means mock impoliteness for social harmony. Here, the face threatening acts are performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere. Culpeper (2005:49) states that "I once turned up late for a party and upon explaining to the host that I had mistaken 17:00 hours for 7o'clock , I was

greeted with a smile and the words "you silly bugger" I knew that the impoliteness was superficial, it was not really and that I had been accepted into the party".

**e. Withhold politeness:**

It is about not performing politeness work where it is expected. Culpeper (2005:44) gives the example that "failing to thank someone for a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness". Being silent is also withholding politeness. It also happens when one keeps silent when he is expected to say something. The absence of expressing greetings where it would be necessary to do so, is one of the example.

#### **2.2.4 Responses to Impolite strategies**

Impoliteness is an inevitable thing that is often done by people in a communication process. When the speaker says impolite words to the hearer, there are some choices from the addressee. Culpeper et al. (2003: 1562) state that the addressee of the impoliteness strategies can accept the face attack or counter it, and give no response.

**a. Accepting the Face Attack**

This respond is characterized when addressee accepts the face attack from the speaker, when he or she may agree with the speaker's utterances which perform impoliteness strategy (Bousfield, 2008: 193). The addressee shows his or her agreement toward the speaker's argument. Bousfield (2008: 200) explains an example of accepting the face attack which is taken from the extract of *The Clampers*. The extract is employed by A (official) and B (car owner). A is presently helping in the removal of an illegally parked car. When the car is being lifted onto the back of the removal truck, B comes. Suddenly, B confuses of this incident.

A: "Oh.. Please don't oh this has never happened to me before, don't do it to me!"

B: "*Sorry Madam.*"

A is angry to B by employing bald on record impoliteness strategy (*Don't do it to me!*). On the other hand, B apologizes to A. It means that B accepts A's



face attack indirectly by saying “*Sorry Madam*” in order not to make the situation worse.

### **b. Countering the Face Attack**

Countering the face attack happens when the addressee counters the face attack from the speaker. The addressee does not just keep silent or agree with the speaker’s face attack. Moreover, countering the face attack is divided into two. They are offensive countering and defensive countering (Bousfield, 2008:193).

#### **1) Offensive Countering**

The addressee of the face attack has choice to face impoliteness strategy; he or she can counter the face attack by using offensive strategy. The addressee uses offensive countering by replying the face attack with face attack (Bousfield, 2008: 193). Example:

A: you have to have a voucher to park in this area

B: *How are you supposed to earn a bleeding living in this fucking country eh*

A: *well there’s no point in shouting at me yeah I never asked you to park here yeah* I’m simply trying to help you if you don’t want me to help you then I don’t need to help you yeah.

B: yeah just give me that please and go away.

The Context here is two ‘Clampers’ have clamped an illegally parked car. Just as they’ve finished, the car’s driver, a workman who was doing a job for a local homeowner, returns to his car to find it clamped, and the clampers still there. The initial offensive impoliteness being countered with an offensive utterance. The initial utterance issued by B. “*How are you supposed to earn a bleeding living in this fucking country eh*” is an indirect challenge to the clamper, coupled with an expression of anger combined with two instances of taboo usage. The response elicited by this outburst is the Clamper’s, “*Well there’s no point shouting at me yeah, I never asked you to park here yeah*”. This is an offensive linguistic output operating as a counter utterance and comprising a direct criticism of both the driver’s challenge and his expression of anger and irritation (not to mention also being of his choice of parking place).

#### **2) Defensive Countering**

Bousfield (2008: 193) states that defensive countering means that the addressee defends his or her own face. The addressee of the face attack uses this type by answering or explaining something to defend himself when facing the face attack. Example:

Courtney : I knew it! You've been sneaking around in my personal stuff!

Norman :*No I haven't! Grandma told me!*

This example is taken from the dialogue between Norman and Courtney. Norman counters his sister who accuses him sneaking around in her personal stuff by saying "*No I haven't! Grandma told me!*". He defends himself by explaining that he does not sneak around in her personal stuff, but he knows her secret from his grandma ghost. He prefers to defend himself because he wants to save his face in front of his sister. He does not want if his sister considers him as a liar who loves to sneak around her personal stuff. (Primadianti, 2015:61)

### **c.No Response**

The hearer can give no response toward the impoliteness strategy. The hearer can give no response by being silent (Bousfield, 2008: 188). There are some reasons why the hearer chooses not to respond, i.e. he or she refuses to speak, he or she does not have the opportunity to speak, or he or she does not understand the content of the speaker's utterance. Example:

A: "On Monday evening, you were told to put your name in all your military items of clothing did you do it? No you didn't. Why not?"

B: "No excuse Sir. I am..."

A: "No excuse!"

B: (*Silent*)

A: "You don't walk in my office."

B: (*Silent*)

From the conversation above, B tries to answer A's question by saying "*No excuse Sir. I am...*", however, A denies B's attempt to answer the question. A replies by saying "*No excuse!*" A does not give opportunity to B for explaining his reason. Then, B chooses not to respond A by being silent. On the other hand, A continues his

anger by saying “*You don’t walk in my office.*” In the end of the conversation, B is staying silent because A denies his attempt to answer and respond to A.

In short, responding to impoliteness can be done in one of the following ways, namely: (1) Accepting (2) Countering, and (3) No Response.

### 2.2.5 Context of Situation

What separate the study of pragmatics from semantics is that pragmatics is about language in context. According to Halliday and Hasan (1985:6) context refers to the words and the sentences that go before and after particular words and sentences that one is looking at. Thus context refers to what has gone before and what is coming after the particular words and sentences. Moreover, context of situation is the situation or environment in which text is uttered.

Mastering language in pragmatically side is convinced to gain successful in communication. To hold a good and understandable communication, speaker and hearer need to understand the situation and the environmental senses of an utterance. Malinowski proposes *context of situation* approach which represent the whole circumstance in an utterance (Halliday and Hassan, 1989:6). Here are the examples of the context of situation analysis:

- a. *Speaker*: a young mother, *hearer*: her mother-in-law, *place*: park, by a duck pond, *time*: sunny afternoon in September 1962. They are watching the young mother’s two-year-old son chasing ducks and the mother-in-law has just remarked that her son, the child’s father, was rather backward at this stage. The young mother says: I do think Adam’s quick.
- b. *Speaker*: a student, *hearers*: a set of students, *place*: sitting round a coffee table in the refectory, *time*: evening in March 1980. John, one of the groups, has just told a joke. Everyone laughs except Adam. Then Adam laughs. One of the students says: I do think Adams’s quick.

(Brown and Yule, 1983:36)

Both examples above have the same comment from the hearers (“I do think Adam’s quick”), but if we notice to the context or the background information given, each of them has a different sense. In the first example, the young mother says that her two-year-old son, Adam, is quick as a reply to her mother-in-law’s remark. This means that the utterance has an actual meaning of what it is stated. Meanwhile, in the second example, the utterance means a sarcastic comment of the situation. This means that Adam is too slow to respond his friends’ joke because each of them in the refectory laughs except Adam.

Based on the illustration above, we can see that an utterance can possibly contain a different meaning depends on the circumstance and the situation it is stated. More specifically related to the present research, Culpeper (2003:1555) states that “as with all politeness phenomena, impoliteness does not simply arise from any one particular strategy, but is highly dependent on context. Thus, context is very important in understanding impoliteness phenomena. Therefore, this study involves the context of situation to comprehend the utterances in *The King’s Speech* movie dialogue.

So, what is considered polite varies from culture to culture. Thus, it is necessary to know the politeness in royal family. In royal family there is some rules how to be polite in conversation. The Queen is always addressed as "Your Majesty" on the first count and thereafter as "Ma'am". According to Buckingham Palace, this should rhyme with jam, not palm. Other members of the royal family are treated with similar respect: "Your Royal Highness" then "Sir" or "Ma'am." If trying to call the family, it is considered as impolite.

To be polite, it should never ask anything about the royal family personal life. The royal lead the conversation and do not try to change the subject, and ask only the politest of questions. For example, "Is Your Majesty enjoying the performance?" is acceptable, but "How's Philip and Charles?" is most definitely out of the question.

Thus, in order to know whether polite or impolite, we have to know the context of situation first.





## CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains the type of research, Type of the data, data collection, data processing and data analysis. It is needed to accomplish the needs of a scientific research since a method plays an essential role to systemize the research and moreover to get as objective result as possible.

### 3.1 Type of Research

The type of research of this study is descriptive qualitative research because it describes the data using narrative description as one of the characteristic of qualitative research without using numerical analysis. According to Mackey and Gass (2005:2) qualitative research is a research to use nonexperimental design in which data cannot be easily quantified and the analysis is interpretative (descriptive). In same vein, Denscombe defines that qualitative research is disposed to be associated with words or images as the unit of analysis (2007:248). Moreover, he states that “qualitative research relies on transforming information from observations, reports and recordings into data in the form of written word, not numbers (Denscombe, 2007:248). Briefly, qualitative research in this study is used to find out the types of impoliteness strategy used by Lionel, to describe or interpret Lionel Logue’s utterances in *The King’s Speech* movie to get valid answer of the research problems.

### 3.2 Type of the Data

The type of the data in this study is qualitative. It consists of two different parts; (1) qualitative data and (2) quantitative data. Qualitative data deal with words and visual images (Denscombe, 2007:286). It is stated that:

“Qualitative data take the form of words (spoken or written) and visual images (observed or creatively produced). They are associated primarily with strategies of research such as ethnography, phenomenology and grounded theory, and with research methods such as interviews, documents and observation” (Denscombe, 2007:286).

Quantitative data, on the other hand, deal with numbers Denscombe states that:

“Quantitative data take the form of numbers. They are associated primarily with strategies of research such as surveys and experiments, and with research methods such as questionnaires and observation”(2007:254).

Based on the definitions of qualitative and quantitative data above, the data in this study are qualitative because the data are in the form of words or utterances. The selected utterances to be analyzed are primarily taken from Lionel Louge’s utterances in *The King’s Speech* movie’s subtitle that includes impoliteness strategies.

### 3.3 Data Collection

Purposive sampling is applied in this study for collecting the data. Blaxter states that purposive sampling is “handpicking supposedly typical or interesting cases”( 2006:163). Purposive sampling is applied to the situation where the researcher already knows something about the specific data because they are seen as instances that are likely producing the most valuable data. It means, the data are selected which is relevance to the topic of investigation. Hence, purposive sampling

is well suited to apply in this study because the dialogues which contain impoliteness strategy only are selected.

There are some steps in collecting data, those are: First, watching *The King's Speech* movie that already had subtitle. Second, taking notes of the character's utterances from the dialogues of movie which were in accordance with the objectives of the study. The utterances to be analyzed are primarily taken from Lionel Louge's sentences, not from the other characters' sentences in the movie as the aim of this thesis is to explore the impoliteness strategy used by Lionel Louge. From 489 utterances, there are 13 utterances in *The King's Speech* movie are picked to be analyzed. In addition, to enrich the data, the subtitle of *The King's Speech* movie is downloaded from <http://www.yifysubtitles.com/subtitles/the-kings-speech-english-yify-948> [accessed on October 21, 2014 at 05:15].

### **3.4 Data Processing**

After classifying or categorizing the data found, the data are processed to apply the impoliteness theory proposed by Culpeper (1996) on the selected dialogue taken from *The King's Speech* movie as sample which has been divided. Since it is decided to focus on impoliteness strategy, it will only take some utterances spoken on some scenes by Lionel Louge that appropriate for the theory. Then, the data tabulation that consists of impoliteness strategy is made to make it easy to analyze their belonging categories. After that, the data is being analyzed to find out the implied meaning with the support of the context in the movie and conclusion is drawn.

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

Dey (cited in Gray, 2004:327) states that "analysis involves the process of breaking data down into smaller units to reveal their characteristic elements and



structure”. Dealing with that, this study applies descriptive and interpretative method. In this study, descriptivemethod is used to apply the theory of impoliteness on the selected utterances taken from Lionel Louge’s dialogue in *The King’s Speech* movie as the sample. Finally, interpretative method is used to find out the implied meaning of the utterances based on the context.

