

**AN ANALYSIS OF IMPOLITE LANGUAGE USED BY MATATU
CONDUCTORS: A CASE STUDY OF MATATUS PLYING ROUTE
32 FROM NAIROBI CITY CENTRE TO DANDORA, NAIROBI
COUNTY.**

**BY
MERAB GORO**

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS,
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGES,
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.**

OCTOBER 2014

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been presented for examination in any other university.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Goro Merab

(Candidate)

This research project has been submitted for examination with our approval as university supervisors.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Dr. Mohammed A. Akida

(Supervisor)

Signed: _____ Date: _____

M/s Mary Ndung'u

(Supervisor)

DEDICATION

To my friend and husband

Julius Gaya

To my dear sons

Dickens Ochieng

Marvin okode

Warren Onyango

To my only daughter

Gizelle Nadia Gaya

You stood by me in prayers through it all

Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

My sincere gratitude goes to the almighty God for granting me a good health and bringing me the far that I have come. My heartfelt appreciation goes to my supervisors Dr. Mohammed Akida and M/s Mary Ndung'u for their relentless professional guidance and devotion geared toward the completion of this study. Their unwavering support and constructive criticism helped to shape this piece of work. May the almighty god bless them abundantly.

Special thanks to my course lectures in the Department of Linguistics and Languages Prof. Luciah Omondi, Prof. Okoth Okombo, Dr. Maloba Dr. Jane Oduor, Dr. Marete, Dr. Kaviti, Dr. Mukhwana Dr. Schroeder and Dr. Michira for their contribution towards my coursework. Each one of them contributed immensely to this work. Thank you all for the academic nourishment.

My appreciation also goes to my M.A linguistics classmates (2012-2014) who have been an encouragement to me. The discussions we have had together have made a positive impact to my intellect. We began the journey together and you always provided a word of encouragement when the going got tough. I also appreciate NEGST and its staff for the support as a source of reference in writing my term papers and the project.

A big thank you to a very special friend, Scholastica Wabende, for believing in me and giving me the confidence to start on and continue with my dissertation research and writing. I appreciate your great support. You have been my source of strength.

My heartfelt gratitude goes to: My late dad Melkizedek Goro and my late mum Mary Goro for their strong foundation and inspiration upon which this achievement is based, my sister Beatrice Otieno for her academic mentorship; my brother Charles and family, my sisters Caren, Joyce and family. Thank you for your love and unwavering belief in me. Without you, I would not be the person I am today.

Finally my most heartfelt gratitude goes to my loving husband Julius Gaya who encouraged me to enroll for my Master Degree and the support he gave me to enable me complete my course. Thank you for believing in me and being there for me whenever I needed you. May God bless you so that you may also reach great heights in your ambition.

ABSTRACT

This project presents the result of a linguistic study on the impolite language used by *matatu* conductors. The study is conducted within the framework of Politeness Theory with focus being on Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies (1996) borrowed from Politeness Theory (1987). Impoliteness strategies are the strategies used by the speaker to attack the positive and negative face of the hearer. These strategies include the Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Off Record Impoliteness and Withhold Impoliteness. This research has endeavoured to answer the following questions: Which are the impolite speech acts that embody impolite language used by the conductors? What strategies of impoliteness are used by *Matatu* conductors? What motivating factors cause impoliteness? This research is conducted using the qualitative method while the data source for this research is 'naturally occurring' conversation between conductors and passengers that contain impolite strategies. The data is collected using purposive sampling after which the data is analyzed into the five impolite strategies based on the theory. The research concludes that there are five strategies of impoliteness used in *matatu* conductor's discourse. Out of the five strategies, there are two dominant strategies namely negative impoliteness and positive impoliteness. Furthermore, the result reveals that a combination of two strategies can be used, such as positive impoliteness and bald on record impoliteness to intensify the illocutionary act and impoliteness. Finally, the findings revealed that power and social distance are the main motivating factors that cause impoliteness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background to the study	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	3
1.3. Objectives	4
1.4. Research questions.....	4
1.5. Rationale of the study	4
1.6. Scope and limitation	6
1.7. Definition of operational terms.....	7
1.8. Literature review	8
1.8.1. Literature on Language.....	8
1.8.2. Literature Review on Politeness Theory.....	11
1.8.2.1. Speech Act	11
1.8.2.2. Cooperative Principle.....	12
1.8.2.3. Politeness Theory.....	13
1.8.2.4 Impoliteness strategies	15
1.9. Theoretical framework.....	18
1.9.1. Introduction.....	18
1.9.2. Bald on Record Impoliteness	18

1.9.3. Positive impoliteness	19
1.9.4. Negative Impoliteness.....	20
1.9.5. Off Record Impoliteness	22
1.9.6. Withhold Politeness	22
1.10. Research Methodology	23
1.10.1. Data Collection	24
1.10.2. Data Analysis and Presentation	25
CHAPTER TWO: COMMUNICATION AND IMPOLITENESS.....	26
2.0. Introduction.....	26
2.1. Politeness and Impoliteness	26
2.1.1. Politeness	26
2.1.2. Impoliteness	29
2.1.3. Impoliteness and Power	29
2.1.4. Impoliteness and Intention.....	31
2.1.5. Impoliteness and Prosody	32
2.1.6. Impoliteness and social distance.....	33
2.2. Face invasion	34
2.3. Speech Acts.....	35
2.3.1. Speech Act and Communication.....	36
2.3.2. Meaning in Speech Acts.	39
2.3.3. Illocutionary force and sentence type.....	41
2.3.3.1. Direct speech act and impoliteness	42
2.3.3.2. Imperative speech act	43

2.3.3.3. Imperative speech act and impoliteness	44
2.3.3.4. Interrogative speech acts.	45
2.3.3.5. Interrogative speech act and impoliteness.	46
2.3.3.6 Declarative Speech Acts.....	47
2.3.3.7 Declarative speech act and impoliteness.	48
2.4. Summary	48
 CHAPTER THREE: IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN MATATU	
CONDUCTOR’S CONVERSATION.....	50
3.0 Introduction.....	50
3.1 Impoliteness strategies	50
3.1.1 Bald On Record Impoliteness.....	51
3.1.2. Positive Impoliteness.....	55
3.1.3 Negative Impoliteness	62
3.1.4. Off Record Impoliteness	71
3.1.5 Withholding politeness.....	74
3.2 Conclusion	76
 CHAPTER FOUR: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 78	
4.0 Introduction.....	78
4.1 Summary.....	78
4.2 Conclusion	81
4.3 Recommendations.....	82
REFERENCES.....	83
APPENDIX.....	i

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Sentence types and illocutionary force.	42
Table 2 Impoliteness in imperative acts.....	45
Table 3 Impoliteness in interrogatives.....	47
Table 4 Impoliteness in declaratives.....	48

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the study

This study investigates the language used in the *Matatu* industry which is an informal sector that people from all walks of life interact with every day. The kind of language used in communication plays a key role in the way the conductor and passengers relate. Moreover, linguistic politeness is an important factor which every careful business person must take into consideration, including people in the *Matatu* industry. Through a pilot research by researcher, observation and interaction, *Matatu* industry is well known of having a culture of impoliteness and this is where the interest of the study lies.

Communication involves two interlocutors, a speaker and a hearer, whereby the speaker communicates a message to the hearer. The message is sometimes not found in his words and utterances literally but can be understood in context. It is necessary to know who the speakers and the hearers are, the time and the place of utterance and aspects of contextual description which help the hearer comprehend the intention of what the speaker said. One important aspect of style in pragmatics is linguistic politeness. Grundy (2000:146), states that politeness phenomena are one manifestation of the wider concept of etiquette, or appropriate behavior. To have a successful interaction one has to follow some important strategies of politeness.

Keinpointner (1997) argues that non- co-operative behaviour should be seen as less exceptional than most politeness theorists see it. He suggests that it is idealistic to assume

that everyone tries to co-operate for most of the time. However Eelen (2001:104) argues that the model of politeness drawn on by researchers in this field is one which implicitly or explicitly focuses only on politeness and sees impoliteness as a deviation.

Many studies have been published on politeness by linguists such as Goffman (1967), Brown and Levinson (1978), Leech (1983), many of which have concentrated on the spoken language. Brown and Levinson's (1978) framework on politeness strategies is perhaps the most reliable attempt to define politeness. As far as research is concerned, there has been little analysis of impoliteness which is attributed to the fact that most research is dependent on a view of conversation which 'emphasizes on conversational contracts and the implicit establishment of balance between interlocutors', Spencer-Oatey, (2003:3). However, there are occasions when people attack rather than support their interlocutors, and sometimes those attacks are considered by others to be impolite and sometimes they are not.

On this basis, the current study investigates impoliteness as used by *matatu* conductors despite the fact that politeness is an important aspect in business. The *Matatu* industry being an important part of today's business, politeness is essential because conductors interact with all those who seek their services.

Mutongi (2006) observes:

Kenyans typically viewed the *matatu* operators as an important, enterprising group of people, contributing to the economic development of the new nation of Kenya. This perception changed drastically in the 1980s when commuters, and indeed many Kenyans of all ranks, increasingly saw the *matatu* operators as thugs

engaging in excessive behaviour – using misogynistic language, rudely handling passengers, playing loud music and driving at dangerously high speeds.

The current study investigate the utterances of the conductors to find out if indeed they are impolite and if so what could be the motivating factor behind it.

1.2 Statement of the problem

This study investigates the impolite language used by conductors within the framework of Culpeper Jonathan (1996) Impoliteness Strategies. A number of scholars studying language concentrated on the recognizable field of politeness inspired by Brown & Levison (1978), but little has been done on the impolite use of language which is the alternative conception of politeness. This has created a knowledge gap which this study intends to bridge through a comprehensive analysis of impolite language used by conductors.

This study is intended to give a deeper insight into this area of impoliteness from linguistic perspective by investigating language features used by conductors which generate impoliteness. It examines impoliteness in the context of the informal sector of *Matatu* industry with the aim of demonstrating the complex interplay between power and impoliteness.

Also, to my knowledge, impoliteness in communication, within the *matatu* industry and in general, has not been studied to a great extent. This study is an endeavor to fill this gap.

1.3. Objectives

This study will be guided by the following objectives:

- i) To investigate impolite speech acts which embody the impolite language used by *matatu* conductors.
- ii) To examine the contribution of impoliteness strategies in the speech behaviour used by *matatu* conductors.
- iii) To investigate the motivating factors for impoliteness by *matatu* conductors based on the parameters of social distance and power.

1.4. Research questions.

This study will be guided by the following questions:

- i. What are the impolite speech acts used by *matatu* conductors that embody impolite language?
- ii. Which are the strategies of impoliteness in the language used by *matatu* conductors?
- iii. What factors motivate the impolite speech behaviour among *matatu* conductors?

1.5. Rationale of the study

The conceptualization of face and the linguistic strategies used to satisfy face vary from person to person, culture to culture and profession to profession. The study of politeness strategies as a means to satisfy face needs is essential in promoting better understanding between the interactants. Understanding a person's culture and linguistic behavior not

only facilitates communication but minimizes the possibility of confrontations as well. This study is based on the observation that though research has been done on the use of polite language in several areas, very few consider that the way language is used can be responsible for impoliteness and creating conflict in communication.

The outcome of the study will be used to create awareness on how interaction between *matatu* conductors and passengers may be undertaken with greater sensitivity. Findings from the study will be used during open forums organized by Matatu Owners Association to sensitize especially the *matatu* conductors on the need to use polite language, and to have a positive attitude towards the passengers. It will also be used to draw the attention of the passengers to how they should be addressed since they also play an important role in the *matatu* industry.

The findings will also add to the existing body of linguistic knowledge by enriching the scientific knowledge on the study of pragmatics especially in the area of impoliteness. Furthermore, the study is useful as literature review for readers who are interested in doing research on impoliteness in the future.

Finally, since *Matatu* is one means of transport used by most people countrywide, the language they use is thus worth examining.

1.6. Scope and limitation

The study is limited to the language used by *matatu* conductors mainly, Kiswahili, English and Sheng. The researcher studied only the language used by the conductors; therefore, the language used by passengers is excluded in the analysis though it is included in the data for purpose of relevance and understanding of the conversation.

The research focused on the five strategies of impoliteness namely: Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Off Record Impoliteness and Withhold Impoliteness. The target group is the conductors and their utterances when interacting with the passengers inside the *matatu*. The area of study covered the *matatus* plying route 32 and 42 from Nairobi City Center to Dandora via Juja Road for a period of two months. The area under study was chosen because of convenience for the researcher who uses the route every day, thus enabled easy collection of data. Apart from this, there was the limitation of time that could not allow the researcher to study other routes. The data was collected in the morning between 6.30.a.m to 7.30 a.m. from Monday to Friday both in the Mini-Buses and Nissan Matatus.

1.7. Definition of operational terms

Cooperation- cooperation exists when the hearer can make correct inferences from a speaker's message.

Face –the public self-image of a person i.e. the emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize.

Face Threatening Act (FTA)-anything said that presents a threat to another person's expectation regarding the self-image.

Locutionary act – the act of articulation in speaking language.

Illocutionary act - the act you speak such as requesting, insulting, threatening and warning.

Implicature – Assumption that more is communicated than is actually said. It is the additional conveyed meaning.

Impoliteness – using acts that intentionally threatens face.

Matatu- A public means of Transport.

Negative face- need to be independent, to have freedom of action and not to be imposed on by others.

Perlocutionary effect– effect of illocutionary act especially on the hearer.

Politeness- means employed to show awareness of another person's face.

Positive Face- persons need to be accepted, even liked by others in order to be treated as a member of group.

Power – ability to get others to do what you want.

Presupposition- The unsaid or assumed meaning. Something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance.

1.8. Literature Review

This section shall deal with the literature review on language in general and also on the theory.

1.8.1. Literature on Language

Language enhances cultural bonds. Schroeder (2005:15) says that culture is a set of accessible beliefs and assumptions which play a crucial role in selection of context during utterance interpretation. Moeschler (2004:52) points out that some scholars think that any kind of communication is determined by cultural context because the interpretation of the communication intent is not predictably referential only, but relies on cultural context, this is, cultural presuppositions, cultural individual background and cultural-shaped world knowledge.

Dattner (2006:1) concurs when he observes that successful communication between human beings, either within a culture or between cultures requires that the message and meaning intended by the speaker is correctly received and interpreted by the hearer. Sustainable error-free communication is rare and in most human interactions there is some degree of miscommunication and misunderstanding. The *Matatu* industry has developed its own culture popularly known as the '*matatu* culture' which is characterized by misunderstanding and miscommunication.

Hudson (1995) studied the relationship between language and society and noted out diversity in the way social groups utilize language. He stated that the language used by

the various social classes differed as one moved up or down the social strata. He also argued that different occupation used language in their own unique way. The present study benefits from Hudson's work as it looks at the *matatu* industry which is an occupation. The conductors who work in the *matatus* belong to either low or middle social class and they have unique discourse which defines them from other social groups.

In her study on language and gender as a tool of abuse against women by *matatu* conductors, Kinyatti (2003) demonstrated how *matatu* conductors use sexist language to demean women and also how women are castigated and subjugated through graffiti writing in and on *matatus*. Her study is significant to this study as it did focus on impolite language targeted at women by use of sexist language. Stereotypes of gender play an important role in assessment of impoliteness. The current study looks at impolite language including stereotypes of gender used by conductors when interacting with passengers. The difference is that the current study investigates the use of impolite language towards both gender, not only women but also men.

Another analysis on use of polite language was done by Njeri (2007) which investigated Language use in Gikuyu HIV/AIDS discourse. The study makes use of pragmatics exploration of the lexical euphemism, as substitute of what is taboo in Gikuyu speech. She uses Politeness Theory by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Grice Theory of Implicatures (1971). Her work provides useful insight into this study in the use of taboo words which are characteristic of conductors' impolite language.

Wambua (2009) did a research on euphemism in Kikamba which indicated that taboo words (which are known to be impolite in nature and can cause embarrassment to the hearer) are not used blatantly; instead euphemistic words which are more polite and acceptable are used thereby minding the hearers face. According to Wardhaugh (2002: 238) Euphemism is the ‘dressing up’ of language to make it more presentable, more polite and more palatable to public taste thus saving face which is the main reason of interactants using politeness strategies. Her study has contributed to the study of politeness theory which is relevant in the development of impoliteness strategies which is used in the current study.

Strategies of politeness is also analyzed by Kariithi (2010) in his study on how youths use various politeness strategies in language depending on who they are talking to, in which context and why they are communicating. For example, when talking to friends and children they are less polite compared to when talking to parents and other elderly or unknown persons, He used Politeness Theory by Brown and Levison which is also significant to my study from which the impoliteness theory is borrowed.

Onchiri (2010) studied the graffiti perspective in *matatu* using lexical pragmatics theory. He demonstrated the use of broadening and narrowing in graffiti and the meaning implied. Graffiti being a common feature in most *matatus* portrayed sexist language which is impolite and insulting, and also biased towards women. The impolite language of graffiti could be a contributing factor to the impolite language used by some conductors.

1.8.2. Literature Review on Politeness Theory

Impoliteness strategies were borrowed from Brown and Levinson's (1983) Politeness Theory which has developed with time:

1.8.2.1. Speech Act

The term speech act was first introduced by English philosopher J.L. Austin. Levinson (1983: 236) said "all utterances, in addition to meaning whatever they mean, perform specific actions (or 'do a thing') through having specific force. Thomas (1995: 51) said that Austin originally used the term 'speech act' to refer to an utterance and the 'total situation in which the utterance is issued'.

The speech act features, especially the illocutionary acts are related to politeness in that they are indicators of politeness or impoliteness. Many theorists, following Brown and Levinson, assume that impoliteness is necessarily an attack on the 'face' of the interlocutor/s, and that 'certain "impolite" speech acts, such as reproaching, threatening and insulting are performed by speakers with the intrinsic purpose of attacking or undermining the hearer's face' (Haverkate, 1988:394).

The analysis of impoliteness is therefore concerned with a reconstruction of what the speaker's intentions are supposed to have been. Leech (1995) had a notion that there are some speech acts which are inherently impolite, and suggests that although there may be a few, they are in the minority. The three speech acts that operate in a conversation are locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts.

J. R. Searle, the other language philosopher concerned with Speech Act Theory, makes a distinction between direct and indirect speech acts that influence the perlocutionary effect of an utterance (Brown and Yule, 1983: 232). A Direct speech act is performed mostly by use of imperative construction, for example, “Open the window!” On the other hand, indirect speech act is performed by means of declaratives, for example, “This room is hot”. Searle categorizes illocutionary acts into five basic types namely Representatives/ Assertives, Directives, Commissive, Expressives, and Declarations (Leech, 1983: 105). Brown and Levinson have used Speech Acts to give particular effect to the hearer negatively or positively.

1.8.2.2. Cooperative Principle

The Cooperative Principle (CP) is proposed by H. P. Grice. Grice expressed CP to suggest that in conversational interaction people work on the assumption that a certain set of rules is in operation, unless they receive indications to the contrary (Thomas, 1995: 62). CP consist of a limited set of conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner, to which Grice maintains interactants in a conversational exchange should but frequently do not adhere (Watts, 2003: 57). Violation of any of the maxims by the speaker leads the addressee or hearer to make what Grice calls implicature.

The rational and efficient nature of communication lies at the heart of Grice’s Cooperative principle (CP). In this conception, the CP is understood as the default principle governing verbal interaction, which is not deviated from without a reason. Politeness, then, is interpreted as a principle motivating such deviations from the most efficient way

of communication, in other words, a major underlying motivation for flouting the maxims of CP. Brown and Levinson (1987) built on Grice's work to produce their own Theory of Politeness.

1.8.2.3. Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson presented politeness as a theoretical construct based on the work of Erving Goffman's (1967) groundbreaking study of *face*. Goffman defines *face* as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (Goffman 1967: 213). Accordingly, *face* is mutually constructed and sustained during social interactions. Politeness theory is theory of interpersonal language production asserting why people do not always speak in the most direct and efficient way possible (Holtgraves, 2002).

Brown and Levinson's (1987) work on politeness suggested that the motivation stems from two main desire: the need to be approved by or connected to other individuals (positive *face*), and the need to remain autonomous (negative *face*). Brown and Levinson (1987) maintain that individuals recognize that the maintenance of their own positive and negative face is dependent on the maintenance of others face needs. Despite the interdependent nature of social relations, however, individuals often perform actions that threaten *face* (Wilson, Aleman & Leatham, 1998).

Brown and Levinson working within the framework of Speech Act Theory developed by Austin and Searle, which allows them to classify an utterance in terms of speech act

categories, observed that through certain speech acts a speaker can be polite or impolite. Although the interpretation of the illocutionary force of an utterance is limited to the sentence- like unit, context was necessary to interpret meaning.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), “certain kinds of acts intrinsically threaten *face*.” These are known as Face Threatening Acts (FTA); and apologies are one of the face threatening acts that are likely to threaten the face of both the speaker and the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) noted that the weightiness of the face threatening act can be calculated using three parameters: the social distance between the speaker and the hearer, the hearer’s power over the speaker, and the degree of imposition of the act.

The relationship of power factor operated as Brown and Levinson (1987) would predict in empirical research. When persons were in the higher power situation, they were more likely to use face threatening actions and less likely to employ negative and positive *face* redressive tactics (Baxter, 1984). Power is also connected to three emotions such as fear, awe and respect .The magnitude of the imposition in terms of *face* threat was posited as a determining factor of politeness in Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory. The variable has predictive force empirically. When persons were in a more severe situation, they were more likely to employ negative and positive face redressive tactics and less likely to use face threatening actions (Lustig & King, 1980).

Although the social distance between the speaker and the hearer was posited as a determining factor of politeness, the variable has had conflicting results in previous research. Since both the speaker and the hearer have their own face wants, the speaker attempts to reduce the potential threat by adopting certain politeness strategies.

The choice of strategies varied according to the weightiness of the face threatening act. Brown and Levinson's (1987) came up with five politeness strategies namely: Bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off record politeness and withhold politeness which Culpeper (1996) borrowed to come up with impoliteness strategies.

Mills (2003: 121) points out; there has been a lot less research done in the area of linguistic impoliteness than in politeness. She suggests it might be due to the fact that in most studies conversation is seen as something that follows the contracts of communication and is harmonious and balanced between the speakers. Nevertheless, she also points out that communication is not always co-operative, and sometimes, speakers may rather attack than support the other in the conversation.

1.8.2.4 Impoliteness strategies

Culpeper (1996) utilizes Brown and Levinson's model as a departure for his seminal article on impoliteness. Terming impoliteness "the parasite of politeness" (ibid. 355), he conceives of impoliteness as the use of intentionally face threatening acts. Culpeper divides impoliteness into two different categories: inherent impoliteness and mock politeness or banter.

Culpeper (1996: 2) states that there are acts that innately threaten one's face regardless of the context of the act, this is called inherent impoliteness. Furthermore, impoliteness that stays on the surface and is not intended to insult anyone is called mock impoliteness (Culpeper 1996).

Culpeper's work includes a framework of impoliteness which is based on the Politeness Theory of Brown & Levinson (1987). Culpeper (1996: 8) defines five impoliteness strategies which are opposites of Brown & Levinson's politeness strategies. These strategies are Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Off Record Impoliteness and Withhold Impoliteness. Culpeper (1996: 8) says: "Instead of enhancing or supporting face, impoliteness strategies are a means of attacking face."

Cashman (2006) states that, Culpeper (2005:38) revises his definition to include the role of the hearer "impoliteness comes about when the speaker communicates a face-attack intentionally, or the hearer perceives and/or constructs behaviour as intentionally face attacking, or a combination of both. While Culpeper's revised definition acknowledges the role of the hearer in assessing impoliteness, Mills (2003: 139) suggests that impoliteness is primarily an evaluative phenomenon, relying on the assessment of the behaviour of the speaker and his/her role in the community of practice, this is the model she is calling for.

In their latest article, Culpeper et al. (2003:1560-1562) have developed Culpeper's impoliteness theory further, for example by examining the use of multiple strategies and

the meaning of repetition of a particular strategy. They performed an analysis on a set data from a documentary series that dealt with clampers and their duties. Clampers who give parking tickets to cars have to face confrontational situations very often because car-owners usually disagree with their decisions about the parking ticket.

There were several occasions in the data where combinations of impoliteness strategies were used and often they were repeated. This repetition was called a parallelism and the reason why it was used was that it boosted impoliteness. In other words, it was used to increase the imposition towards the hearer and stress the speaker's negative attitude. When a combination of strategies was used it was common that the positive impoliteness strategy using taboo words combined with another strategy as bald on record. For example:

*“Shut up you f**king idiot!”*

In this example, there is a taboo word *f**king* and it acts as intensifier for the word *idiot*. The whole utterance can be identified as bald on record impoliteness because the speaker is rudely commanding the hearer to stop talking. The impact of the command is intensified with the positive impoliteness strategy of calling hearer names. It is possible to combine several strategies and this finding strengthens significantly Culpeper's earlier theory. But as Culpeper et al. (2003:1561) note, Brown and Levinson do not accept the mixing of strategies.

1.9. Theoretical Framework

1.9.1. Introduction

Theoretically this study falls within the field of pragmatics that deals with utterances rather than sentences. Pragmatics has been defined as a branch of linguistics dealing with analysis of language in context. Context on the other hand is the situational environment within which utterances are made. It is the study of these relations between language and context that are grammaticalized. This study will be based on the postulation of impoliteness strategies by Culpeper Jonathan (1996) which was developed from politeness theory and speech act theory. Culpeper lays out five strategies that speakers use to make impolite utterances as follows:

1.9.2. Bald on Record Impoliteness

In bald on record impoliteness the face threatening act (FTA) is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized. It is important to distinguish this strategy from Brown and Levinson's Bald-on-record. For Brown and Levinson, Bald on record is a politeness strategy used in fairly specific circumstances. For example, when face concerns are suspended in an emergency, when the threat to the hearer's face is very small (e.g. "Come in" or "Do sit down"), or when the speaker is more powerful than the hearer (e.g. "Stop complaining" said by a parent to a child). In all these cases little face is at stake, and, more importantly, it is not the intention of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer. According to Culpeper, Bald on record impoliteness occurs when a request or a command is made directly without any redressive action. For example,

a) Conductor: *Nipatie pesa yako.* (Give me your money.)

b) Conductor: *Tafadhali, nipatie pesa yako.* (Please give me your money.)

In the normal circumstances where politeness is concerned, when requesting for something we use the word 'please' and 'excuse me'. In the example (a) above there is no use of this polite language whereas in example (b) the polite lexical 'please' has been used making the request polite. According to Culpeper (a) is a command without any redressive action, and it is a typical case of bald on record FTA.

1.9.3. Positive impoliteness

Positive impoliteness is the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. Positive impoliteness output sub-strategies include when an interlocutor is ignored or snubbed during interaction as well as being disassociated from the other - for example, deny association or common ground with the other, avoid sitting together. In addition to these ,being disinterested in the other and using inappropriate identity markers - for example, use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains are also positive impoliteness. Finally one can also use taboo words such as swearing, or use of abusive or profane language and calling the other names or use derogatory nomination.

An example of positive impoliteness is illustrated below:

Conductor: *Lipa pesa.* (Pay your fare.)

Passenger: *Shika pesa ndio hii.* (Here, take the money.)

Conductor: *Hii ni pesa ngapi?* (How much is this money?)

Passenger: *Si ni kumi.* (It is ten shillings.)

Conductor: *Nilisema kila stage ni mbao. Ungeniambia kabla uingie.* (I said every bus stop is twenty shillings. You should have told me before getting in.)

Passenger: *Si nilikuliza ukakubali.* (But I asked you and you accepted.)

Conductor: *Mimi? Nilisema mbao, wacha kunichezea akili.* (Myself? I said twenty shillings, don't play with my mind.)

In the above example there's an agreement between the conductor and the passenger on how much to pay for fare but later on the conductor denies such an agreement thus disassociating himself. According to Culpeper (1996) this impoliteness sub-strategy of 'disassociating from the other' damages the passenger's positive because the passenger feels rejected.

1.9.4. Negative Impoliteness

According to Culpeper (1996) negative impoliteness output sub-strategies are designed to damage the addressee's face wants such as frighten by instilling a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur. Another example is when one condescends, scorns or ridicules another to emphasize their relative power. In addition to these, there is also belittling the other (e.g. use diminutives), being contemptuous and not treating the other seriously.

Other negative impoliteness strategies is Invading the other's space-literally by position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits or metaphorically by ask for or

speaking about information which is too intimate given the relationship. Putting the others indebtedness on record and hindering or blocking the other physically or linguistically are also some of the negative impoliteness sub-strategies. Finally negative impoliteness occurs when one explicitly associates the other with a negative aspect or personalizes by use of the pronouns 'I' and 'you'.

Conductor: *Wale wanashuka seniors kujeni kwa mlango haraka .Bado mnakaa chini natuko na haraka? Shukeni haraka haraka.* (Those who are alighting at seniors, come to the door quickly. You are still sitting down and we are in a hurry? Alight quickly.)

Passenger: *Gari lijasimama.Wacha kutuharakisha.* (The vehicle has not stopped. Stop telling us to hurry.)

Conductor: *Nitawapitisha. Kama hamutaki kuharakishwa simununue gari lenu, ndio mkae starehe .Munaringa hapa bure tu.* (I will not stop for you to drop off. If you don't want to be told to hurry, why don't you buy your own vehicle so that you can sit comfortably? You are showing off for nothing)

In the above conversation the conductor is intimidating the passenger by commanding them to alight quickly or he will drive off with them. He further goes personal and ridicules them by telling them that they should buy their own vehicle instead of showing off, which is impolite. In a situation when there is politeness the conductor would have them with respect and allow them to alight with ease since they have paid for the service. In fact he should thank them for choosing to use his *matatu*.

1.9.5. Off Record Impoliteness

In off record impoliteness, face threatening act is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere or sarcastic in nature, and thus remain surface realizations. (Culpeper 1996: 8-9) This is closely connected with Leech's (1983) irony principle which states that the recipient should only indirectly understand the offensive part of a statement (Culpeper 1996: 356). This can be observed when asking a question which only requires a simple answer or a yes or no but instead it is met by a sarcastic answer.

The following interaction demonstrates off record impoliteness:

Passenger: *Shukisha hapo.* (Drop me there.)

Conductor: *Wapi?* (Where?)

Passenger: *Hapo;* (There.)

Conductor: *Kuna stage inaitwa hapo?* (Is there a bus-stop called 'there'?)

The strategy used in this conversation is sarcasm. The conductor responds to the passenger's request with a sarcastic 'there' which demeans the passenger. In a polite situation, the conductor should have given the name of the bus-stop where the passenger wants to drop because he knows the stoppage points on this route which he plies every day.

1.9.6. Withhold Politeness

This is a strategy of deliberate impoliteness and occurs in the absence of expected politeness. An example of this is "failing to thank somebody for a present or when they

offer service or assistance” since this can be interpreted as intentional impoliteness (Culpeper 1996:357). Below is an example of withhold politeness.

Conductor: *Patia huyo mzee ticket yake.* (Pass this ticket to that gentleman.)

Passenger: Mtu mgani? (Which man?)

Conductor: *Huyo anakaa nyuma yako.* (That one sitting on the seat behind you.) .

In this conversation the conductor has requested the passenger to assist him in issuing the ticket which he does willingly. The conductor does not thank the passenger for this service rendered thereby withholding politeness. In a polite situation the conductor is expected to say ‘thank you’ for that service.

To sum up impoliteness strategies, Culpeper (1996) has come up with five impoliteness strategies namely: bald on record impoliteness, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record impoliteness and withhold politeness. For each of these strategies there are a range of sub-strategies which a speaker can use.

1.10. Research Methodology

This study uses the qualitative approach because it is naturalistic, it does not set up artificial experiment, but natural setting within which influence behavior. Also the key instrument is the researcher who is interested in life as it is lived in real natural setting. The data to be used is sourced from utterances that are spoken in words rather than numbers. In addition it allows the data to be analyzed inductively by generating theory from the data and establish links between the research objectives and the summary findings derived from the raw data.

1.10.1. Data Collection

The researcher used purposive sampling as a tool for selecting information because it is based on purpose and guided by the theory. Purposive sampling is random selection of sampling units within the discourse with the most information on impoliteness strategies. In addition, it enabled the researcher identify the targeted sample quickly. Purposive sampling is also convenient because sampling for proportionality is not the main concern. The researcher identified twenty such conversations used for the study. Only those utterances that are impolite were noted down.

Being a daily user of *matatu*, the researcher easily collected the Primary data by elicitation i.e. participation and observation of the utterances in the speech event. The data was collected by noting down the naturally occurring conversations between the conductors and the passengers inside *matatus* plying route 32-from Nairobi City Centre to Dandora for a period of two months.

The first hand data was collected devoid of the interactants knowledge of an academic work going on which is in accordance with Guise Method by Labov in his New York studies on ‘Attitude towards language and people.’ This is because the language one uses can determine the attitude people have towards you. The secondary data was obtained from literature in library and internet which is very rich with information on impoliteness.

1.10.2. Data Analysis and Presentation

During data analysis process the researcher freely translated the conversations to English. The context of the situation in the conversation that employs impoliteness was then described. Next, the illocutionary acts that embody impoliteness are explained. The data was then classified and interpreted based on the theoretical framework of Culpeper's impoliteness strategies.

A discussion on how the conductors in the *matatu* business use impoliteness strategies was done after which a conclusion was drawn. The sampled interactions represented the five strategies by observing the occurrences of impoliteness and searching for linguistic markers which could prove that one's face had been insulted. It was then concluded that a face threatening act had occurred. From this study the researcher analyzed the use of impolite language by the conductors. The passengers' participation was not analyzed but included in the data for case of flow of analysis.

The data is presented guided by the theory. For every impoliteness strategy, the researcher presented the conversation between the conductor and the passengers and then discussed the findings by explaining the situation and context of the speech, the illocutionary acts used and how they represent the impoliteness strategies. The researcher was also be guided by the research questions and objectives.

CHAPTER TWO

COMMUNICATION AND IMPOLITENESS

2.0. Introduction

The chapter highlights the concept of impoliteness and communication. First, the terms politeness and impoliteness are discussed with examples of sentences in which they occur are given. After that, the relationship between impoliteness and power, intention, prosody and social distance is discussed. In the last section speech acts has been discussed and how it's related with communication, meaning in speech act and also how speech acts embody impoliteness.

2.1. Politeness and Impoliteness

In spite of the fact that this study concentrates on impoliteness, it is important to acknowledge politeness because impoliteness is in a way its other half and also to know what is polite and what is impolite.

2.1.1. Politeness

According to Holmes (1995), politeness refers to “behaviour which actively expresses positive concern for others, as well as non-imposing distancing behaviour”. It is “a battery of social skills whose goal is to ensure everyone feels affirmed in a social interaction” (Mills, 2003). In terms of Brown and Levinson (1978), politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearers’ “face”. “Face” refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that “self-esteem” in public or in

private situations. This refers to the situation, where the addresser usually tries to avoid making the addressee feel uncomfortable. Hence, politeness means some manners or etiquette which is grafted on to individual speech acts in order to facilitate interaction between speaker and hearer. Such etiquette emerges over stretches of talk and across communities of speakers and hearers. Politeness is therefore defined by the concern for the feelings of others.

Politeness is achieved in several ways. First, the choice of lexical words as well as the structure of sentence contributes to politeness. The following example shows the difference between a polite and impolite utterance. 1 (a) is a more polite construction compared to 1 (b) although both the sentences mean the same. In fact 1 (b) is considered a rude speech.

1 (a).You are not a good boy.

1 (b).You are such a nuisance!

Indirectness is also another aspect of politeness. When a speaker steers conversation without being obvious about it, so that the addressee feels comfortable, is the real art of communication. A request can be made indirectly in order to keeping oneself from the potential of imposing themselves on others. Consider the following examples:

2(a) Can I use your phone?

2 (b) I was thinking of making a call but my battery is down.

In 2(a) the request is direct thereby making it impolite. Instead of directly asking as 2(a), it would be more polite to say a softer sentence such as 2 (b) which is indirect.

A speaker can also be polite by avoiding the use of negative questions. Positive questions are considered to be more polite than negative questions. In 3 (a) we have an example of a positive question which is polite whereas in 3 (b), the negative question sounds rude and impolite.

3 (a) Do you have a pen?

3 (b) Don't you have a pen?

Uses of performative utterances (Austin, 1962) such as: 'thank you' or 'sorry' are lexical means of politeness. When interlocutors utter an utterance or does something that offends the other, the polite thing to do is to apologize as in 4(a). On the other hand if the interlocutors render a service to the other they need to be appreciated as in 4 (b).

4 (a) Sorry for that, it was a mistake.

4 (b) Thank you for your help.

Other lexical items and expressions such as: please, excuse me, may, could, do you mind, do me a favour, and can also be used to express politeness. The examples below contain such expressions which are polite.

5 (a) Please pass me that bag.

5 (b) Excuse me, can you let me pass.

5 (c) May/ could you move your luggage I would like to pass?

5 (d) Do you mind if you move a little bit?

5 (e) Hello, will you do me a favour and get me that money.

2.1.2. Impoliteness

Culpepper et al (2003: 1546) defines impoliteness as communicative strategies designed to attack face and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony. Impoliteness comes about when the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally or the hearer perceives and or constructs behaviour as intentionally face-attacking or a combination of both. Locher and Bousfield (2008: 3) describe: “Impoliteness is behaviour that is face-aggravating in a particular context”. However, they then state that this definition is probably too vague and needs more elaboration. Locher and Bousfield (ibid.) continue by stating that one of the key elements that arises in impoliteness studies is that impoliteness is caused intentionally (Bousfield 2008: 132, Culpepper 2008: 36). The use of insults is often a signal of potentially impolite utterances. Thus Culpepper (1996) mentions taboo language (swearing, abusive or profane language) as one marker of impolite utterances in English.

2.1.3. Impoliteness and Power

Bousfield and Locher (2008: 8) argue that power is a critically important aspect in the study of impoliteness. According to them, power is a vital part of interaction and “impoliteness is an exercise of power”. Furthermore, impoliteness causes restrictions in the ways one can respond to the impoliteness or to the face-attack, and the restriction of one’s options to act is of course the use of power (ibid).

Moreover, Bousfield (2008: 150) argues that always when a person is truly being impolite he or she is either “creating/, activating or re-activating some aspect of his/her relative power” or “challenging someone over their (assumption of) power” or even both. However, Bousfield also states that when a person uses power, it does not mean that he or she is always being impolite in doing so. Furthermore, according to research conducted by Culpeper (2011: 186-194), it was discovered that , in fact , conventional directness , bald -on -record FTA , was not considered to be impolite when the speaker was of a higher social status than the addressee.

Culpeper (1996: 354) also connects power with the use of impoliteness. Culpeper states that impoliteness is more likely to occur when the speaker is more powerful than the addressee. When the speaker is in a higher position he or she can use impoliteness more freely since he or she might have the means to “reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness and “to threaten more severe retaliation should the less powerful participant be impolite” (ibid). Therefore, one could argue that impoliteness is likely to occur in situations where the speaker has more power, such as in *matatu* conductor’s discourse.

Impoliteness is an exercise of power and power is expressed through language and cannot be explained without contextualization. (Culpeper, 1963:354) argues that:

A powerful participant has more freedom to be impolite because he/she can reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to relate with impoliteness e.g. through the denial of speaking rights and also threaten more severe retaliation should the less powerful participant be impolite (Culpeper,1996:354).

To sum up Culpeper explains that impoliteness occurs in a situation where there is an imbalance of social structure power. This as it is the case in the present study; the participants are the conductors and passengers. In this context conductors are considered more powerful than the passengers because they are in charge of the *matatus* which the passengers have to use every day as they go about their daily activities. Therefore, they have no choice but to put up with the impoliteness and arrogance of the conductors.

2.1.4. Impoliteness and Intention

According to Locher and Bousfield (2008:132) impoliteness is caused intentionally. Culpeper (2008: 31-6) also makes a distinction between impoliteness and rudeness. According to Culpeper, both impoliteness and rudeness are “inappropriate and negatively marked” behaviour. However, Culpeper’s suggestion is that impoliteness is intentional while rudeness is unintentional negative behaviour. Therefore, Culpeper is also in agreement with Bousfield that impoliteness as something that is caused intentionally.

Furthermore, Terkourafi (2008:61-2) also makes a distinction between impoliteness and rudeness. However, this distinction is the opposite of Culpeper’s definition: Terkourafi (ibid) claims that rudeness is intentional and impoliteness is unintentional behaviour. Terkourafi bases this claim on lexicographical details. According to Terkourafi rudeness in most English dictionaries refers to intention, whereas impolite refers usually to an “accidental slight”.

2.1.5. Impoliteness and Prosody

Paralinguistic features can also aid in the interpretation of utterances as polite or impolite. As Culpeper (2005: 68) notes, the communicative resources for impoliteness extend well beyond grammar and lexicon. In particular, prosody can play a central role in the creation and evaluation of impoliteness. Bernal (2008) also notes that prosodic considerations (tenor, rising tone, laughter) play a large role in the determination of an utterance as authentically impolite or mock-impolite.

Culpeper (2011b: 57-60) has touched the area of prosody as well. Sometimes it is not what is said that is impolite but how it is said. This means that prosody has its own effect on utterances. Prosody is defined as being variation in loudness, pitch, intonation, and speaking tempo, for instance. In Andersen's (1999) categorization prosody belongs to the group of vocalic. An utterance that would otherwise be formally polite can be made impolite by changing the tone of voice.

At the phonological level, pragmatic meaning related to the illocutionary force of an utterance e.g. statement, question, imperative can be associated with individual intonational features. Culpeper (2011) points out that implicatures, in his account of prosody convey impoliteness. He illustrates prosodically conveyed impoliteness with the example of an exchange between two young sisters.

A: Do you know **anything** about yoyos?

B: That's mean.

In the interaction, there is nothing about the lexical content or syntactic form of A's utterance that signals impoliteness. But A produces the utterance with nuclear prominence on 'anything' followed by a sharply falling intonation which is marked differently from the rising intonation pattern that is typical of yes/no questions in English. The mismatch of prosodic pattern and syntactic form carries conversational implicature. The result is the response from B who has clearly interpreted A's utterance as intentionally impolite. Prosody plays a role in prosodic cues to types of speakers affect such as irony and sarcasm which are some of the impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper. A hearer can distinguish ironic and non-ironic speech through the tone of voice. Prosody also correlates of perceived sarcasm. In the present study, prosody will help highlight the impolite illocutions.

2.1.6. Impoliteness and social distance.

Culpeper (1996:354-355) take a closer look at the circumstances when we are impolite. It is relevant whenever the relationship between speakers is equal or unequal. When we think of equal relationship, the situations where impoliteness occurs are more complex. In a relationship where the social distance is close, impoliteness is likely to be more than compared to relationship between strangers where the social distance is not close.

For example, spouses know each other well such that they know each other's soft spots for attacks and they also know how their partner is going to react when they get offended and how they can be appeased. The concern for face is also minor in close relationship where person do not like each other or one of the participants is more powerful. One

notable characteristic of impoliteness in equal relationships is its tendency to increase. One verbal attack can easily lead to counter-attack and in the end even to physical attacking even though mocking might have started as harmless.

Fukushima (2000) splits social distance into three sub components. First is whether people are similar or different. Second is how much people know each other and lastly is whether people like each other. According to Fukushima, a speaker unconsciously or consciously makes choices depending on social distance which in turn influences the strategies they use. The social distance scale indicated the degree of respectfulness that depends on real factors such as age, social class and sex. This scale is used to show difference, existence or solidarity between group members, for instance people who have known each other will show the higher solidarity for each other. On the contrary people who are in distance relationship will have a low solidarity to each other. For example, the conductors and the passengers belong to different social class; therefore, they have distant relationship and low solidarity.

2.2. Face invasion

During an act of communication, speakers resort to a variety of linguistic strategies which might save or attack the interlocutor's face, this is "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (Goffman, 1967, p.12). In some situations, the speaker might unintentionally choose a type of strategy which violates the addressee's social norms and expectation and as a result be considered rude or impolite.

Culpeper also wants to prove that conflictive communication is not marginal to human behaviour at all, as Leech (1983: 105) quoted by Culpeper, 1996: 350) has claimed. First he tries to clarify the circumstances when people are impolite. In order to do that, he goes back to Brown and Levinson's theory (1987) about presence of politeness, which claims that it is normal for people to co-operate to maintain each other's faces.

This is based on the mutual vulnerability of the face. It is in everyone's mutual interest to maintain each other's face because they do not want their own face to be threatened either (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). However, Culpeper points out that there are situations where this vulnerability is, in fact, not mutual, which causes the motivation not to threaten face disappear. For example, there might be a conflict of interest between participants: another participant might benefit from the fact that the other participant loses their nerves. Situations like these occur in the *matatu* sector for instance. Additionally, if another participant is more powerful than the other, they do not have to be mutually polite to each other.

2.3. Speech Acts

The concept of speech acts is of significance in the speaker-hearer interactions. Speech acts play a very important role in communication. Searle (1976: 16) states that all linguistic communication involves linguistic (speech) acts. In other words, speech acts are the basic or minimal unit of linguistic communication. Understanding of the operations of speech acts and their application to utterances and speech events will provide a clear picture how speech acts operate in interpersonal communication in

particular and pragmatics in general. The illocutionary force is the central concept of examining meaning in speech act which are found in different sentence types. Through these illocutionary acts, we discuss the relationship between speech act and impoliteness.

2.3.1. Speech Act and Communication.

Communication is an ongoing process. It has no beginning nor an end, and it perpetually changes. Communication is a very collective activity as well; human society could not exist without human communication. Communication can be divided into two main categories, verbal and nonverbal communication. Verbal communication is the spoken language which is a significant part of our everyday communication while nonverbal communication does not involve use of language although its functions are similar to verbal communication. Nonverbal communication exists beside language. Verbal communication is single-channeled and relatively manipulated, whereas nonverbal communication is multi-channeled and relatively honest.

This is based on the fact that nonverbal communication is usually much more spontaneous and therefore it is more difficult to lie. We often think about what we say, but not how we move our head or our gaze. Also verbal communication is a culturally based system, whereas most of nonverbal communication is a biologically based system. As a case in point, facial expressions tend to communicate same things in most cultures. However, some nonverbal communication, such as certain gestures and the role of touching are not the same in every culture. Therefore, for communication to be effective, the speech act and the speech event has to be considered.

One of the central concepts in pragmatics is utterance-meaning, or speaker-meaning. Whereas sentence-meaning refers merely to the abstract meaning of a sentence regardless of the context, utterance-meaning refers to what a speaker intends or wants to communicate. For instance, if someone says 'it's really cold in here' in a room with a window open, they do not only make a statement about the room temperature but perhaps make a hidden request for someone to close the window.

Another important pragmatic concept is a speech act, which is very closely connected to utterance-meaning. Speech acts are verbal actions with which we perform different actions, such as promising, demanding, or requesting. They can also be described as "the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication" (Searle 1969: 16 as quoted by Mey 2001: 93.) There are various ways of categorizing speech acts. One of the most common and used distinction is the one of direct and indirect speech acts. Whereas a direct speech act refers to the match between the sentence type and the intention of the act, an indirect speech act does not reveal this intention instead it is implicit and the hearer presupposes what the speaker has in mind. .

Pragmatics distinct between what a speaker's words mean and what a speaker might mean with his words. In interpersonal communication, it is not so much what the sentence literally means that matters when we talk but how they reveal the intentions and strategies of the speakers. Illocutionary acts such as questioning, claiming, threatening, requesting and so on reveal the intention of the speaker. To communicate, we must express propositions with a particular illocutionary force and in so doing we perform

particular kinds of actions or illocutionary acts. Searle (1969:60-1) states that the speaker intends to produce a certain illocutionary effect by means of getting the hearer to recognize the intention to produce that effect. Therefore, in interpersonal communication, performance of speech acts matters most because it conveys the intention and strategies of the speaker. Look at the example of this utterance by conductor:

1. *Hi mziigo inazuia wateja kupita.*

This luggage is preventing customers from passing.

This is a declarative sentence which may be interpreted as complain about the luggage blocking the way for other passengers in the *matatu*. The utterance will have a further illocutionary force. The speaker is indirectly requesting the passenger to remove the luggage so as to give way. For the hearer to understand this implicit utterance there has to be a relationship between the speaker and the hearer and the context.

In another situation a speaker may use conventional speech acts which maybe indirect but familiar to the language user from experience. This familiarity enables the hearer to interpret the intended meaning of the speaker correctly despite the indirectness of the sentence form. The meaning is interpreted in context. For example:

2. *Unawezu kupisha hizo pesa?*

Can you pass that money?

The above question will not be a question about the hearer's ability to pass the money but a request to pass the money. The utterance may occur in many situations and will always be understood as a request.

Illocutionary acts are performed with an audience- directed communication intention which conveys the speakers intended meaning to the hearer. The speaker chooses his words carefully so that the addressee recognizes the speaker's communicative intention. For the hearer to understand the utterance he has to recognize that a certain type of speech act is to be performed Example of such acts include warning, (Don't play with fire!); reprimanding,(That was foolish of you.); requesting, (Lend me some money.) and making a promising,(I promise to buy a present.)

2.3.2. Meaning in Speech Acts.

Utterances have meaning as a result of our understanding of the speech acts and the speech event. Austin (1962) identified three levels of total speech acts performed by a speaker to make an utterance. These are locutionary acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts. Since communication involves more than expressing propositions, the speaker makes a locutionary act (proposition) and by doing so, makes an illocutionary act which produces a perlocutionary effect.

A locutionary act refers to the actual words uttered by the speaker. It is the act of making a linguistic expression, Yule (1995). It involves the articulation of sound using speech organs, formation of a grammatical sentence in a particular language, and arrangement of intonation. For example if a teacher says "Collect your books," the locutionary act he has performed is to say that the books should be collected.

Illocutionary act is the second level of communication of an utterance which reveals the speaker's meaning or intention. The illocutionary act enables the hearer to interpret the action to be performed by the utterance such as by making a promise, requesting, reprimanding, insulting, warning, ridiculing, condemning, threatening and so on. In the sentence said by the teacher "Collect your books," the illocutionary act is a request. The teacher is requesting the students to hand in their books at a specific time.

Perlocutionary act is the effect of the illocutionary act especially on the hearer. According to Blackmore (1992) language is "used not just for describing existing states of affairs but also for creating new ones." For communication to take place the speaker performs an act that is recognized by the hearer. A perlocutionary act is performed with the aim of producing an effect or results. For example in the sentence "Collect your books," the consequence of the illocutionary act is that the students will give the teacher the books. This act of giving the teacher books is the perlocutionary effect.

The illocutionary and perlocutionary acts are important in communication because they suggest the success of communicating an utterance. Communication becomes complete and successful if the illocutionary act is followed by the correct perlocutionary act. Otherwise, if a certain illocutionary act is followed by an incorrect perlocutionary act then there is miscommunication. In this study, the focus is on the illocutionary act which the *matatu* conductors use when talking to passengers and not the perlocutionary effect acted by the passengers.

2.3.3. Illocutionary force and sentence type.

Illocutionary acts are considered the core of the theory of speech acts. As already suggested above, an illocutionary act is the action performed by the speaker in producing a given utterance. The illocutionary act is closely connected with speaker's intentions, e.g. stating, questioning, promising, requesting, and giving commands, threatening and many others. As Yule (1996: 48) claims, the illocutionary act is thus performed via the communicative force of an utterance which is also generally known as illocutionary force of the utterance. Basically, the illocutionary act indicates how the whole utterance is to be taken in the conversation.

Shopen (1985:160) points out that "it is in some respect a surprising fact that most languages are similar in presenting the three basic sentence types with similar functions and similar form". These three sentence types are declaratives, imperatives and interrogatives. Lyons (1981: 189) also expresses the same observation that all languages provide their user with the means of making statements, asking questions and issuing commands. Bearing in mind Shopen's observation that sentence types are similar for most languages, our study will focus mainly on the declarative, imperative and interrogative structure and how they determine the impolite illocutionary forces of utterances.

Generally declarative sentences are used to make statements such as announcements, assertion, ridicule, threats, and warnings, insults and so on. The interrogatives ask questions and elicit verbal responses from the hearer in order to gain information. The

imperatives indicate the speakers desire to influence future event. It is of service in making request, giving orders, making suggestion and the like. Each sentence type has been linked to what Sadock et al (2004:71) call Illocutionary Act Potential (IAP) as illustrated below.

UTTERANCE	SENTENCE TYPE	ILLOCUTIONARY FORCE
Sit right here.	imperative	commanding
When will you attend to us?	interrogative	inquiring
Get out of here.	imperative	threatening
You are blocking the way.	declarative	requesting
How much are you able to pay?	interrogative	inquiring
This luggage is too heavy.	declarative	complaining

Table 1 Sentence types and illocutionary force.

Table 1 above illustrates the relationship between sentence type and the meaning each sentence brings out also the attitude towards the factual content of the utterance. It is possible to describe the proposition as declarative, imperative and interrogative without the context in which it is uttered. However, we cannot tell the Illocutionary force without the context. The context provides the hearer or reader with the Illocutionary Act Potential of the utterance. Some examples of speech acts which are used to reveal speaker's meaning and intention include the following:

2.3.3.1. Direct speech act and impoliteness

A direct speech act is considered impolite in most circumstances. To make straight forward assertions or issue blunt and unqualified, commands threatens the hearers 'face'.

This is because the speaker is imposing him or herself. Look at the examples below:

- 3 a) You are fat.
- 3 b) It seems you are eating well nowadays.

Statement 3 (b) is more polite and preferable to 3 (a). Statement 3(b) has an illocutionary force of appreciation whereas in 3(a) the illocutionary force is of assertion which definitely does not protect the face of the hearer in an interaction. Commands, assertions and requests clash with the rule of politeness which states 'don't impose'. In this study the language used by conductors has a lot of direct speech acts which make them impolite.

2.3.3.2. Imperative speech act

Imperative speech acts are used to issue directives. The context in which it is uttered clearly shows which illocutionary act is being performed. Lyons (1981:192) states that a language has grammatical mood which is used distinctively and characteristically for the imposing of one's will on others. This mood is referred to as imperative. The imperative mood is associated with the performance of speech acts of 'directive' such as ordering, entreating, requesting, insisting and advising. These speech acts attempt to get the hearer to do something.

For example

4. *Toa mziro kwa kiti.*

Remove the luggage from the seat.

To understand the above utterances, the hearer must identify the imperative speech act which could be an order or request. The speaker is aware that the hearer is able to put the luggage down and that he will follow instructions as directed. The speaker expects the hearer to carry out the instructions immediately failure to which there will be conflict. This kind of order infringes on the hearers public face image. Like in most languages imperatives do not have an overt subject and their verb does not carry any overt indication of tense. The tense implied is immediate.

2.3.3.3. Imperative speech act and impoliteness

Lyons (1997:746) defines imperatives as ‘utterances which impose, or propose some cause of action or pattern of behavior and indicate that it should be carried out’. This implies that imperatives generally have an element of imposition and infringing on the hearer space or face. When one commands another, there is total imposition and it is also an indication of speaker’s authority over the hearer. Commands do not protect face because they are imposing. Request using the imperative is not polite either; although the degree of politeness is higher than in commands. Therefore, imperatives are characterized by an element of impoliteness in the speaker. The table below illustrates some of the impolite imperatives statements extracted from the data collected in the *matatu* interaction versus the expected polite version.

Impolite imperative locutionary act	Polite non-imperative locutionary act
<i>Shuka haraka unatuchelewesh.</i> Alight quickly you are making us get late.	<i>Jaribu kushuka haraka kidogo.</i> Try and alight a little fast.
<i>Songa wateja wapite.</i> Move, for customers to pass.	<i>Songa kidogo hapo upishe wenzako.</i> Move a little bit there to allow others to pass.
<i>Ngoja, nakupatia change</i> Wait, I am giving you balance.	<i>Tafadhali ngoja kidogo nitafute change.</i> Please wait a bit I look for the balance.
<i>Beba mzigo wako</i> Carry your luggage.	<i>Unaweze kubeba mzigo wako.</i> You can carry your luggage.
<i>Lipa pesa yako.</i> Pay your fare.	<i>Tafadhali nipatie pesa yako.</i> Please give me your money.

Table 2 Impoliteness in imperative acts.

2.3.3.4. Interrogative speech acts.

Interrogatives speech acts refer to verb forms or sentence clause types which are typically used as questions. Crystal (1980:241) states that interrogatives are analyzed as having the force of question, which is in turn analyzed as request for information. Like in English, Kiswahili also has two main categories of question. First is the yes- no question type which seeks a response to the truth of the questioned proposition. These questions maintain a declarative form which is Subject + Verb order or Assertive + Subject + Verb with a rising intonation. For example:

5 a Uko na mzigo?

Do you have luggage?

5 b Umelipa?

Have you paid?

5 c Unashuka wapi?

Where are you alighting?

The questions above show the attitude of the speaker as being in doubt hence requiring the hearer to clear this doubt by either responding 'yes' or 'no'.

The second category of interrogative speech acts is what Shopen (1985:179) calls informative or question-word question type. They are also referred to as Wh- Questions by Wales (1989:258). These questions require content when responding to. They are formed with interrogative pronouns such as whom, who, where, when, why and how and make use of falling intonation towards the end. Consider the following examples from the conductors' utterances:

6 a Ulinipatia pesa saa ngapi?

When did you give me the money?

6b Unaongea na nani?

Whom are you talking to?

6c Utabeba huo mziigo aje?

How are you going to carry that luggage?

In response to the wh-questions, the hearer has to give an explanation to support their actions

2.3.3.5. Interrogative speech act and impoliteness.

In performance of speech acts, interrogatives will not always imply that there are elements of politeness. Sometimes speaker uses questions that are not face saving, that is,

they deliberately mean to impose or offend. Also the speaker may use figurative language as he performs a speech act that is meant to hurt the feelings of the hearer.

The following table demonstrates that interrogative utterances may be used to express impoliteness

Impolite question locutionary act	Illocutionary effect	Alternative Polite question
<i>Mbona unabebana kama mwendazimu?</i> Why are you carrying baggage like a mad man?	Ridiculing	<i>Unaenda wapi na huo mzigo mzito ?</i> Where are you going with that heavy baggage?
<i>Unaongea matope aje?</i> Why are you talking rubbish?	Insult	<i>Siuongee vizuri tuelewane?</i> Why don't you talk nicely we understand each other?
<i>Kuna stage inaitwa hapo?</i> Is there a bus-stop called 'there'?	Sarcasm	<i>Ulikwa unataka kushuka wapi?</i> Where did you want to alight?
<i>Umerogwa?</i> Are you bewitched?	Insult	<i>Uko na shida?</i> <i>Are you having a problem?</i>
<i>Unafikiri unafanya nini?</i> What do you think you are doing?	Condemning	<i>Mbona unafanya hivyo?</i> Why are you doing that?

Table 3 Impoliteness in interrogatives.

2.3.3.6 Declarative Speech Acts

Declarative are statements that declare state of something. The declarative verb that changes a state; this is usually done by somebody in authority e.g. 'I declare you husband and wife'. Only a church minister can make this declaration. Declaratives are also direct speech act.

2.3.3.7 Declarative speech act and impoliteness.

Declaratives statements are made to produce impoliteness by adding tag question. If the tag has a rising tone, it invites verification while tags with falling tones invite confirmation of the statement. Declaratives are spoken with finality and they are also direct acts which makes them impolite. For example, if a speaker says ‘You are stupid , aren’t you?’ he has constructed an impolite sentence which increases the potential for face damage to the hearer by inviting; that is coercing the hearer to self- face damage by agreeing with the impolite assessment in the declarative ‘You are stupid’.

Impolite declarative act	Illocutionary effect	Alternative Polite declarative
<i>Umekalia viti viwili.</i> You are sitting on two seats.	Complain	<i>Tafahali , kalia kiti moja.</i> Please sit on one.
<i>Wewe ni Malaya.</i> You are a prostitute.	Insult	<i>Tabia yako si mzuri.</i> Your behaviour is not good.
<i>Uko na utoto nyingi, sivyo.</i> You are childish, aren’t you?	Insult	<i>Ongea kama mtu mkubwa.</i> You need to be mature.
<i>Hakuna kitu unajua, sivyo?</i> You know nothing, don’t you?	Belittle	<i>Kuna mengi inatakikana ujifundishe.</i> There’s a lot you need to learn.

Table 4 Impoliteness in declaratives.

2.4. Summary

The above discussion on the concept of speech act should provide the reader with clear understanding of the theory of speech act and its pragmatic contribution to interpersonal communication. It sheds light on the importance of context which is the main recipe for interpretation of utterances to enable the hearer understands what the speakers’ meaning is. The speakers’ communication intention is realized in the illocutionary force of

utterances which convey the speakers' intended meaning to the hearer. Through communication one can be termed as polite or impolite. We have also discussed how impoliteness relates to power, intention, prosody and social distance. A speaker may be impolite if he has power over the hearer or if there is social distance between them; others do it intentionally. In conclusion, impoliteness is embodied in the speech acts.

CHAPTER THREE

IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN MATATU CONDUCTOR'S CONVERSATION

3.0 Introduction

This chapter analyses the language used by *matatu* conductors using politeness theory in the interpretation. It makes an analysis on impolite turns in order to establish a descriptive account of impoliteness. In the illustration, the study has used the five classifications of impoliteness strategies namely: bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off record impoliteness and withhold politeness, to interpret the data. For each of the five impoliteness strategies, the impolite speech acts that represent impoliteness are identified then discussed in context. The classification of these utterances is done in accordance with Culpeper's impoliteness strategies (1996; 356-57).

It is important to note that the analysis that follows is not a comprehensive account of impoliteness in language in all of their possible manifestations. Such an account would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. Rather, the analysis is intended to describe these particular examples. Nevertheless, these examples shed light on some of the possible strategies interlocutors can use to express impoliteness in other contexts.

3.1 Impoliteness strategies

In this section I have provided examples of each of Culpeper's impoliteness strategies, starting from bald on record impoliteness and finishing with withholding politeness. The context of the conversation is firstly explained to give description of the conversation.

This context is important to be explained because the message of the utterances cannot be known literally.

3.1.1 Bald On Record Impoliteness

Bald On record impoliteness is the most obvious and most straightforward impoliteness there is. According to Culpeper (1996) this kind of impoliteness is especially common among people who have a close relationship. However, in the following examples conductors interact with passengers whom they have never met before, which make the effect of bald on record impoliteness even stronger. In this category, it was common that the impoliteness was clear, unambiguous and direct.

Example 1

Conductor: *Kila mtu pesa mkononi.*(Everybody, money in your hand.)

Pesa yako(Your money)

Passenger: *Niko na kumi.* (I have ten shillings.)

Conductor: *Wacha ujinga.* (Don't be silly.)

In the first example the interlocutors are in the matatu and the conductor wants to take fare from the passengers. He has told them to have the money ready in their hands. The passengers hold the money in their hands and give it to the conductor as he collects from one passenger to another.

The interaction begins with a directive from the conductor ordering the passengers to have their money in their hands. The next locution which is also a directive has an

illocutionary act of demand, which in the real sense should be a request. According to Culpeper (1996), direct request is an example of Bald on Record Impoliteness. This is because the conductor commands the passengers without any redressive action thus threatening the 'face' of the passengers. In addition, such direct speech acts have illocutionary force of command and assertion which goes against the rule of impoliteness that requires one not to impose themselves on others. Commands do not protect the face of the hearer because they impose.

The utterance by the conductor, illustrates his impolite behavior towards the passenger. He uses bald on record impoliteness when he says "*Wacha ujinga*" 'Don't be silly'. The word 'silly' itself connotes an insult to the passenger. In this conversation even without hearing the tone of voice, it is clear that this expression has a rising intonation which is negatively evaluated in this context. Furthermore, the conductor wants to maintain his power by damaging the passenger's face want.

Example 2

Conductor: *Lipa pesa ya mziro wewe?! (You, pay the money for the luggage.)*

Passenger 1: *Sina pesa ingine. (I don't have any other money).*

Conductor: *Wacha kucheza na kazi yangu Wewe utalipia huo mziro. (Stop joking with my job. You will pay for that luggage).*

Passenger: *Haki sina pesa ingine. Hii ndio nilikuwa nayo. (For sure I don't have any money. This is all I have).*

Passenger 2: *Tafadhali, si umwachie leo tu. Ameomba ,hana pesa ingine,*(Please just allow him for today, he has pleaded he has no extra money).

Conductor: *Wewe nyamaza. Nani amekuambia uingilie mambo sio yako? Kama uko na pesa si umlipie. Usiniletee kisirani kwa kazi* (You shut up. Who has told you to get involved in other people’s business? If you have money, pay for him. Don’t give me stress in my job).

In the second example, a passenger boards a *matatu* with some luggage but he does not have money to pay for the luggage as expected by the conductor. The conductor insists that the passenger must pay for the luggage. To show solidarity, one of the passengers gets involved in the conversation and tries to plead on behalf of the other. The conversation reveals bald on record impoliteness strategy is clearly used by conductor when he asks the 2nd passenger, “*Nani amekuambia uingilie mambo sio yako?*”(‘Who has told you to get involved in other people’s business?’.) In this interrogative speech act the conductor tries to attack the face of the passenger directly.

Furthermore, the interrogative speech act reveals the displeasure of the conductor towards the second passenger for interfering with his work. The conductor’s utterance shows his unwillingness to listen to the 2nd passenger .Simply looking at his utterance; one can see that the conductor behaves impolitely towards the passenger because in his opinion the passenger should not get involved in an issue that does not concern him. So, the conductor's utterance has a clear intention to be maximally offensive. In addition to this, the locution ‘*Usiniletee kisirani kwa kazi*’, (‘Don’t give me stress in my job’.) is also uttered in a harsh tone which heightens the impoliteness.

The conductor further performs an impolite act by uttering the imperative statement: ‘*Wewe nyamaza*’. (‘You shut up’) to the second passenger. The word ‘shut up’ is an impolite word which involves the loss of ‘face’ on the part of the hearer. In fact, the conductor’s impolite behaviour with the passenger can deepen the conflict between them. The tone of voice in commanding the passenger is very clear in expressing the negative attitude towards the passenger. Furthermore, the expression ‘shut up’ is not an insult as much as it reflects the speaker’s self-derisiveness. Therefore the whole utterance of the conductor is identified as bald on record impoliteness as it occurs in a direct face to face interaction.

Example 3

Conductor: *Toa mziho hapo* (Move this luggage out of the way.)

Passenger: *Niweke wapi* (Where do I place it?)

Conductor: *Beba*. (Carry it.)

In this interaction, the passenger has boarded a *matatu* with a luggage; he places the luggage along the passage then goes and sits down. When the conductor comes he bluntly orders the passenger to move the luggage and when the passenger inquires where he can put it, he rudely tells him to carry it.

The imperative speech act used by the conductor is impolite because it has an element of imposition; it also indicates that the conductor has authority over the passengers. In the first locution ‘*Toa mziho hapo*’ (Move this luggage out of the way.), the illocutionary act is a request but it is not polite because it is infringing on the hearer’s ‘face’. The second

locution ‘*Beba*’ (Carry it) is a command and commands do not protect the face of the hearer because they are imposing thereby qualifying to be a bald on record impoliteness.

3.1.2. Positive Impoliteness

Positive impoliteness refers to the strategies that are designed to damage the addressee’s positive face wants. A positive face is the need to be part of a certain action or to be approved of, Culpeper comes up with a number of sub-strategies for positive impoliteness of which some are identified in the data collected in the *matatu* conductor’s discourse. It is also common that there are many different positive impoliteness strategies in the same dialogue. The use of multiple strategies is a way to emphasize impoliteness and create a bigger offense towards the hearer.

Example 4

Conductor: *Mathee leta pesa.* (Mother, bring your money)

Passenger: *Shika pesa ndio hii* (Here, take the money.)

Conductor: *Hii ni pesa ngapi?* (How much is this money)

Passenger: *Si ni kumi.* (It’s ten shillings.)

Conductor: *Nilisema kila stage ni mbao, ungeniambia kabla uingie.* (I said every bus stop is twenty shillings. You should have told me before getting in,)

Passenger: *Si nilikuuliza ukakubali.* (But I asked you and you accepted.)

Conductor: *Mimi? Nilisema mbao, wacha kunichezea akili.* (Myself? I said twenty shillings, don’t play with my mind)

The first example of positive impoliteness sub-strategy is seen where the interlocution is from a conflictive conversation between a male passenger and conductor. The passenger had requested the conductor if he could pay ten shillings from Nairobi City Centre to Mathare instead of the usual twenty shillings to which the conductor accepted.

In this conversation the conflict arises after the passenger pays ten shillings instead of twenty shillings since he had asked the conductor before boarding the *matatu*. The conductor insists that there was no such agreement. According to Culpeper (1996), this sub-strategy is ‘disassociating from the other’ by denying common ground. The positive impoliteness strategy is clearly used by the conductor when he talks to the passenger as if he had not had an earlier agreement with him. He is distancing himself from the passenger because there is no close social distance between the two of them. In addition, the conductor’s illocutionary force in ‘Don’t play with my mind.’ which is a warning has the implication that the passenger is not honest. In the conductor’s second locution, he expresses doubt in the interrogative speech act to justify that indeed there was no agreement.

Example 5

Passenger: *Si ulisema unapita njia ya ndani?*(Didn’t you say you are using the route that passes inside the estate?)

Conductor: *Nani, mimi? Mama, hukuongea na mimi* (Who, me? Woman, you didn’t talk to me)

Passenger; *Nilikuuliza na ukasema ndio, sasa mbona unakataa* (I asked you and you said you will follow that route, why are you now refusing?)

Conductor: *Mimi? Sikusema chochote unless maskio yako ni mbaya. Nilisema Dandora mwisho.* (Me? I didn't say anything unless your ears are impaired. I said the destination is Dandora)

Passenger: *Basi nirudishie pesa nipande matatu igine.*(Then refund me fare so that I board another *matatu*.)

Conductor; *Pesa gani?* (Which money?)

Passenger: *Si ten bob.* (Ten shillings)

Conductor: *Ten bob ya nini na nimekuleta mpaka hapa. Shuka, unafikiri gari ni la bwana yako, ubebwe bure? Hii ni kazi.* (Ten shillings for what and I have brought you up to here. Get out. You think this is your husband's car to have a free ride?)

Passenger: *Mambo ya bwana inaingilia aje na kuitisha pesa?* (How does the issue of husband come in when asking for a refund?)

The conversation above illustrates another example of positive impoliteness strategy. A female passenger had inquired from the conductor if the *matatu* would use the road branching into the estates or the highway on reaching Dandora. The conductor had assured her he would do so but instead the *matatu* used the highway. This results to a conflictive conversation as the passenger is asking why he didn't keep the promise.

Although the conductor is disassociating himself from the passenger, he has also used another positive impoliteness sub-strategy which Culpeper (1996) refers to as 'seek

disagreement'. The conductor selects a sensitive topic by bringing in the issue of the passengers husband without considering whether she is married or not. This is intrusion in one's private life which causes embarrassment to the passenger thus threatening her positive face. It is not the conductors business to question the passenger's marital issues.

In the same conversation the conductor uses another different positive impoliteness strategy which Culpeper refers to as: 'be unconcerned'. The conductor behaves impolite by not being concerned towards the passenger's predicament of which he is the cause. In the last utterance of the conductor, he has used a bald on record impoliteness in the command 'get out' with the purpose of aggravating the passenger's face. This extract combines between bald on record impoliteness with positive impoliteness.

Example 6

Conductor: *Mzee wacha wapiti.* (Old man, let them pass)

Passenger: *Siunishikie hii.* (Hold for me this)

Conductor: *Wewe mzee, kama hutaki ushuke* (You old man, if you don't want, get out.)

Passenger: *Nani mzee? Mimi si mzee. Wacha madharau.* (Who is an old man? I am not an old man. Stop despising me.)

In this conversation a young man of about thirty years old has boarded a matatu and is standing at the door. The conductor directs him to move so as to give way for other passengers to pass. He requests the conductor to hold for him the luggage that he had but the conductor ignores him.

In this situation the sub-strategy of positive impoliteness used is ‘inappropriate identity markers’, Culpeper (1996:37). This impoliteness strategy concentrates mainly on titles, calling names and their misusages. In this case the conductor calls the passenger an ‘old man’. The passenger is offended by this name calling because he is in his thirties. In fact he refutes that he is not an old man. In the same interaction the conductor uses ‘bald on record impolitenesses in his command ‘*Mzee wacha wapite.*’ (Old man, let them pass.), and reinforces his utterance with positive impoliteness by employing ‘name calling’. He further uses a threat ‘*Kama hutaki ushuke*’ (If you don’t want, get out) to force the passenger to obey his command.

Where politeness is concerned, conductor is supposed to assist his passengers when they request him to do so but here we see the conductor being very indifferent which is impolite. The fact that he dares the passenger to alight if he does not want to move indicates that he has power over the passenger.

Example 7

Conductor: *Rounda rounda, wale wanashuka raunda wakuje haraka* (Rounda rounda, those who are alighting to come quickly)

Passenger: *Tukuje na gari haijasimama.* (You want us to come and the vehicle is still moving)

Conductor: *Bado munang’ethia hapo?*(You are still idling there)

Passenger: *Mbona sazile mnabeba watu hamkuagi na haraka, alafu wakati wa kushuka mnaharakisha watu* (Why is it that when you want people to board you don’t

tell them to hurry and when it comes to alighting you want us to hurry?)

Conductor: *Wacha kutuwestia time, shukaa haraka* (stop wasting our time, alight fast)

The following interaction the conductor is calling passengers who are to alight at the next stage *rounda*, which means ‘round about’ to move quickly. The passenger complains that the vehicle is still moving and the conductor should not force them to hurry. The sub-strategy used is that of ‘unconcerned’. This is because the conductor is not concerned about the safety of his passengers who, unfortunately, can slip and fall because the vehicle is still moving and the road is also bumpy. Furthermore he condemns them for still being seated and wasting his time. In a polite situation the conductor should wait until the vehicle comes to a stop then let the passengers alight without being threatened.

In addition to being unconcerned, the conductor also uses another sub-strategy of ‘disassociation’. This is seen in the passenger’s second locution complaining of the conductor’s insincerity.

Example 8

Conductor: *Mbao, Mbao* (Twenty shillings, twenty shillings)

Passenger: *Mimi niko na kumi.* (I have ten shillings)

Conductor: *Kila stage ni mbao.* (Every stop over is twenty shillings){*Looking very bored and disinterested*}

Passenger: *Uwezi ukanibeba na kumi.?* (You can’t allow me to pay ten shillings?)

Conductor: *Nimekuambia kila stage ni mbao. Unaenda ama huendi? Kaa hapo ungoje ingine. Wateja wako wengi. Mbao, mbao wale wako na haraka.* (I have told

you every stop is twenty shillings. Are you going or not? Stand there and continue waiting. There are many passengers.) {*Pauses then continues calling*} Twenty shillings, twenty shillings, those who are in a hurry.)

The conversation above illustrates another positive impoliteness strategy used by the conductor referred to as 'being disinterested'. A young male passenger is asking the conductor if he can pay ten shillings to Dandora. Without even looking at the passenger, the conductor responds that every stopover the *matatu* makes the fare is twenty shilling. The positive impoliteness is enhanced by nonverbal communication. The conductor's mood is bored rather than enthusiastic and interested.

Also he does not maintain eye contact with the passenger which is expected in any business transaction. This impoliteness can be interpreted in the locutionary act, '*Are you going or not? Stand there and continue waiting. There are many passengers*', this utterance has the illocutionary force of dismissing. A good conductor ought to listen to their passengers and at least show some interest even if he is really not interested. This is because he needs money from the passengers for the business to be successful. Showing disinterest openly is impolite

Example 9

Passenger: *Conductor tafadhali punguza sauti ya radio nataka kuongea kwa simu.*

(Conductor, please reduce the volume of the radio I want to receive a call).

Conductor: *Hio hewa ni sawa.* (That music is okay) {Mumbling}

Passenger: *Conductor tafadhali. Nakuongelesha na umenyamaza.* (Conductor pleases. I am talking to you and you aren't listening.) {*The conductor ignores the pleas of the passenger and continues nodding his head to the beats of the music*}.

In this extract the conductor is acting impolitely through the use of nonverbal communication by ignoring the female passenger. Instead of listening to the request of the passenger, he responds with a mumble and completely ignores her. The sub-strategy in this question is thus 'ignore the other'. It is not suitable for a conductor to continue entertaining himself at the expense of his passengers who need his attention.

The conductor ignores the passenger's request because he has power over the passenger. Since he is the one in control of the *matatu*, he has the power to do whatever pleases him. This makes the passenger vulnerable in this situation. In addition to this, the social distance between the conductor and the passengers is not close thus promoting impoliteness. These actions exemplify the relationship between impoliteness and power in which the conductor aims to damage passenger's negative face and he employs negative impoliteness of explicitly

3.1.3 Negative Impoliteness

Whereas positive impoliteness attacks the addressee's positive face, negative impoliteness attacks the addressee's negative face, that is, an addressee's will or need to be unimpeded, not distracted by others, and free from all kinds of imposition. (Brown and

Levinson, 1987). Culpeper (1996) has listed six different negative sub-strategies, and a few of these could be found in the data collected. Looking at another interaction, we again see further usages which indicate that lexical items traditionally perceived and produced with an eye to impoliteness can also be used to express mock-impoliteness as well. The range of negative impoliteness strategies is smaller than positive impoliteness strategies. However, the negative impoliteness strategies are quite noticeable.

Example 10

Conductor: *Pita ukae nyuma.* (Go and sit in the back)

Passenger: *Hai! Siwezi.* (Hai! I can't)

Conductor: *Mathee unazuia watu.* (Woman, you are blocking others)

Passenger: *Shida ni hii space ni ndogo, siwezi pita.* (The problem is that this space is narrow, I can't pass)

Conductor: *Shida ni wewe, sio gari. Umeshasikia juu ya slim possible.* (The problem is you, not the vehicle. Have you heard of Slim Possible?)

The first example of negative impoliteness is illustrated in conversation above where the conductor is asking the young woman passenger to go and sit on the back seat so that other passengers can pass. The passenger refuses claiming that the passage is narrow and she cannot pass through. The negative impoliteness sub-strategy used in this conversation is *ridiculing*. The conductor is ridiculing the passenger that she is the one who has a problem by implying that she is fat, hence she cannot fit in that narrow space. Furthermore he makes sarcastic remark through the interrogative speech act, '*Have you*

heard about slim possible?' The illocutionary force in this locution is that of advice. The conductor is advising the passenger to exercise to reduce her size. This locution carries the implicature that the passenger is overweight.

Example 11

Conductor: *Nipe 10 bob?* (Give me ten shillings)

Passenger: *Kwani gari ni ngapi. Si nimekupatia mbaao ya watu wawili?* (How much is fare? Haven't I given you twenty shillings for two people?)

Conductor: *Akili yako ni mzuri kweli mzee? Shilingi kumi inalipa gari tangu lini?* (Is your mind functioning well old man.? Since when did ten shillings pay fare?)

Passenger: *Sahizi gari inalipishwa kumi.* (At this time of the day the fare charged is always ten shillings).

Conductor: *Wewe wacha utoto. Lipa gari ama nitakushukisha. Unijui.* (*{Pointing a finger at the passenger}* You, stop being childish. Pay the fare or I will force you to alight. You don't know me.)

In the conversation above, the conflict arises when the conductor and the passenger disagree on the fare the passenger wants to pay. As a result, the conductor uses negative impoliteness strategy by threatening the passenger that if he does not pay he will be forced to alight. Culpeper refers to this negative impoliteness sub-strategy as '*to frighten.*'

According to Culpeper (1996) the sub-strategy of frightening is done by the speaker instilling a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur. In this context the conductor is instilling fear in the passenger by threatening him that he will be thrown out forcefully. This illocutionary force is accompanied by nonverbal communication when the conductor points a finger at the passenger which is an indication of threat.

The second utterance of the conductor is a threat which can turn to physical confrontation. The command is deployed by the conductor with the purpose of aggravating the passengers 'face'. The face-threat thus is seen as a result to a large extent from the type of punishment the passenger can expect. The face-threatening implication of this threat is not readily observable but can only be inferred from the interaction.

The conductor also scorns at the passenger in his locutions '*Is your mind functioning well?*' and '*Stop being childish*'. At the same time he uses bald on record impoliteness when he says '*Stop being childish*'. The word 'childish' itself connotes an insult to the passenger. Both the interrogative speech act and declarative speech act has the illocutionary force of belittling the passenger and declaring him useless. In a normal situation the conductor is expected to treat the passengers with respect and not to disrespect them. This conversation combines between bald on record impoliteness strategy and negative impoliteness of threatening or frightening the hearer.

In the same conversation, power also plays a key role in heightening impoliteness. The conductor is the powerful participant because he threatens the passenger by limiting his

rights thus forcing him to comply. In this situation the passenger has to do as the conductor wants or be thrown out. The conversation also reveals the distance relationship between the conductor and the passenger. This is evident when the conductor says '*Unijui*'. (You don't know me.), implying that there is no close social relationship between them that warrants politeness. In situations where there is unequal social distance impoliteness is likely to occur.

Example 12

Conductor: *Songa madam.* (Madam, move.)

Passenger: *Nisonge wapi. Hakuna nafasi hapa.* (Where do I move, there is no space here?)

Conductor: *Hapa inakaliwa na watu watatu. Huoni umekalia space yote.* (Three passengers always sit here. Don't you see you have occupied all the space?)

Passenger: *Hizi viti ni ndogo na watu watatu.* (These seats are small for three passengers.)

Conductor: *Ebu songa mama, wacha kusumbua.* (Woman, move! Stop being problematic.)

Passenger: *Nasumbua aje, wewe huoni hakuna nafasi hapa?* (How am I being problematic? Can't you see there is no space here?)

Conductor: *Basi utalipa viti viwili.* (Then you will pay for two seats)

Passenger: *Siwezi, ukitaka ni songe si panua gari.* (I won't. If you want me to move, why don't you enlarge the vehicle?)

Conductor: *Nawewe si uwache kukula basi, nguruwe.* (And you, why don't you stop eating, you pig.)

Passenger: *Unaniita nguruwe.* (You are calling me pig?)

Conductor: *Ndio. Utado nini, bure sana?* (Yes, what will you do, rubbish!)

In the above conversation the interlocutors are in the *matatu* and the conductor wants the lady passenger to move so that he can take in more passengers. The conductor uses direct speech acts in his illocutions which demonstrate the escalation of the conflict. The interaction begins with a directive from the conductor to the passenger: '*Songa madam*' 'Madam, move'. The traditional intended perlocutionary effect of such a directive (namely, having the passenger to move) is not achieved. Instead the directive is met with an assertion from the passenger. The conductor reacts to this assertion with two further illocutionary acts. The first is a threat 'you will pay for the two seats', and the second is an insulting declarative 'you pig'.

The negative impoliteness strategy that is used here is 'invading the other's space metaphorically by commenting on things that would not normally come up because the social distance is not equal. According to Culpeper (1996) insult attack the addressee's negative face by distracting their will and being imposed on. The conductor further dismisses the passenger in his illocutionary act, '*Ndio. Utado nini, bure sana*' 'Yes, what will you do, rubbish?' The utterance of the conductor exemplifies the relationship between impoliteness and power in which the conductor aims to damage the passenger's negative face.

He employs negative impoliteness of explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect and personalizes by using the pronoun 'You'. The conductor's negative attitude towards the passenger is clearly expressed in these utterances. He combines negative impoliteness and positive impoliteness of name calling e.g. 'you pig'

The conductor's expression '*Nawewe si uwache kukula basi, nguruwe.* (And you, why don't you stop eating, you pig') is completely impolite since he uses an impolite word 'you pig' which holds an insult to the passenger. Importantly, his behaviour reflects that he disrespects the passenger and the tone of voice he uses in commanding is negatively evaluated because he commands the passenger to stop eating. He employs bald on record impoliteness and reinforces his utterances with positive impoliteness employing calling the other names sub-strategy.

Example 13

Conductor: *Msichana, leta pesa* (Lady, bring your money.)

Passenger: *Polepole buda, ninakupatia.* (Be calm man, I am giving you.)

Conductor: *Wacha kusumbua. Leta pesa.* (Stop being problematic, give me the money)

Passenger: *Haraka ya nini maze.* (What is the hurry for, man.?)

Conductor: *Usinipotezee wakati. Sahii asubuhi watu wanalewa?* (Don't waste my time.

At this time in the morning people are drunk?)

Passenger: *Nani amelewa? Wewe ndio ulininunulia pombe?* (Who is drunk? Are you the one who bought me alcohol?)

Conductor: *Nipatie pesa usiniletee umalaya wako kwa kazi yangu. Si wewe umeshafanya kazi Yako, heshimu yangu. Unanipotezea wakati.* (Give me the money. Don't bring your prostitution to my work. You have already done your work so respect mine. Don't waste my time)

Passenger: *Nani Malaya. Malaya ni wewe.* (Who is a prostitute? You are the prostitute.)

Another example of conductor's and the passenger's unequal relationship, which can be analyzed as negative impoliteness strategy is in the above conversation. The conductor is arguing with a young lady passenger who is drunk and is no hurry to pay the fare when requested. The conductor is getting impatient with the drunken lady passenger. She takes her time to look for the money in her bag. The conductor is getting irritated hence the illocution. '*Usinipotezee wakati. Sahii asubuhi watu wanalewa?* (Don't waste my time. At this time in the morning people are drunk?). The illocutionary force is that of condemning the passenger for being drunk early in the morning.

In addition to this, the conductor insults the passenger by calling her prostitute which is a taboo word that is deployed to offend the hearer. The conductor has used a negative impoliteness strategy of invading the passenger's space literally in his interrogative speech act '*Sahii asubuhi watu wanalewa?*. We are able to read the passengers aggressive reaction in her illocution, '*Nani amelewa? Wewe ndio ulininunulia pombe?* (Who is drunk? Are you the one who bought me alcohol?). In this utterance, the conductor is embarrassing the passenger by implying that she is immoral thereby not saving her negative face in public.

Example 14

Conductor: *Wale wanashuka seniors kujeni kwa mlango haraka. Bado mnakaa chini na tuko na haraka? Kujeni harak haraka.* (Those who are alighting at seniors, come to the door quickly. You are still sitting down and we are in a hurry? Come quickly.)

Passenger: *Gari halijasimama. Wacha kutuharakisha.* (The vehicle has not stopped. Don't tell us to hurry.)

Conductor: *Nitawapitisha. Kama hamtaki kuharakishwa, simununue gari lenu ndio mkae starehe. Munaringa hapa bure tu.* (I will not stop for you to alight. If you don't want to be told to hurry, why don't you buy your own vehicle so that you sit comfortably? You are showing off for nothing.)

The last example of negative impoliteness sub-strategy is *to personalize by the use of pronouns 'I' and 'you'*. In this situation the *matatu* has reached Dandora estate and the passengers are to alight at different bus-stops. The conductor is telling the passengers who are to alight at a bus-stop known as 'Seniors' to leave their seats and come to the door because the conductor is in a hurry. The passengers do not heed to this command as they are still seated waiting for the *matatu* to come to a stop. This annoys the conductor who in turn threatens the passengers in this illocutionary act, '*Nitawapitisha*'. (I will not stop for you to alight.).

In his threats he uses the pronoun 'I' and 'you' thereby making the utterance personal; furthermore, he attacks their negative face by telling them that they are showing off which is impolite. In a situation where there is politeness, the conductor would treat his

passengers with respect and not command them to alight quickly; in fact, he should thank them for using his *matatu*. The conductor also ridicules the passengers by saying ‘*Simununue gari lenu ndio mkae starehe. Munaringa hapa bure tu.*’ (Why don’t you buy your own vehicle so that you sit comfortably? You are showing off for nothing.) Moreover, the utterance is said in a sarcastic tone.

3.1.4. Off Record Impoliteness

In this strategy, politeness is performed with clear insincere intentions, which then makes the performed utterances impolite. The two sub strategies here are sarcasm and mock politeness. Just as in irony, sarcasm is heavily related to the context. Mock politeness, in turn, is surface politeness, which can be interpreted in an impolite way because of certain contextual clues.

Sarcasm and mock politeness are used to promote disharmony in conversations without openly insulting or acting impolitely towards the hearer. In the data collected sarcasm was the common strategy than the mock politeness.

Example 15

Passenger: *Shukisha hapo.* (I am alighting there.)

Conductor: *Wapi?* (Where?)

Passenger: *Hapo;* (There.)

Conductor: *Kuna stage inaitwa hapo?* (Is there a bus-stop called ‘there’?)

The first example of *sarcasm* is in this context where the passenger informs the conductor that he wants to alight, but he does not mention exactly which bus-stop, instead he uses the adverb ‘there’ to refer to the station. According to Culpeper (1996), sarcasm is observed when the conductor responds to the passenger’s request with the question, ‘*Kuna stage inaitwa hapo?* (Is there a bus stop called ‘there’?). The illocutionary force is sarcastic. The conductor should understand that passengers use such term as ‘there’ to indicate where they want to alight instead of mocking him sarcastically.

Example 16

Passenger: *Pesa ngapi?* (How much?)

Conductor: *Wapi?* (Where?)

Passenger: *Chai Road.* (Chai Road)

Conductor: *30 Bob.* (Thirty shillings)

Passenger: *Hapa tu ni 30 bob? Sifiki Dandora.* (Just here is thirty shillings? Am not going to Dandora?)

Conductor: *Kama ni hapa tu siutembee,* (If it’s just here, why don’t you walk then?)

In this example the first illocution is an interrogative speech act whereby the conductor inquiries from the passenger where he is going. His next illocution is a declarative speech act declaring the amount of fare the passenger is to pay. This in turn makes the passenger to react that the distance to be covered is too short for that amount. The conductor responds to this assumption of the passenger by being sarcastic and remarks ‘*Kama ni hapa tu siutembee,*’ (if it’s just here, why don’t you walk then?)

What has happened in this conversation is that the conductor mocks the passenger's ability to estimate short distance when he uses the expression' *Kama ni hapa tu siutembe*. (If it's just here, why don't you walk then?) Sarcasm is in this conversation where the passenger does not want to pay the amount of fare suggested by the conductor believing that where he is going is not very far

Example 17

Passenger: *Dere twende*. (Driver, let's go)

Conductor: *Gari halijajaa*. (Bus isn't full)

Passenger: *Kwani lazima lijaa. Wengine wetu tunaenda kazini na tunachelewa*. (Must it be full? Some of us are going to work and we getting late.)

Conductor: *Ata sisi tuko kazi na gari halijachelewa, wewe ndio umechelewa*. (Even us we are working, and the *matatu* is not late. It is you who is late.)

In this conversation, the cause of conflict is the delay of the *matatu* and the passengers are requesting the driver to start off although the *matatu* has not yet carried the full capacity. The passengers are tired of waiting for the *matatu* to be full. The conductor responds to their request with a direct declarative '*Gari halijajaa*. (The bus isn't full) implying that they still have to wait a little longer until the *matatu* is full. As the passengers complain that they are getting late for work, the conductor responds with a sarcastic declarative in his second illocution '*ata sisi tuko kazi na gari halijachelewa, wewe ndio umechelewa*',(Even us we are working, and the *matatu* is not late.It is you\who is late .)

In this utterance the conductor implies that the passengers are not early risers, therefore they should not complain. The conductor is unconcerned the problem of his passengers who promote his business

3.1.5 Withholding politeness

Culpeper's last impoliteness strategy is 'withholding of politeness' and it was the least used category. I was able to find only three instances that can be described as including this strategy. From all other categories, this was the most unnoticeable group because it is about identifying something that is not there. When we are reading a dialogue, we have some kind of presuppositions about what is going to happen next, for example in familiar situations like greetings, requests, invitations and apologies when it comes to being polite. If these, presuppositions do not appear in places we expect them to appear, one possible explanation is withholding of politeness.

Example 18

Conductor: *Nani ako na fifties anisaidie nirudishe change?* (Who has several fifty-shillings to help me with so that I give out the balance?)

Passenger 1: *Unataka ya pesa ngapi?* (For how much?)

Conductor: *Mia mbili*(Two hundred shillings.)

Passenger 1: *Ndio hii.* (Here)

Conductor: *Nani change?* (Who wants balance?)

Passenger 2: *Mimi.* (I)

Conductor: *Shika.* (Here)

The first example takes place in the *matatu* when the conductor has taken fare from the passengers and he does not have loose money to give the balance. He requests the passengers to assist him with loose money so that he can give out the balance. One of the passengers offers to give him change. We expect the conductor to thank the passenger for assisting him; on the contrary, he does not. This is what Culpeper (1996) refers to as withhold politeness.

Example 19

Conductor: *Nilipishie hao wako mbele.* (Take for me the money for those sitting in the front seat.)

Passenger: *Shika ,pesa ndio hii.* (Here, take the money.)

Conductor: *Mpatie hii change.* (Give him this balance.)

Another example of withholding politeness is evident in the conversation above where the conductor request one of the passengers to get for him the money of other passengers who are out of his reach. In the interaction, the illocution of the conductor is an imperative speech act which is indirectly a request to the passengers. The passenger responds to this illocutionary act with the appropriate perlocutionary effect, namely, handing over the money to the conductor. In a normal situation when one requests for something and they receive it, they should appreciate the person in return. The conductor uses the passengers to render services for him but he fails to appreciate their service. This can be interpreted as withholding politeness intentionally.

Example 20

Conductor: *Nani ako na umbrella anisaidie nayo?* (Who has an umbrella to help me with?)

Passenger: *Chukua yangu na urudishe.* (Take mine and remember to return it.)

The last example is in this short interaction where the event occurs when it is raining and some passengers are standing under a shelter at the bus stop. The conductor wants to go and bring them to board the *matatu* but he has no umbrella.

In the conversation the conductor uses an interrogative speech act to request a passenger to assist him with an umbrella. Indeed, one passenger offers her umbrella to the conductor, which he gladly takes but he does not thank the passenger for assisting him. The fact that the conductor does not thank the passenger is an indication of withholding politeness because we have a presupposition of what is to happen after a request. If this presupposition does not appear when we expect them, then the explanation is that of withholding of politeness.

3.2 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the application of Impoliteness Theory in the analysis of the conductor's impolite language. The analysis of the impolite language is done according to the Impoliteness Strategies. The analysis was done through the following strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off record impoliteness and withhold politeness.

In sum, all of the five strategies listed by Culpeper (1996) were used. However, positive and negative impoliteness strategies were clearly the most strategies and more frequent than others. The other three strategies, bald on record impoliteness, withholding impoliteness and sarcasm/mock politeness were few of the instances in total, the latter being the least used strategy.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the research findings which led to the conclusions and recommendations. The study set up to analyze impolite language used by *matatu* conductors and to investigate the strategies of impoliteness use and whether they can be interpreted and analyzed using impoliteness by Culpeper (1996). The conclusion of the study is inferred from the data analyzed. This will assist approve findings that conductors use impolite language which is understood pragmatically. In the last section the recommendations are given.

4.1 Summary

The analysis of the data gave a varying range of results. The first research question examined the impolite speech acts. The analysis revealed that conductors used imperatives, declaratives and interrogatives as impolite speech acts. Most of the conductors' locutions were composed of imperatives which brought out the positive and negative impoliteness strategies. The illocutionary acts such as command, sarcasm, insult, ridicule, condemn and threat was very common.

Regarding the second research question which sought to identify the impoliteness strategies used by conductors, it was found out that all the impoliteness strategies listed by Culpeper (1996) were used. The first strategy, Bald on Record Impoliteness varied from the extremely explicit ways of insulting into slightly more implicit ways of

offending someone. Both verbal and non-verbal communication was used. Nonverbal ways of offending were mostly conveyed through facial expressions, gestures but also through tone of voice and mood.

Although Culpeper (1996) claims that bald on impoliteness is common particularly in extremely close relationships, in the data the distant relationship does not prevent conductors from using this strategy. Reasons for the conductor's using this strategy with relatively unknown people might be that they do not care about the passenger's opinion in general. Also they might be highly annoyed and decide to go bald on record because they believe that they will never meet that passenger again. In most cases, there is no close relationship between the conductor and the passengers which warrant politeness.

The study also revealed that the most used strategies are positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness. The two strategies had other sub-strategies which often overlapped. Bald on record impoliteness also often overlapped with positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness strategies. A certain instance of impoliteness could be found on Culpeper's list of positive impoliteness or negative impoliteness sub-strategies and still be extremely rude and therefore considered as a bald on record impoliteness. Nevertheless, not every instance of bald on record impoliteness represented some of the positive and negative impoliteness sub strategies, and not every instance of positive or negative impoliteness was necessarily a bald on record impoliteness.

Off record impoliteness (sarcasm) which is the fourth strategy was also frequently used with other strategies. This was not surprising since most *matatu* conductors are considered to be quite sarcastic in general. In most cases of sarcasm/or mock politeness one could understand the impoliteness because of a general knowledge of the context. Moreover, this was the only strategy which always involved verbal impoliteness, nonverbal elements being there only as strengthening factors. This is due to the fact that sarcasm and mock politeness are always primarily verbal phenomena.

The final strategy, withholding impoliteness was the most complicated strategy to analyze since it involved detecting something that is not there. In addition, it is a matter of an opinion to a great extent. Some instances of withholding impoliteness involved the absence of manners that are expected from anyone in a normal interaction like passing greeting; goodbye and thanking.

In addition to the five strategies, nonverbal communication also played an important role in increasing impoliteness in positive and negative impoliteness strategies. It either created the impoliteness alone or strengthened the effect of verbal impoliteness. The tone of voice, facial expressions, and gestures are the most common ways of doing this.

In short, each confrontational dialogue included at least one impoliteness strategy but many had more than one strategy. Culpeper et al. (2003:1561) had already proven that combining and repeating of strategies existed and this data had similar instances.

The third research question investigated the factors that motivate impolite speech behaviour. The analysis revealed that both power and social distance were the main motivating factors. *Matatu* conductors had power over the passengers, since they managed the *matatus* leaving the passengers with no choice but to use this necessary service irrespective of the language used by conductors. Social distance also motivated impoliteness because there was no relation between the conductors and passengers that needed to be maintained.

4.2 Conclusion

This research proves that impoliteness is interpreted differently depending on the context. Thus, impoliteness is context dependent. Impoliteness can be analyzed from the speaker's and the hearer's perspectives since it depend on the speaker's intention and the hearer's reception. In this data analyzed, negative impoliteness and positive impoliteness strategies are used frequently more than others. Bald on record impoliteness is also commonly used to reinforce negative and positive impoliteness. Although this study was about impoliteness in *matatu* conductor's discourse, similar impoliteness strategies can also be found in everyday life. Presumably, there are differences between conductor's and everyday discourse, but the principles of this linguistic behaviour are the same.

In conclusion, it is human nature to apply impoliteness in certain situations and the strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996) try to explain how and why individuals use impoliteness.

4.3 Recommendations

The study used the impoliteness strategies to analyze the impolite language used by conductors in their discourse with passengers. We therefore recommend that future researcher could be done on the reactions and responses of the passengers towards this impolite language using the same or different theory. Although I focused on verbal aspects in this study, one could research on verbal and nonverbal aspects in more spontaneous discourses such as television interviews or talk shows. This study focused on only one route which cannot be used to represent all the other routes plied by *matatus*; therefore, a comparative study can be done on other routes and see if the same results is found.

Further research could also be done on literary data and the functions of impoliteness. This way one could get information on how impoliteness is connected to the building and developing of the plot. The impoliteness research is an area of research that not much has been done; therefore, are many possibilities for further research.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with Words. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bernal, M.(2008). Do Insults Always Insult? Genuine Impoliteness versus Non-Genuine Impoliteness in Colloquial Spanish. *Pragmatics* 18: 781-802.
- Bogdan, R. C.and S.K.(Biklen 2003) Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and Methods (4thed) New York: Pearson Education Group
- Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness in Interaction. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Bousfield, D. and L.Miriam (eds.) 2007. Impoliteness in Language. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown,P. and S.C.Levinson (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..
- Crystal, D.(1980) A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Culpeper, J. (1996) '*Towards an anatomy of impolitenesses*, *Journal of Pragmatics* 25, 349-367.
- Culpeper, J. (2008) Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power in Bousfield, D & Locher (eds). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Culpeper, J. (2011) Impoliteness – Using Language to Cause Offence. Cambridge: University Press.

- Goffman, E. (1967). Interactional rituals: Essays on face-to-face Behaviour. New York: Doubleday.
- Grundy, P. (2000) Doing Pragmatics. London: Arnold Publications.
- Grice, H. P. (1989) Studies in the Way of Words. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hudson (1995) Language and Society. London: Macmillan Publishers.
- Kariithi, F. (2011) 'Mikakatiya Upole ya Lugha katika Matumizi ya Lughaya Vijana.' Unpublished MA Thesis UON.
- Kend, M (2006) 'Thugs or Entrepreneurs? Perceptions of *Matatu* Operators in Nairobi, 1970 to the Present.' <http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/afr.2006.0072>
- Kienpointner, M. (2008). '*Impoliteness and emotional arguments*.' Journal of Politeness Research. Issue: 4, 243-265.
- Kinyatti, L. (2002) 'Language as a Tool of Abuse against Women: A case study of the language of *matatu* touts and male university students in Nairobi.' Unpublished MA Thesis UON.
- Kramsch, C. (1998) Language and Culture. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1973) *The Logic of Politeness; On minding your p's and q's*. Paper from the 9th Regional Meeting. Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago Linguistic Society University.
- Leech, G. (1983) Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Levinson S. (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locher, M. (2007). Impoliteness in Language – Studies on its Interplay with Power and Practice. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lyons, J. (1981) Language and Meaning. London: Fontana Paperbacks,.

- Lyons, J. (1997) Semantics: Cambridge: Universal Press.
- Mills, S. (2003) Gender and Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Njeri, S. (2007) 'A Pragmatic Analysis of Gikuyu Euphemism in HIV/AIDS Discourse.'
Unpublished MA Thesis UON
- Onchiri, H. (2002) 'Graffiti Perspective on Matatu.' Unpublished MA Thesis UON.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). Speech Acts. London: Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979) Expression and Meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffirin, D. 1994) Approaches to Discourse. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd,
- Shopen, T (Ed) (1985) Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Clause Structure.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sperber D. & D.Wilson.(1986) Relevance, Communication and Cognition (2nd edition)
Oxford Blackwell.
- Terkourafi, M. (2008) Toward unified theory of politeness, impoliteness and rudeness in
Bousfield,D & Locher M. (eds.), Impoliteness in Language –Studies on
its Interplay with Power and Practice. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thomas, J. (1996). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. Longman:
Pearson Education.
- Yule, T. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wales K. (1989) A Dictionary of Stylistics. Longman: England.
- Wambua, R.S. (2009) 'Variation in Dialectal use of and Attitude toward Taboo Words
and Euphemism in Kikamba.' Unpublished MA Thesis University of
Nairobi.

APPENDIX

Example 1

Conductor: *Kila mtu pesa mkononi.*(Everybody, money in your hand.)

Pesa yako(Your money)

Passenger: *Niko na kumi.* (I have ten shillings.)

Conductor: *Wacha ujinga.* (Don't be silly.)

Example 2

Conductor: *Lipa pesa ya mzigu wewe?!* (You, pay the money for the luggage)

Passenger 1: *Sina pesa ingine.* (I don't have any other money)

Conductor: *Wacha kucheza na kazi yangu Wewe utalipia huo mzigu.*(Stop joking with my job.You will pay for that luggage)

Passenger: *Haki sina pesa ingine. Hii ndio nilikuwa nayo.*(For sure I don't have any money. This is all I have)

Passenger 2: *Tafadhali, si umwachie leo tu. Ameomba ,hana pesa ingine,*(Please just allow him for today, he has pleaded he has no extra money)

Conductor: *Wewe nyamaza. Nani amekuambia uingilie mambo sio yako,? Kama uko na pesa si umlipie. Usiniletee kisirani kwa kazi* (You shut up. Who has told you to get involved in other people's business? If you have money, pay for him. Don't give me stress in my job)

Example 3

Conductor: *Toa mzigu hapo* (Move this luggage out of the way.)

Passanger: *Niweke wapi*(Where do I place it?)

Conductor: *Beba.*(Carry it.)

Example 4

Conductor: *Mathee leta pesa.*(Mother, bring your money)

Passenger: *Shika pesa ndio hii* (Here, take the money.)

Conductor: *Hii ni pesa ngapi?* (How much is this money)

Passenger: *Si ni kumi.*(It's ten shillings.)

Conductor: *Nilisema kila stage ni mbao, ungeniambia kabla uingie.* (I said every bus-stop is twenty shillings. You should have told me before getting in.)

Passenger: *Si nilikuuliza ukakubali.* (But I asked you and you accepted.)

Conductor: *Mimi? Nilisema mbao, wacha kunichezea akili.*(Myself? I said twenty shillings, don't play with my mind)

Example 5

Passenger: *Si ulisema unapita njia ya ndani?*(Didn't you say you are using the route that passes inside the estate?)

Conductor: *Nani, mimi? Mama, hukuongea na mimi* (Who, me? Woman, you didn't talk to me)

Passenger; *Nilikuuliza na ukasema ndio, sasa mbona unakataa* (I asked you and you said you will follow that route, why are you now refusing?)

Conductor: *Mimi? Sikusema chochote unless maskio yako ni mbaya. Nilisema Dandora mwisho* (Me? I didn't say anything unless your ears are impaired. I said the destination is Dandora)

Passenger: *Basi nirudishie pesa nipande matatu igine.*(Then refund me fare so that I board another *matatu*.)

Conductor; *Pesa gani?* (Which money?)

Passenger: *Si ten bob.* (Ten shillings)

Conductor: *Ten bob ya nini na nimekuleta mpaka hapa. Shuka, unafikiri gari ni la bwana yako, ubebwe bure? Hii ni kazi.*(Ten shillings for what and I have brought you up to here. Get out. You think this is your husband's car to have a free ride?)

Passenger: *Mambo ya bwana inaingilia aje na kuitisha pesa?*(How does the issue of husband come in when asking for a refund?)

Example 6

Conductor: *Mzee wacha wapiti.* (Old man, let them pass)

Passenger: *Siunishikie hii.* (Hold for me this)

Conductor: *Wewe mzee, kama hutaki ushuke* (You old man, if you don't want, get out.)

Passenger: *Nani mzee? Mimi si mzee. Wacha madharau* (Who is an old man? I am not an old man. Stop despising me.)

Example 7

Conductor: *Rounda rounda, wale wanashuka raunda wakuje haraka* (Rounda rounda, those who are alighting to come quickly)

Passenger: *Tukuje na gari haijasimama.* (We come and the vehicle is still moving)

Conductor: *Bado munang'ethia hapo?*(You are still idling there)

Passenger: *Mbona sazile mnabeba watu hamkuagi na haraka, alafu wakati wa kushuka mnaharakisha watu* (Why is it that when you want want people to board you don't tell them to hurry and when it comes to alighting you want us to hurry?)

Conductor: *Wacha kutuwestia time, shukaa haraka* (stop wasting our time, alight fast)

Example 8

Conductor: *Mbao, Mbao* (Twenty shillings, twenty sillings)

Passenger: *Mimi niko na kumi.* (I have ten shillings)

Conductor: *Kila stage ni mbao.* (Every stop over is twenty shillings){*Looking very bored and disinterested*}

Passenger: *Uwezi ukanibeba na kumi.?* (You can't allow me to pay ten shillings?)

Conductor: *Nimekuambia kila stage ni mbao. Unaenda ama huendi? Kaa hapo ungoje ingine. Wateja wako wengi. Mbao, mbao wale wako na haraka.* (I have told you every stop is twenty shillings. Are you going or not? Stand there and continue waiting. There are many passengers.) {*Pauses then continues calling*} *Twenty shillings, twenty shillings, those who are in a hurry.*)

Example 9

Passenger: *Conductor tafadhali punguza sauti ya redio nataka kuongea kwa simu.* (Conductor, please reduce the volume of the radio I want to receive a call).

Conductor: *Hio hewa ni sawa.* (That music is okay) {*Mumbling*}

Passenger: *Conductor tafadhali. Nakuongelesha na umenyamaza.* (Conductor pleases. I am talking to you and you aren't listening.) {*The conductor ignores the pleas of the passenger and continues nodding his head to the beats of the music*}.

Example 10

Conductor: *Pita ukae nyuma.* (Go and sit in the back)

Passenger: *Hai! Siwezi.* (Hai! I can't)

Conductor: *Mathee unazuia watu.* (Woman, you are blocking others)

Passenger: *Shida ni hii space ni ndogo, siwezi pita.* (The problem is that this space is narrow, I can't pass)

Conductor: *Shida ni wewe, sio gari. Umeshasikia juu ya slim possible.* (The problem is you, not the vehicle. Have you heard of Slim Possible?)

Example 11

Conductor: *Nipe 10 bob?* (Give me ten shillings)

Passenger: *Kwani gari ni ngapi. Si nimekupatia mbao ya watu wawili?* (How much is fare? Haven't I given you twenty shillings for two people?)

Conductor: *Akili yako ni mzuri kweli mzee? Shilingi kumi inalipa gari tangu lini?* (Is your mind functioning well old man.? Since when did ten shillings pay fare?)

Passenger: *Sahizi gari inalipishwa kumi.* (At this time of the day the fare charged is always ten shillings).

Conductor: *Wewe wacha utoto. Lipa gari ama nitakushukisha. Unijui.* ({*Pointing a finger at the passenger*} You, stop being childish. Pay the fare or I will force you to alight. You don't know me.)

Example 12

Conductor: *Songa madam.* (Madam, move.)

Passenger: *Nisonge wapi. Hakuna nafasi hapa.* (Where do I move, there is no space here?)

Conductor: *Hapa inakaliwa na watu watatu. Huoni umekalia space yote.* (Three passengers always sit here. Don't you see you have occupied all the space?)

Passenger: *Hizi viti ni ndogo na watu watatu.* (These seats are small for three passengers.)

Conductor: *Ebu songa mama, wacha kusumbua.* (Woman, move! Stop being problematic.)

Passenger: *Nasumbua aje, wewe huoni hakuna nafasi hapa?* (How am I being problematic? Can't you see there is no space here?)

Conductor: *Basi utalipa viti viwili.* (Then you will pay for two seats)

Passenger: *Siwezi, ukitaka ni songe si panua gari.* (I won't. If you want me to move, why don't you enlarge the vehicle.)

Conductor: *Nawewe si uwache kukula basi, nguruwe.* (And you, why don't you stop eating, you pig.)

Passenger: *Unaniita nguruwe.* (You are calling me pig?)

Conductor: *Ndio. Utado nini, bure sana?* (Yes, what will you do, rubbish!)

Example 13

Conductor: *Msichana, leta pesa* (Lady, bring your money.)

Passenger: *Polepole buda, ninakupatia.* (Be calm man, I am giving you.)

Conductor: *Wacha kusumbua. Leta pesa.* (Stop being problematic, give me the money)

Passenger: *Haraka ya nini maze.* (What is the hurry for, man.?)

Conductor: *Usinipotezee wakati. Sahii asubuhi watu wanalewa?* (Don't waste my time. At this time in the morning people are drunk?)

Passenger: *Nani amelewa? Wewe ndio ulininunulia pombe?* (Who is drunk? Are you the one who bought me alcohol?)

Conductor: *Nipatie pesa usiniletee umalaya wako kwa kazi yangu. Si wewe umeshafanya kazi Yako, heshimu yangu. Unanipotezea wakati.* (Give me the money. Don't bring your prostitution to my work. You have already done your work so respect mine. Don't waste my time)

Passenger: *Nani Malaya. Malaya ni wewe.* (Who is a prostitute? You are the prostitute.)

Example 14

Conductor: *Wale wanashuka seniors kujeni kwa mlango haraka. Bado mnakaa chini na tuko na haraka? Kujeni harak haraka.* (Those who are alighting at seniors, come to the door quickly. You are still sitting down and we are in a hurry? Come quickly.)

Passenger: *Gari halijasimama. Wacha kutuharakisha.* (The vehicle has not stopped. Don't tell us to hurry.)

Conductor: *Nitawapitisha. Kama hamtaki kuharakishwa, simununue gari lenu ndio mkae starehe. Munaringa hapa bure tu.* (I will not stop for you to alight. If you don't want to be told to hurry, why don't you buy your own vehicle so that you sit comfortably? You are showing off for nothing.)

Example 15

Passenger: *Shukisha hapa.* (I am alighting there.)

Conductor: *Wapi?* (Where?)

Passenger: *Hapo;* (There.)

Conductor: *Kuna stage inaitwa hapa?* (Is there a bus-stop called 'there'?)

Example 16

Passenger: *Pesa ngapi?* (How much?)

Conductor: *Wapi?* (Where?)

Passenger: *Chai Road.* (Chai Road)

Conductor: *30 Bob.* (Thirty shillings)

Passenger: *Hapa tu ni 30 bob? Sifiki Dandora.* (Just here is thirty shillings? Am not going to Dandora?)

Conductor: *Kama ni hapa tu siutembea.* (If it's just here, why don't you walk then?)

Example 17

Passenger: *Dere twende.* (Driver, let's go)

Conductor: *Gari halijajaa.* (Bus isn't full)

Passenger: *Kwani lazima lijae. Wengine wetu tunaenda kazini na tunachelewa.* (Must it be full? Some of us are going to work and we getting late.)

Conductor: *Ata sisi tuko kazi na gari halijachelewa, wewe ndio umechelewa.* (Even us we are working, and the *matatu* is not late, it is you who is late.)

Example 18

Conductor: *Nani ako na fifties anisaidie nirudishe change?* (Who has several fifty-shillings to help me with so that I give out the balance?)

Passenger 1: *Unataka ya pesa ngapi?* (For how much?)

Conductor: *Mia mbili*(Two hundred shillings.)

Passenger 1: *Ndio hii.* (Here)

Conductor: *Nani change?* (Who wants balance?)

Passenger 2: *Mimi.* (I)

Conductor: *Shika.* (Here)

Example 19

Conductor: *Nilipishie hao wako mbele.* (Take for me the cash for those sitting in front.)

Passenger: *Shika ,pesa ndio hii.* (Here take the cash.)

Conductor: *Mpatie hii change.* (Give him this balance.)

Example 20

Conductor: *Nani ako na umbrella anisaidie nayo?* (Who has an umbrella to help me with?)

Passenger: *Chuku yangu na urudishe.* (Take mine and remember to return it.)