

# Translation Quality of Expressive Speech Acts: An Implementation of Bald on Record Impoliteness in the Translation Novel “The Silkworm”

**Yoyok Sabar Waluyo**

Student of Doctoral Program of Translation Studies  
Universitas Sebelas Maret  
Surakarta, Indonesia  
yoyok\_sw@yahoo.com

**M.R. Nababan**

Professor of Doctoral Program of Translation Studies  
Universitas Sebelas Maret  
Jl. Ir. Sutami, Surakarta, Indonesia  
amantaradja@gmail.com

**Riyadi Santosa**

Professor of Doctoral Program of Translation Studies  
Universitas Sebelas Maret  
Jl. Ir. Sutami, Surakarta, Indonesia  
riyadisantosa@staff.uns.ac.id

**Djarmika**

Professor of Doctoral Program of Translation Studies  
Universitas Sebelas Maret  
Jl. Ir. Sutami, Surakarta, Indonesia  
djarmika@staff.uns.ac.id

**Abstract**—This study reveals how expressive speech acts representing an impoliteness strategy used in the novel. In many cases impoliteness used in speech acts is to make a disharmony relationship, but not in bald on record impoliteness strategy. This strategy explores some other ways to express the speaker’s emotion, feelings, and other psychological condition in responding situations happened. Using the theory of impoliteness proposed by Culpeper this study tries to convey some evidences of implementation at one of the theory of impoliteness strategies. The data is qualitative which is some utterances representing impoliteness and explored in descriptive ones, so that in explaining this uses descriptive-qualitative method. The data is analysed using a content analysis through purposive sampling to get the purpose of study. In assessing the quality of translation uses an assessment model designed by Nababan et,als. in which there are accurate, acceptable and readable aspects. The study results this impoliteness strategy is not the intention of the speaker to attack the hearer’s face. Most of the translation have a medium level of quality. This finding hopefully may contribute to develop a discussion of impoliteness strategy for other objects.

**Keywords**—*impoliteness; bald on record impoliteness; descriptive-qualitative; translation quality*

## I. INTRODUCTION

A recent decade pragmatics as science become an interesting study for scholars and researchers. Pragmatics have been used for explaining the relation of sign and its interpretation or meanings (Levinson, 1983; Horn, 2006; Swan, 2007). Pragmatics is a part of stylistics sciences used as reference in many researches (Burke, 2014; Black, 2006). Pragmatics have concerned to discuss reference and deixis, speech acts, and implicature. (Cruse, 2000; Bloomer, 2005), presupposition dan definite–indefiniteness (Horn, 2006;

Levinson, 1983). Speech acts is the most popular theme researches done using pragmatics point of view. It is therefore *pragmatics is a study of language in context* (Black, 2006). And speech act is a communicative action which has many contexts to interpret their meanings.

Speech acts usually was used for conveying message from a speaker to hearer. However, speech acts have really an important role in having social relations among the participants. Speech acts revealed cross-cultural and social values or norms. That is why speech acts must be performed to create a harmony, which is packed by Brown & Levinson in Politeness Theory (Felemban, 2012). In this theory stated that *‘politeness is a form of communicative behavior found very generally in human language and among human cultures; indeed, it has been claimed as a universal phenomenon of human society’* (Leech, 2014).

In many cases participants have not gotten the goals in performing the communication. It may be caused of some differences such as social and cultural background (Hobjila, 2012). The differences could made frictions concerning with the accepting utterances or attitudes. The frictions reveal inconvenient situation in the speech acts. Even one of participants may assume him/her be underestimated by others. It may happen one or both participants do impolite or *face threatening acts* (Aydinoğlu, 2013). The attitude and behavior done in the communication present an impolite, it is caused that *the use of politeness as a discursive concept to legitimize external behaviours.* (Thom, 2013). That is why a person conveys or do an attitude against social concepts or norms was called impoliteness. This also broke the principle of *politeness as a kind of behavior which has been developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction* (Aliakbari, 2015, p. 981). Meanwhile

an *impoliteness*, Culpeper stated, an activity or strategy designed to *attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony* (Culpeper, 2011).

One of the strategies as Culpeper proposed, i.e. *bald on record impoliteness*, presents utterances to not give offence to the hearer. Culpeper (1996) stated that *bald on record impoliteness is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized* (Nikoobin & Shahrokhi, 2017). And Culpeper (1996) said that this strategy *is not the intention of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer*. In this strategy the speaker does not mean to threaten his partner, the hearer, in a certain speech act. The speaker has no intentions to damage the hearer face. It could be the utterance means to express the speaker's emotive feelings. This study tries to give evidences that this *impoliteness* strategy is not intentionally to attack the hearer's face.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. *Impoliteness Theory*

In performing speech act a speaker certainly has had an intention in his utterances (Kecskes, 2010). In catching goal concerning with the intention a speaker may use a strategy of communication represented in his utterances. *Impoliteness* is as one of the strategies to catch the target. *impoliteness* has been one of the controversial issues and has been defined in many different ways since politeness theory was first introduced by Brown and Levinson. Watts argues that "(im)politeness is a term that is struggled over at present, has been struggled over in the past and will, in all probability, continue to be struggled over in the future (Aydinoğlu, 2013). Then, this *impoliteness* strategy is systematically, functionally, purposefully intention and intentionally gratuitous designed to attack face (Ahmadi & Soureshjani, 2011). This is in line with a definition that *impoliteness* was designed *to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony* (Culpeper, 2011).

In his book entitled *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistics (Im)politeness*, Culpeper stated there are five super-strategy of *impoliteness*, they are *bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off record impoliteness* dan *withhold politeness*. He also mentioned a *sarcasm or mock politeness* which was included as *impoliteness meta-strategy* (Culpeper, Haugh, & Kadar, 2017).

However, *impoliteness* strategy does not always convey an *impoliteness* gotten a negative impact. In another context of communication *impoliteness* could be as constructive critiques to come a better or positive point of view (Jamet & Jobert, 2013). An utterance containing *impoliteness*, likes insult, are not necessarily face threatening and cannot be always interpreted as aggressive or violent to the hearer (Pagliai, 2010). It is more than just revealing emotive expression of disappointment and other feelings. In the strategy of *bald on record impoliteness* the emotive expression of disappointment does not intend to attack the hearer's face, but it exclaims his bad-feelings. Therefore, *(Im)politeness is an evaluation based on sets of*

*expectations, many of which are believed to be verified or transgressed in the course of interaction* (Tayebi, 2016).

### B. *Speech Acts*

The term of *speech acts* revealed in a book written by Austin entitled *How to Do Things with Words*. The term revealed in the word of *performative sentence* or *performative utterances* (Austin, 1962, pp. 2-11). In the form of utterances Austin explored his ideas about spoken activities of communication, i.e. utterances, stressing on meaning caught in those communication or written as well. Sadock explained that Austin in the book gave examples of utterances such *I christen this ship the Joseph Stalin; I now pronounce you man and wife*, as performing activities, it was more than stated something (Horn, 2006, p. 54). It was caused by applying locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts of the utterances. Therefore, every utterance revealed in speech act always has goals or intention, representing the meaning out of the text in spoken communication (Bayat, 2013) called contexts.

It was stated before that in understanding intention of speech act there are three meaning point of view. They are *locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts* (Witek, 2015; Herman, 2015). Meaning of *locutionary act* is utterances intentionally as stated in references. It is the lateral meaning of utterances. Meanwhile, *illocutionary acts* mean how the utterances in a speech act works. The meaning has been understood by both of the participants. Then, *perlocutionary acts* provide the impact meaning of the utterances, either thought, feelings or behavior (Levinson, 1983; Horn, 2006; Cruse, 2000). The utterance has a consequence of the speaker on the hearer to achieve the goal. In this case, an example we can take an utterance of '*Shoot her!*' has meaning of locutionary, like what the words stated in the spoken activities. But in the meaning of illocutionary the utterance could have meaning of commanding, suggesting or forcing the hearer to do an activity of '*shoot.*' Then, in the point of view of perlocutionary, the utterance means that speaker wants the hearer does an activity of '*shoot*' intentionally to make him scared, persuaded or forced (Levinson, 1983, pp. 236 - 237).

Based on the three meanings Austin divided five categories of utterances work. They are representative, directive, commissive, expressive dan performative (Liu, 2011), and it was also developed by Searle who mentioned it as assertive, directive, commissive, expressive dan declarative (Hiani, 2015). There were different terms on Austin and Searle but they have similar meaning on those classification. There were on the terms of *assertive to representative, and declarative to performative* (Djatmika, 2016). Those classification provide activities conducted to represent the meaning of utterances revealed in speech acts.

### C. *Translation Quality*

In assessing translation quality always refer to equivalent the source and target texts. It always was shown by two different point of view. Nida stated there were formal and dynamic translation. According to Newmark there were semantic and communicative translation. Then, Catford proposed formal correspondence and textual

equivalence. House divided the translation as overt and covert, meanwhile Anthony Pym differed natural from directional equivalences (Panou, 2013). The previous theory provided a state-assessment. It still has difficulties to justify the equivalences. It is caused there was not an exact standard scoring to indicate the degree of equivalences. The assessment showed a qualitative statement. To make easier indicating the degree or level of equivalence, it still needs another parameter.

In getting assessment of translation quality providing level of equivalence, indicated by numeric system, it can use the model of assessment of translation quality proposed by Nababan et.als. (Nababan, 2004; Nababan, 2010). The model explained how the translation was assessed referring 3 aspects, i.e. accurate, acceptable and readable point of views. The aspects were elucidated into numeric system which accurate has a score of 3, acceptability of 2 and readability of 1. And each aspect or category was indicated by scoring of 3, for translation which has high level, scoring of 2 which has medium level and scoring of 1 for low level. Using this model it will be gotten level of equivalence indicated by numeric that it is why a translation quality has high, medium or low degree of equivalences.

### III. METHOD

Research design is an activity to describe how a research is arranged and functioned (Griffiee, 2012). This present study is a translation study. This study tries to explore the existence of expressive speech act containing impoliteness strategy in communication existed in the novel of *The Silkworm* (Ulat Sutra). The impoliteness strategy discussed in this study is one of impoliteness strategy proposed by Culpeper which is *bald on record impoliteness*.

Because of novel as object of study, this study uses descriptive method to explain the discussion. The explanation concerning with settings, participants or characters and events in the novel could be easily described using this method (Creswell, 2012; Santosa, 2017). Those elements of novel may consist of data in this study. Data in a research could be supposed as live sources railing out a theory and its practices so that a research conducted (Griffiee, 2012).

Novel includes a narrative genre. Toolan stated that *a narrative is a sequence of events that are perceived to be non-randomly connected, typically involving one or more humans or other sentient participants, these being the experiencing individuals at the centre of events* (Allan, 2016). Therefore, in the novel reveals some type of speech acts representing impoliteness involved bald on record impoliteness. In finding and collecting data, this study uses a method of *documentorcontent analysis method*. This method qualitatively read, write, compose, and classify as well as relate each category, then interpret data based on the context (Santosa, 2017).

In the strategy of *bald on records impoliteness*, there found some expressive speech acts revealed. The impoliteness speech acts were influenced by emotive feelings and attitude of speaker. The impoliteness conveyed in speech acts basically refer to the crucially norms influenced by emotive factors (Langlotz & Locher, 2013). Based on this emotive factor the strategy of *bald on records impoliteness* revealed in utterances of speech acts. Some the results may be described as follows.

Impoliteness may be as swear word, which is one of impolite word intentionally not attack the hearer's face. It is caused that *swear words are words with negative connotations and are uttered to express emotions in different contexts* (Azman, Azmi, Maros, & Bakar, 2017). The utterance present impolite words used for expressing speaker's thought or feelings. The impoliteness existed is considered as negative or unexpected linguistic behaviour (Biscetti, 2015).

There is found an expressive speech act to convey disappointment feeling and not used to damage the hearer's face. This impolite expression can be found in the novel as follows.

*“Shit,” mumbled Strike. “can’t’ve set the alarm right— gimme five min---“*  
*“Sialan,” gumam Strike. “Tidak pernah beres menyetel alarm -kasih waktu lima men ---“*

(quoted from *The Silkworm*, pg. 9)

The real situation in the novel, Strike wants take arrest for a while, but it is disturbed by a guest coming to have a business with him. This situation makes him disappointed so that he expresses an impolite utterance. This impolite utterance represents his feeling of disappointment. His impolite utterance does not mean to attack the hearer.

Another impolite expressive speech act is use for giving evaluation or criticizing an activity. This impolite expressive exists in the term of taboo words. Taboo words is a ban or inhibition resulting from social custom or aversion (Jay, 2009). Why taboo word is ban, it because presenting an impolite behaviour or attitude against social norms or values. However, in a certain context these words are used for giving evaluation or critics of those behaviour or attitudes. This impolite expressive can be found in example below.

*“Is she single?” Strike asked. “What, you after a shag, too?” said Culpepper*  
*“Dia masih lajang?” tanya Strike. “Eh, kau mau tidur dengannya juga?” tanya Culpepper*

(quoted from *The Silkworm*, pg. 75)

In the above example quoted from the novel, a word ‘shag’ was used for performing evaluation what Strike used to conduct. The expression of ‘you after a shag’ is utterance presenting an impoliteness. However, this utterance is not used for attacking the hearer’s face. It is used for evaluating or criticizing the hearer’s usually or ever done when he met a single woman. This utterance is also not used for performing closed relationship among them, because they have same interest but different orientation with the case happens in the story.

Impolite expressive also reveals in the form of swearing. Swearing functionally in accordance with how and in what context used is divided into three types. The three types, according to Ljung, are called *stand alone*, *slot fillers*, dan *replacive swearing* (Shakiba, 2014). In certain context stand-alone swearing means showing a stressing or forcing for which it was said (Rebillard, 2013).

Utterance of impoliteness showing the intention as explained above can be read in the following example.

*“A burqa,” repeated Strike. “Bloody hell.”*  
*“Burqa,” ulang Strike. “Sialan.”*

(quoted from *The Silkworm*, pg. 188)

Utterance of ‘bloody hell’ contains an impolite expression. The utterance reveals what the speaker thinks about something and used for asserting. It does not seem the speaker tries to threat the hearer’s face. He wants to firm what he thinks about something exists.

Another impolite expression found in the novel as result of *bald on record impoliteness* strategy is used for showing avoiding. This expressive impoliteness is used to avoid self-indulgence by playing down their own suffering (Leech, 2014). Utterance expressed in this speech act present to try avoidance of what he undergoes such sadness, painfulness, and so on. This impolite expressive utterance tries to avoid what really happens on him. An example below may be able to convey this utterance.

*“Felt something go,” he said through gritted teeth, “in my knee. Shit....shit!” “We’ll get a taxi.”*  
*“Rasanya ada yang lepas,” kata Strike dengan rahang terkatup. “Shit....shit!” “Kita naik taksi.”*

(quoted from *The Silkworm*, pg. 204)

In trying to run after a character from which he may get an information, Strike expresses an impolite utterance when he felt there was something wrong on his knee. The impolite utterance is expressed for avoiding what painful he got. The utterance is not trying to attack the hearer.

TABLE I. THE RESULT OF TRANSLATION FOR IMPOLITE EXPRESSIVE SPEECH ACTS FOUND AS EXPLAINED ABOVE COULD BE READ IN THIS TABLE BELOW

No	Expressive Speech Act	Translation Quality									Score	
		Accurate			Accept			Read				
		3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1		
1.	disappoint ment		v		v				v			1.3
2.	evaluating/ criticizing		v		v				v			1.16
3.	firming/ass erting		v			v				v		1.3
4.	avoiding	v						v			v	0.8
												1.14

The table shows that the quality of translation for impolite expressive utterance has low degree of equivalence. The score of 1.14 indicates the low level of translation quality. This is caused by what translation technique or strategy used in translating the source text into target text. Different strategy used in translating a same object or data will provide different quality of translation. In this case it depends on the translator’s goal to get. Other reasons, the translator may be not having enough knowledge the background or context of speech acts performed.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The above explanation described that there are some expressive speech acts as implementation of impoliteness strategy, in this case a bald on record impoliteness. It is a

strategy of impoliteness, however, this intentionally does not threaten or attack the hearer. Some expressive speech acts revealed in the novel prove that the strategy results to express speaker's emotive feelings and attitudes. The expressive speech acts used for conveying disappointments, evaluating or criticizing, avoiding and disclaiming. Those speech acts used impoliteness strategy to express the emotive feeling and attitude, but not trying to attack the hearer. There may be some other speech acts existed in the novel for further study or researches.

The quality of translation for those impolite expressive speech act has low degree of equivalence. The low level is indicated by the score of 1.14. In the criteria of translation quality, the score of 1.14 means that the translation result in the aspects of accurate, acceptability and readability have low degree of equivalence. In accurate element the translation may have inaccurate terms or clauses in the target text. According to acceptability the translation has some unfamiliar terms or clauses for the target text reader. And the last in readability aspect the translation has difficulties in understanding the meaning.

Having analysed the data it could be concluded that bald on record impoliteness reveals as strategy to unintentionally attack the hearer. The expressive impoliteness is used for conveying the emotive feelings and attitudes. In other case this impoliteness contributes the speaker to overflow of emotion concerning with his emotive feelings and attitude. Further study needs to do for catching other goals such as to find other category of speech acts and its translation quality.

## References

- Ahmadi, A., & Soureshjani, K. H. (2011). Should we teach the impolite language? A study of Iranian EFL learners, teachers, experts and non-Iranian experts attitudes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1274-1282. doi:10.4304/jltr.2.6.1274-1282.
- Aliakbari, M. (2015). Variation of politeness strategies among the Iranian students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 981-988. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0505.13
- Allan, K. (2016). *The Routledge handbook of linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. (J. Urnson, Ed.) Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Aydınoglu, N. (2013). Politeness and impoliteness strategies: an analysis of gender differences in GERALD L. HORTON'S plays. *PROCEDIA: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 473-482. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.093
- Azman, I. N., Azmi, N. F., Maros, M., & Bakar, K. A. (2017). (IM) Politeness: swearing among youths in Malaysia. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences*, 47-54. Retrieved from www.textroad.com
- Bayat, N. (2013). A study on the use of speech acts. *Procedia : Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 213-221. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.057
- Biscetti, S. (2015). Power, (im)politeness and aggressiveness in early modern master-servant relations (1660-1750). *Journal of Early Modern Studies*, 287-314. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-15811
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bloomer, A. P. (2005). *Introducing language in use: a coursebook*. London: Routledge.
- Burke, M. (2014). *Routledge handbook of stylistics*. New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in language : an introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Pragmatics*, 349-367.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: using language to cause offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., & Kadar, D. Z. (2017). *The palgrave handbook of linguistics (im)politeness*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Djatmika. (2016). *Mengenal pragmatic yuk!?* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Felemban, F. H. (2012). Building up learners' communicative competence : the politeness principles. *Procedia : Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70-76. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.070
- Griffiee, D. T. (2012). *An introduction to second language research methods: design and data*. California: TESL-EJ Publication.
- Herman. (2015). Illocutionary acts analysis of Chinese in Pematangsiantar. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 41-48. Retrieved from www.ijhssi.org
- Hiani, K. E. (2015). Performing speech acts among Moroccan EFL advanced learners. *PROCEDIA: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 479-485. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.535
- Hobjila, A. (2012). Positive politeness and negative politeness in didactic communication—landmarks in Teaching Methodology. *PROCEDIA: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 213-221. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.10.032
- Horn, L. R. (2006). *The handbook of pragmatics*. Victoria: Blackwell.

- Jamet, D., & Jobert, M. (2013). *Aspect of linguistic impoliteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jay, T. (2009). The utility and ubiquity of taboo words. *Association for Psychological Science*, 153-161.
- Kecskes, I. (2010). The paradox of communication: socio-cognitive approach to pragmatics. *Pragmatics and Society*, 50 - 73. doi:10.1075/ps.1.1.04kec
- Langlotz, A., & Locher, M. A. (2013). The role of emotions in relational work. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 87-107. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.05.014
- Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, S. (2011). An experimental study of the classification and recognition of Chinese speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1801-1817. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.031
- Nababan, M. (2004). Strategi penilaian kualitas terjemahan. *Jurnal Linguistik Bahasa*.
- Nababan, M. (2010). Pengembangan model penilaian kualitas terjemahan. *Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia*.
- Nikoobin, A., & Shahrokhi, M. (2017). Impoliteness in the realization of complaint speech acts: a comparative study of iranian Efl learners and native english speakers. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 32 - 52. doi:10.5539/ijel.v7n2p32
- Pagliai, V. (2010). Conflict, cooperation, and facework in contrasto verbal duels. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 87-100. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1395.2010.01050.x.
- Panou, D. (2013). Equivalence in translation theories: a critical evaluation. *Theories and Practices in Language Studies*, 1 - 6.
- Rebillard, S. A. (2013). The speech act of swearing: gregory of nazianzus's oath in Poema 2.1.2 in Context. *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 177-207.
- Santosa, R. (2017). *Metode penelitian kualitatif kebahasaan*. Surakarta.
- Shakiba, N. (2014). Swearing: a cross-cultural linguistic study. Magnus Ljung (2011). *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 183-187.
- Swan, M. (2007). Grammar, meaning and pragmatics : sorting out the muddle. *Teaching English as Second or Foreign Language*, 1-10.
- Tayebi, T. (2016). Why do people take offence? Exploring the underlying expectations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1-17. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.09.011
- Thom, D. (2013). Impolite interventions? English satirical prints in the presence of academi, c. 1750-1780. *European Comic Art*, 13-39.
- Witek, M. (2015). An interactional account of illocutionary practice. *Language Science*, 43-55. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2014.08.003